

[Price 6d. each]

Islamic Review

AND

MUSLIM INDIA.

A Monthly Journal devoted to the Interests of the Muslim.

Office: THE MOSQUE, WOKING.

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

VOL. II.] SEPTEMBER 1914. [No. 8

Contents.

	PAGE
Study for an Atheist.—No. II.	3
True and False Worship	3
Our Friday Sermon: The Unity of God	3
Many a Muslim Here. By MARIE LOUGUIT	3
"The Eternal One." By JAMEELA MAUDE	3
Why I Adopted Islam. By SHAIK KHALID SHELDRAKE	3
"Let there be no Compulsion in Religion." By NAUREDDIN CLUND HARRIS	3
Miss Grace Ellison's Impressions of Harem Life, Polygamy	3
The Present War and the Prophet of Islam.—I.: The Work of Sunday Lecture Series. By KHWAJA KAMAL UD-DIN	3
Muslim and Christian Holy Wars	3
Soldiers and Morality	3
An Appeal Against War	3
Maxims of War: Caliph Abu Baker and Lord Kitson	3
The Arab Wakes: "Le Ghalib illa Allah." By BEAUMONT	3
The "Mare's Nest." By PROFESSOR JOHN PARKINSON	3
Islam: La Religio de la Homaro (<i>Esperanto</i>). By KHAN	3
Arabic	3

Price Six Shillings per annum post free in advance

Single copies to be obtained from the Publisher, 99 Strand,
and in India from Azeesmanzal, 1, ...

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
نَحْمَدُهُ وَنُصَلِّي عَلَى رَسُولِهِ الْكَرِيمِ

ISLAMIC REVIEW

AND

MUSLIM INDIA.

VOL. II.]

SEPTEMBER 1914.

[No. 8.

STUDY FOR AN ATHEIST.

II.

"The Nature made by God in which He has made all men—that is the right religion."—The Quran 30 : 29.

THERE is one most striking feature in Nature which a superficial observer even does not fail to notice. Everything in Nature is on its way to evolution, but under some marked course. It obeys certain laws, and so secures its progress. Its very utility to the whole world around it depends on its submission to the procedure fixed for it. The violation of its law means destruction and loss. Every day the sun rises and sets, with no deviation from its prescribed course. The whole solar system, the atmosphere, the earth and the things thereon are all tending to progress, but under given rules and regulations. The day and the night never overlap each other's province. How faithfully the moon and the stars pursue their course! This universal phenomenon of the law and obedience observable in the whole universe has so beautifully been depicted in the following Quranic words:—

"A sign to them also is the night. We withdraw the day from it, and lo! they are plunged in darkness, and the sun hasteneth to her place of rest. This is the ordinance of the Mighty, the Knowing."

"And as for the moon, we have decreed stations for it till it change like an old and crooked palm branch."

"To the sun it is not given to overtake the moon, nor doth the night outstrip the day. Each in its sphere doth journey on."—36: 37, 40.

What a truism—'Each in its sphere doth journey on!' Each component of Nature to pursue its own course—no violation, no trespass, but implicit obedience to the fixed unchangeable law. This alone reduces conflicting elements into one harmonious whole: a cosmos out of chaos! This alone is responsible for all scientific discoveries. Science creates nothing: its whole province is confined to the discovery of laws that guide the forces of Nature. Such discoveries were impossible, and futile too, if there be no certainty as to the unchangeable nature of the laws, and the obedience thereto by Nature.

Is it design or adaptation? Does not Nature follow a prescribed course? Does not the law govern matter? Had its evolution been haphazard, disorderly and unsystematic, one could argue in favour of adaptation in the working of Nature, with the law merely as its sequel. But science always finds system, order and regularity as the governing principles in the whole universe, and her discoveries are only discoveries of *rules and regulations prescribed to govern matter*. It means design and intelligence. The law precedes matter, and hence no adaptation. We quote here a few words from the writings* of the Great Muslim Saint of Qadian, India, who, in proving the existence of God so logically, made the following remarks:—

"Had all these heavenly systems no designer they would soon have been disorganised and ruined. The vast mass of matter rolling in space without disturbing each others' motion demonstrate contrivance and design by the regularity of their motions, and hence the Designer. Is it not surprising that these innumerable spheres thus rolling on from time immemorial do neither collide nor alter their course in the slightest degree. How could such a grand machinery work on without any disorder for numberless years unless it were in accordance with the intention and contrivance of a Supreme Contriver? Alluding to this consummate Divine Wisdom, Almighty God says in the Holy Quran: 'Is there any doubt concerning God who has made such wonderful heavenly bodies and such a wonderful earth' (14: 11)."

So far for our friend the Atheist in this number, as we propose to write more under this heading subsequently; but we have to say something to our brother, the follower of Christianity in its modern form.

* "The Teachings of Islam." (Luzac & Co., 46 Great Russell Street, London; or the *Review of Religions* Office, Qadian, India.

THE RELIGION OF NATURE.

If what we say here appeals to his conscience and reason, he should then believe in Religion of 'the Law and Obedience' which is, therefore, the religion of Nature, and science bears a practical testimony to its truth. Can we dispense with this religion? The religion of the Church in Christendom absolves us of it. Under the teachings of St. Paul it declares the law to be a curse. It believes in man's incapability to bear this curse of the law, and proposes salvation from its consequences through vicarious atonement. But is not man after all a sort of microcosm, a perfect organism, the finest product of Nature? Everything in Nature in its best fabric* finds room in him. Their harmonious combination creates in him vitality, intelligence, emotions and conscience, which have conjointly been named soul. Elements may change their form, but they do not change in their nature. To obey implicitly the law and thereby to produce marvellous and most desirable results is in the nature of the elements. Will they lose this characteristic feature when combined in human organism? Paulinity, and after it Churchianity, may dogmatise as much as it chooses to justify her belief in the divinity and atonement of a man, but science proves otherwise. No one could discover and formulate medical sciences, were capability to obey the law not certain. Laws of affinities, laws of assimilation, laws of organic working, and so forth, when systematised, make a science. Even a most superficial observation of human organic working establishes the same truth. We have eyes, ears and mouth: Put them to a use other than they are meant for, they may become impaired, they may lose their very existence, but they refuse to work under such unnatural ways; use them under the prescribed law, and you will find them most obedient: yea, in doing so, they become strengthened in their power. The same Religion of "the Law and Obedience" permeates the whole human fabric. If the use of our organs to our best advantage can be secured only through implicit obedience to certain laws, the propriety of their use needs much more guidance under the law. Are not all crimes but an abuse of our limbs, joints and various faculties. If the government of a country promulgates criminal laws to force on us the right use of our hands, feet and mouths, are we not in need of some higher law to rule our volition, judgment and discretion which actuate and regulate all our actions? We have been equipped with various morals and passions: Love, mercy, meekness, patience, generosity, anger, vengeance, bravery, hunger, thirst, and so forth. They all have their use and abuse. Anger when properly used becomes virtue, while love misplaced is a sin.

* "That of goodliest fabric we created man."—The Quran, 95: 4.

Mercy shown to the murderer endangers society, while the discreet use of vengeance secures peace and safety for it. Are we not in need of the law which may regulate all these behests, cravings, passions and morals in human nature? The working of present society has admitted the need; we do obey certain laws consciously or unconsciously in the use of all our morals and passions and in satisfaction of our cravings. The same is true, as already shown, about our limbs, joints and organs. Thus man, with the rest of Nature, practically believes in the Religion of Nature, the Religion of the Law and Obedience—*i.e.*, Islam—Resignation to God, implicit obedience to His high will and complete submission to His control in preference to all our opinion, judgment and discretion.

It is not an abject slavery, as ignorance styles it sometimes. We receive the law from others; we every day bow down before a wiser discretion; we give way to saner judgment. And who can be more discreet, saner, and wiser than the High Intelligence and All-Knowledge which so wisely governs the whole Universe to its best advantage? A designer is the best authority to propose a course to get his object accomplished. And does not Nature disclose great design? Who other than the Creator Himself can enlighten us as to the ways most efficient to accomplish His ends? Therefore we need revelation from God. The Religion of the Law and Obedience is the best rule of life, and this was first revealed to Adam when he was ordered not to eat the fruit of a certain tree. The same religion of Islam (submission) found its developed expression from the Mount of Sinai. Human nature had become corrupt, and it received some degree of rectification at Seir, Mount of Olives. The same religion was vouchsafed to the other nations of human race, as the Quran says. Humanity evolved everywhere under Divine guidance, and when its various branches, so separated from each other, were to come together to make a united whole, the Religion of Nature found its last exponent at the Mount of Paran (Arabia), and thus the words of the Lord were fulfilled, who spoke through Moses in days bygone:—

“And he said: ‘The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; He shined from Mount Paran’” (Deut. xxxiii. 2).

Jesus preached the same religion till He left the world. If the event of the Cross was to give a New Dispensation, which must not be unknown to Him as God, what necessity was there for Him to deliver homilies and sermons from the Mount of Olives? Did He not say, “Think not that I am come to destroy the law. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.” This religion He gave to His disciples. Did He authorise St. Paul to destroy it, as he afterwards did? The One who was to come after Him had to teach all the truth. Was this the new truth—dispensing with the law, which the Church has taught to

the world? Read chapters v. and vi. of St. Matthew. "Ye have heard that . . . But I say unto you that . . ."—is the running feature of the whole sermon. Is not Jesus giving some law? Is He not repealing or correcting the current view of the law? If He knew that man was incapable of obeying it, was He joking with His disciples? If the law was a curse, did He come to aggravate it? God forbid my saying it, but this is a legitimate conclusion under the teachings of His present Church. All this is apparent to simple reason, but a clergyman in the church with his academical gown on his shoulders can manage to ignore all this.

TRUE AND FALSE WORSHIP.

UNDER the above heading the late Bishop J. C. Ryle, D.D., has given ventilation to some beautiful thoughts, published by Drummond's Tract Depot, Stirling, in a small tract form, from which we make the following quotation. It will be perused, we hope, with some interest by our readers:—

The last thing that demands our attention in these verses is *the tendency of man's inventions in religion to supplant God's Word*. Three times we find this charge brought forward by our Lord against the Pharisees: "Laying aside the commandments of God, ye hold the traditions of men" (Mark vii. 8); "Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own traditions"; "Making the Word of God of none effect through your own traditions." The first step of the Pharisees was to add their traditions to the Scriptures, as useful supplements. The second was to place them on a level with the Word of God, and give them equal authority. The last was to honour them above the Scripture, and to degrade Scripture from its lawful position. This was the state of things which our Lord found when He was upon earth.

It is a mournful fact that Christians have far too often walked in the steps of Pharisees in this matter. The very same process has taken place over and over again. The very same consequences have resulted. Religious observances of man's invention have been pressed on the acceptance of Christians—observances to all appearance useful, and at all events well-meant, but observances nowhere commanded in the Word of God. These very observances have by and by been enjoined with more vigour than God's own commandments, and defended with more zeal than the authority of God's own Word. We need not look far for examples. The history of our Church will supply them.

Let us beware of attempting to add anything to the Word of God, as necessary to salvation. It provokes God to give us over to judicial blindness. It is as good as saying that His Bible is not perfect, and that we know better than He does what is necessary for man's salvation. It is just as easy to destroy the authority of God's Word by addition as by subtraction, by burying it under man's inventions as by denying its truth. The whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, must be our rule of faith—nothing added and nothing taken away.

Finally, let us draw a broad line of distinction between those things in religion which have been devised by man and those which are plainly commanded in God's Word. What God commands is necessary to salvation. What man commands is not. What man devises may be useful and expedient for the times; but salvation does not hinge on obedience to it. What God requires is essential to life eternal. He that wilfully disobeys it ruins his own soul.

ISLAMIC REVIEW.—We re-echo the sentiments so rightly expressed in the above. "What God commands is necessary to salvation; what man commands is not"—words pregnant with truth, the best watchwords in the ups and downs of life. Every right-minded Christian should, therefore, see the Church of his Master built upon the words that escaped His blessed lips. It should be purged of all human inventions. But perhaps the most difficult question in this work of reformation will be to specify the landmark in the history of the Church when human invention began to take hold of the Church of Christ. One can easily dispense with the decisions of the Council of Nice and others. But the modern Church finds its real superstructure in the writings of St. Paul. His religion is not based upon the teachings of Christ; in fact he makes very sparing references to the words of the Lord as his authority. His half-logical and half-ingenious religious fervour makes up the whole creed. We shall have to eliminate his writings out of the Biblical record if we desire to be relieved of human ingenuity. There is, however, another difficulty in the way. We wish we could say, in the words of the very right reverend bishop: "The whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, must be our rule of faith—*nothing added and nothing taken away.*" No one can say about the Bible what we have put in italics. Our readers will read something in this connexion in an article reproduced elsewhere* under the heading "Where is the Bible?" The only sacred book intelligible to average man as to which we can safely say "Nothing added and nothing taken away" is the Holy Quran, a book which gives us a complete code of life, and satisfies all human needs.

* In the coming number.—ED.

OUR FRIDAY SERMON.

THE UNITY OF GOD.*

"I am only a man like you."

"Say: In sooth I am only a man like you. It hath been revealed to me that your God is one only God. Let him then that hopeth to meet his Lord work righteous work: nor let him give any other creature a share in the worship of his Lord."

—The Quran, 18: 110.

BROTHERS AND SISTERS,—I most emphatically congratulate you on having a Man in the person of your Prophet. You are men, with all the ideals and aspirations of man, with the capabilities and aptitudes of man, and you need for your Guide and Teacher a man. Indeed, we are proud of our Lord (Muhammad), who, in the above-quoted words of the Quran, says, "I am only a man like you." This is the only Gospel of evolution, the best impetus for human advancement. As an incentive to us to follow our teacher nothing could be stronger than our belief in the likeness that exists between him and ourselves. Man, and only man, can be our best model; neither animal nor angel. Are we not creatures of imitation? Does not environment go further in the moulding of our character than heredity? From our infancy, as we advance in age, our parents, our tutors, our friends, or, say, any personality stronger than others, claim our attention and allegiance as a model. But we never think of imitating one whose nature or aptitude is different to that of our own. We admire the lion and the elephant for their courage and power respectively; but we never take them for our ideal. We have neither the wish nor the capacity to become a lion or an elephant. Are we then capable of the desire of becoming Gods? Admittedly not, we do not possess the aptitude to become so: we cannot go beyond the limits imposed by our human nature. Where, then, lies the necessity of having a God-in-Man before us as our model? How lucidly this truth has been expounded in another verse in the Quran: "And what hindereth men from believing when the guidance came to them, but that they say, 'Hath God sent a man as an Apostle?' Say, 'Did angels walk the earth as its familiars, we had surely sent them as angel-apostles out of them'" (17: 96, 97).

An angel-apostle from God could only come to angels. Equipped with faculties quite different to ours, he could not

* Delivered by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, at the White City, July 17, 1914.

be a teacher or apostle of God to us. Much less, in the case of God Himself, could we imitate Him or follow His footsteps as God, for we cannot transcend our human limitations. I wonder what induced the Church in the West to deify Jesus? The son of Mary may or may not be a God; the question, perhaps, is not worthy of rational consideration. But decidedly he is not in requisition as a teacher or type of humanity if he was a God. In fact, Jesus himself never claimed to be such. He has been spoken of as a son of God, but so he thought others to be. He gave us some laws of morality, but he did not destroy the law in existence; he used to work wonders, but he did not deny the capability of others to do the same. In fact, I read nothing of him in the whole evangelical record which could not be said of his fellow-men. He is human all through, and worthy of being received as a specimen, with the necessary allowance for his environment. Of his atonement the less I say the better; but even then he is no model. No other could become God, to bear the universal curse said to hang over humanity. In short, Jesus may or may not be a Deity, but, if so, his utility to me as a pattern of humanity is next to nil, as nothing could make me Divine in that sense. I am a man, with the ideals and aspirations of a man. Oh, I love to hear that great and noble Teacher of Arabia, who says, "I am a man like you." It brings the true ideal before me, and opens up a splendid vista of shining hopes and glorious possibilities before my eyes. Here is the great man, the great ideal, as he says, "I am only a man like you." I may not reach the top of the ladder he is standing on, but his thrilling words dispel all clouds of doubt enveloping my capabilities, and open a gateway to hope and success. He assures me that he and I are potentially alike, sharing in each others aspirations and desires, and equally subject to human shortcomings. This assurance on the part of my Divine Teacher and Prototype can only actuate me to follow in his footsteps, with the hope to reach the goal of humanity. Could any God-in-Man say the same to me, and fill my glowing heart with hopes and fair prospects, and make my life a veritable millennium? Lord Muhammad could rightly say to me, in the words of the Quran, "Follow me; God will love you, and suppress your evil propensities"; but the Lord Jesus, if God, cannot invite me to follow him. As a God, he is hopeless as a pattern, for he cannot turn me into a God, there being no affinity between him and myself in the matter of aptitude and capability.

Faithful Muslims accept Muhammad as the best and most perfect specimen of humanity, and if he himself says that he is a man like us, then no one but God can be the object of our worship. How lucidly this very idea has been brought home to us in the text under consideration: "I am only a man like you; it has been revealed to me that your God is one only God." Other spiritually-minded men of less achievement and

distinction have been hailed by their fellow-men as Deities, but the clear teaching of the Quran has saved the Faithful from the humiliation of man-worship.

The idea of equality and likeness between man and man, which Islam thus forcibly established by personal reference to the Holy Prophet, creates the true spirit of emulation, but for which no personal advancement is possible. This is one of the chief reasons that Islam, the only Gospel of Brotherhood and Equality, emphasises the belief in the Unity of God. Do not think that our God is "a jealous God." To associate others with Him is to a great extent the cause of all moral, intellectual, and social thralldom. When we say, "We believe only in one God," we take one, and only one, as the object of our worship and adoration, the only source of our light and guidance; one, to Him alone we should look for help and guidance; one who alone can inspire love, fear, awe, and respect in our breasts. Thus our belief in the Unity of God brings forth all healthy democratic ideas, it creates independence of spirit and pertinacity of character, and kills all base ideas of improper subordination and slavish subservience. I can think for myself, I am the captain of my own life, and the worker out of my destiny; all chances are equally open to me; I can do what others have done. A Muslim, therefore, with his firm belief in the Unity of God, cannot subscribe to any institution that destroys or ignores this spirit of equality between man and man. The variety of grades in society is in no sense contrary to the equality of man with man. It is the effect of individual effort, and the incentive of further activity. It is the equality of chances for progress which should be open to every man, as the world and the bounties of God are open to all. If other people have become superior in rank and status in any respect, it is not a gift but an acquirement and development of things within the reach of others also. What has been accessible to them has not been sealed against us.

THE UNITY OF GOD A GREAT FACTOR IN CIVILISATION.

The belief in the Unity of God as preached in Islam served also another great purpose. From time immemorial till the advent of Islam, man worshipped the elements of Nature, from fetichism to man-worship. As man-worship is antagonistic to democratic ideas, and destroys the emulation in us which is the only passport to success, similarly element-worship acted as a great impediment to our progress in natural sciences. We need a firm belief in our mastery over the whole Universe as an impetus to make scientific discoveries, and our belief in the Unity of God comes to our help in this respect. With the Islamic faith in one Allah, all our dieties become but our equals or even our subservients. Could we treat the various manifestations of Nature as ministers to us if they were believed to be

our Deities? Man worshipped the sun, the moon, and the stars in days gone by; he adored the rivers, the winds, and the trees, and always approached them with respect and awe. Such psychology of mind was not favourable to scientific research. Man could not dare—or even imagine it—to bring his gods under his investigation. To think of utilising them for his needs was a sacrilege and a profanity. Hence no regular progress was made in scientific research before the advent of Islam. The Quran has revealed and impressed the Unity of God on the Muslim mind: the Book not only brought these pseudo-deities down from their pedestal of Divinity, but showed them to be only the ministers to our needs. The words of the Quran in this respect are sufficiently eloquent:—

“It is God who hath created the heaven and the earth, and sendeth down water from the heaven, and so bringeth forth the fruits *for your food*. And *He hath subjected to you the ships*, so that by His command they pass through the sea; and He hath *subjected the rivers to you*, and He hath *subjected the sun and the moon* in their constant courses, and He hath subjected the day and the night (14: 38). See you now that God *hath put under you all that is in the heaven and all that is on the earth*” (31: 19).

All that is in the heavens and all that is on or in the earth has been subjected to man, a truth so lucidly revealed to man by the Quran. Could you make progress by leaps and bounds, as we have done in recent times, without such belief? Does it not spur you on to further progress, and bring all the latent forces of Nature under you? Do you think that to work wonders is an impossibility, if every latent power of the Universe is subject to you, if you have insight into it? Is not the whole world, therefore, under a tremendous obligation to the Quran for giving it clear knowledge of this great truth? If we lay special stress upon the Unity of God, it is to establish our own superiority over the Universe, and restore the equality of man. God is not one whit more dignified, or one whit less honourable in His divine glory, if we worship Him alone, or if we associate Him with ten thousand deities. He is self-sufficient, and not a jealous God. To glorify Him is consistent with your own edification; you bring indignity to His image when you bow down before Nature or its components, including man.

MANY A MUSLIM HERE.

How many are Muslims at heart who yet know it not, and if asked would deny it? The West has starved these souls long enough because they refuse to pander to the silly rites of man-invented creeds. When they read the Quran they will find, instead of standing alone, they are one in that greatest of all brotherhoods: the dear unity of Islam. Independence may be precious, but there is a longing in all of us for the strange sweet comfort in the companionship of those who think as we do on the subjects nearest to our hearts; there is a deep solace in the sympathy of those who pray with us, because they pray as we do. Islam has its happiness in its appreciation of God's great love and care for us, its joy in the fulfilment of the laws in the Quran, its pleasure in family affection and the beauties of Nature; it has always held out its hand in peace to the West. Has it ever had anything offered it but dynamite, guns, prisons, and famines by the nations whose chief hobby seems to be breeding that cruel untruth: "Islam is the religion of the sword"? All the time the Quran is singing out that splendid law of gentleness and generosity that there must be no compulsion in religion, for it demands purity in the love it offers God, well recognising that compulsion against the will can produce but a poor and imperfect form of adoration; closer, through connivance, to toleration than true affection of the heart. The "creed" of the general run of Western ecclesiastics is:—

"We are the true selected few,
The rest can all be damned,
There's only room for me and you,
We can't have Heaven crammed."

Compare the sentiment of this with this golden thought from the Quran:—

"It matters not whate'er ye name yourselves,
Believing Muslims, Jews, or Nazarenes,
Or Sabeans—whoe'er believe in God,
The last e'erlasting day, and act aright,
Their meed is with their Lord; no fear nor care
Shall come upon them, nor the touch of woe."

These words shed the glorious sunlight of God's love on all who love Him and are sincere in their convictions. The Quran is not full of instructions in heathenish rites, but it tells sellers to treat buyers fairly, it inculcates the doctrine that cleanliness *is* Godliness, not "next to" it; it has not one commandment that only a "saint," a coward, or a lunatic could fulfil; but it says, "turn away evil with good"—that is within the reach of

us all. Islam is no "creed" in the Western acceptance of the word; it is just God's arms around us. By the increasing keenness of perception it grants us we may drink deeper of the cup of sorrow when it comes our way; but just the joy it gives in the unveiling of the loveliness of one spring day—well, those who have wept, they know; they will tell you it is God's voice calling us through the ages from the Beginning of Time. All it asks is that we will throw open the "sanctuary of sanctuaries" in our souls—and let Love in.

MARIE LOUGUIT.

"THE ETERNAL ONE."

ALL praises be to God on high,
 Who to mankind doth give
 The power and the fruits thereof
 That ever we may live

Thy bounteous mercy did provide
 Whilst we were yet unborn,
 Thy favours with us e'er abide,
 N'er let us be forlorn.

We see Thy sun, Thy moon, Thy stars,
 We see Thy handiwork,
 And emperors and kings and czars
 Thy mandates cannot shirk.

Our inmost being longs to cry,
 "All praises be to Thee,"
 Our actions ruled by Thee e'er nigh,
 Make us near perfect be.

At break of day and noon, and when
 The sun climbs slowly by,
 At even-tide and night, e'en then
 Do prayers reach the sky.

We try to live at one with Thee
 And obey Thy command,
 That in the end we all shall be
 In Thy vast presence grand.

Oh Allah, hear us when we call,
 And help us every day;
 Who art to us our all in all,
 The Light to show the way.

JAMEELA MAUDE.

WHY I ADOPTED ISLAM.*

I WAS brought up by my parents in strict conformity to Church of England principles, and for seven years was a chorister. Our clergyman was a man for whom I still have every regard. He was sincere, patient, generous to a fault, and a man of his word. I must confess that during my boyhood days religion troubled me very little, and my service was rather that of an automaton. Later I began to battle in the world, and came in contact with a new environment. My first position gave me as companions an Agnostic and a Roman Catholic, and one can imagine the discussions that ensued daily. Here for the first time I heard attacks upon the creed which I held; as these upset me, I registered a mental vow to study my own creed in order to refute the arguments of my colleagues. To my utter surprise, when I began to read and attend lectures on Christian subjects, I found that I really did not believe many of the propositions stated. I read anti-Christian literature, and felt alarmed for my own creed. I attended every denomination I could, chapel and church, and went deeply into the history and teachings of these parties. I felt attracted to one sect only, and that was the Unitarian Church. However, prepossessed as I was in favour of the Trinitarian Church, I still read with avidity, ready—nay, eager—to be convinced that Christianity was the only true religion, and that all others were not of Divine origin. I still retained my bias against other creeds, consequently all my reading was through orthodox spectacles. At last I decided that the religion I had evolved in my own heart was far from the teachings of the Churches of Christendom. First of all I found that they taught me I was “conceived in sin,” thus insulting the ones nearest and dearest to me—my parents. I read that they had committed a sin in bringing me into this world. Should I be worthy of the name of “son” if I could consent to this? Then I found that I was born with a sinful nature, that I really could not help sinning, and therefore, to my mind, I should be glorifying God by becoming as great a sinner as I could, as He had given me sin as a part of my creation. What a travesty of Nature, what an insult to the work of the Creator, what a blasphemy against God Himself! I also found that, being sinful, I was already destined for Hell, with its terrible picture of boiling lakes of fire and brimstone; that if I were not baptised and should die there was no hope for me, even as an infant: my soul would perish. What a contrast to what I later learned of Islam on this point: “All children are born with a disposition to the natural religion, its parents make of it a Christian, a Jew, or a Muslim”; thus by the saying of the

* An address by Shaik Khalid Sheldrake at the White City, London.

Holy Prophet this pernicious doctrine is given the lie. I also found that God, as represented by different phases of the Bible, was in reality not a kind Creator but an inhuman monster, who wished for the destruction of all humanity in order to gratify the national desires of one petty people. It wished me to believe that God, after creating mankind, found that He had so bungled the work that He wished to destroy all nations but the Jewish. He is given as issuing this unholy command to this "chosen people," "Slay ye every one of them, take not one of them alive." Could I believe this? Never: may His forgiveness extend to those who caricature Him thus. Then I find that although He sent scores of Prophets, mankind were as stiff-necked as ever, and that He made up his mind to utterly condemn all to an Everlasting Hell. There was one proviso. The "Only-begotten" Son of God pleaded for humanity, and the Father (God forbid that I should ever say that this is true, I only quote the Christian doctrine) agreed that His Son should be killed as a sacrifice, and take upon His shoulders the sin of the whole world. It would have me believe that God was guilty of murdering his own Son; yes, and for what reason? to gratify His own insensate anger. To my mind, in thus portraying God as a murderous fiend, those who are its originators are guilty of the grossest blasphemy conceivable. Then the Son would take away sin upon one condition, that the person must believe in "His saving Blood," and we find hymns which read, "Washed in the Blood of the Lamb." What a conception of barbarity: would any clergyman or follower of this doctrine go to the slaughter-house and obtain a bath full of blood and then wash therein. It is disgusting, revolting to the mind of the Twentieth Century, and a relic of barbarism. How educated people can accept this is beyond me. Then the very idea of the Supreme Force behind the universe begetting a Son, endowing Him with the passions of a human being! here is blasphemy again, to my mind. If one does not accept this concoction and this "Saving Blood," he is condemned to torment. What a terrible conception of God. Adam is referred to as the "Son of God," but Christians wish us to believe that Jesus was the *only* offspring of the Deity. It represents God as a fiend, whose action in giving a sinful nature to man makes Him guilty of the same passion as the human frame; nay, more than ever a human being could possess, for where is the father who would deliberately kill his own son to appease his own wrath? I found that whilst Christianity was triumphant, everyone who dared to think for himself was burned alive, or imprisoned and tortured, that the rule of the Church was steeped in blood. One can imagine the justification of these recent wars in the Balkans, where these champions of Christianity no doubt followed their creed in bathing the Near East in blood in order to save a few souls in Macedonia, afterwards spilling the blood of each other to make it more efficacious and thus show to the world the

cementing power of Christianity. I found that men who were Freethinkers were responsible for our freedom of speech and freedom of the Press to-day, that men like George, Jacob Holyoake, Charles Bradlaugh and their followers were persecuted, but stuck to their guns, and we are reaping the benefit of their sacrifices for liberty. We owe our emancipation not to Christianity, but to Rationalism. I also saw that Christian Divines admitted that they could not give any authenticity to the names appearing upon the books which constitute the Bible, that they admitted that Moses did *not* write the first five books; that the Kings and Chronicles, Ruth, Isaiah, Malachi, &c., &c., were the writings of unknown men, probably founded upon some works of these Prophets; that Matthew, Mark, Luke and John did not write those Gospels, which they admit differ, and say that it is impossible to reconcile the Fourth Gospel to the others; that St. Paul did not write the epistles and letters attributed to him, and so practically the whole book is the composition of unknown writers, which is given to the world as a sacred book. That it has been altered and interpolated even in recent years is evinced by the fact that the Revision Committee have recently taken out the 1 John v. 7, "There are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost, and these three are one," which they state is found in no ancient copy, and Augustine Calmet, the eminent French theologian, admits was introduced of late date. It has even been attributed to Martin Luther. This great reformer, though certainly he did reform the ritualistic abuses of the prevalent superstition at that time, failed most signally in delving at the root of things. He left absolutely untouched the history of the Bible; he accepted it as it stood, and never sought to prove its authenticity, perhaps because he dared not. He evidently was possessed with a morbid imagination, for we hear of his having seen the devil and thrown an ink-pot at him. He, however, would have persecuted anyone who dared raise his voice to endeavour to investigate its origin. In fact, Christianity, though we hear that it was persecuted by the Roman Emperors, has never been the religion of toleration. No sooner did Constantine declare his allegiance to it, than we find the Arians, who believed in Jesus as a Prophet, were persecuted with the utmost ferocity by the Trinitarians. Always when in the ascendant Christianity has persecuted anyone who dared to differ from it, and Protestants burnt Catholics as merrily as Catholics performed the same operation upon Protestants here in England. This all went to prove to my mind that the Church must first of all, before it preaches about Jesus and His teachings, find the original manuscripts or the books which are beyond doubt the work of the apostles or prophets of those days. Christianity is wrong as it stands by presenting an unknown book as the evidence of the mission of Jesus. How different from Islam, where the Holy Quran stands

to-day as it was delivered by the Holy Prophet Muhammad, free from interpolation, still in its original purity. We can confidently face any attack, but Christendom must bow before any storm until she searches for the true accounts of the life of her principal figure. Even if we take the book as it stands, do we not read that Jesus said, "If a man smite thee on thy right cheek, offer him the left," and, judging Europe by that saying, is Europe Christian? England is building dreadnoughts, and voting large sums of money for the Army and Navy; but why? If England is Christian she should allow all her enemies to come and take possession of her lands, her people, and all that she has. Something must be wrong; either the teaching of Jesus or the policy and humbug of European nations. I came into contact with that great writer W. Stewart Ross, who so admired that great champion of Islam that he adopted as his pen name "Saladin." He said that "if God existed, then He was far above any conception of Him given by Christianity; if there was a Supreme Power, and I have never denied this, then He is immeasurably above the pitiful pictures given in the Bible: and if any description tallied with the God we see mirrored in Nature, then that sublime picture of God was given by Islam." I came, through him, to study Buddhism, which I found rather a philosophy than a religion. One could wonder if, acting upon the example of the Buddhist monk with the begging bowl, or that of Jesus in His wanderings, a Jesus could come to the world to-day and pursue the same kind of mendicant life, would the world receive Him? No: he would most probably be imprisoned as a vagrant. I needed a practical faith, not a faith to dream away one's life, to disassociate oneself from others, but a creed that would be helpful to me each hour in my conduct to others and myself. I studied the other "systems," as they are styled by many people who have never taken the trouble to try to understand them, and found that the thoughts within myself which have crystallised into a kind of creed met their counter-part in Islam. That was BEFORE I had ever read one book written by a Muslim or had ever met one of the Muslim faith. I had noticed the continual attacks made upon Islam by Christian writers, and I asked myself these questions: "Why are they so afraid of Islam?" "What does Islam teach that renders it such a formidable enemy to the Church?" I obtained every book that I was able, and these were only by Christian critics. From these, weighing the matter in my mind, I came to the truth ten years ago, and realised that I was Muslim, and the first Musulman I ever came into contact with was that noble example of self-abnegation Dr. Abdulla al Mamun Suhrawardy. After talking with him, and still inquiring very critically, even now feeling the Christian bias, I at last had all my doubts removed and declared myself Muslim. These points have always struck me in Islam from the prac-

tical standpoint : Islam forbids alcoholic liquor and gambling. Does Christianity ? Can we find any text in the Bible against these crying evils of European civilisation ? No : on the contrary, although I admire the efforts of Christians in this direction, I must admit that they are better than their creed. The first miracle of Jesus, as recorded in the New Testament, was to turn ordinary drinking water into wine, and fermented wine at that. We read of the master of the feast, who no doubt would have to be a good judge of wines, asking Him why He had kept the good wine until now, when it was usual to give the best first, and after the palate had lost its acuteness, or to give the actual words "when men have well drunk," to give them inferior, as they would not remark the difference. Is not this an encouragement to liquor ? The Holy Communion is celebrated with *fermented* wine, and should any remain, being consecrated, it must be finished by the officiating priest. Again, does not St. Paul, or the anonymous writer, advise Timothy to "take a little wine for thy stomach's sake" ? Where, then, can Christianity have obtained the idea of Temperance ? certainly not from the Bible. No doubt they arrived at the conclusion that it was an evil after their observations in Muslim lands, and so are indebted to Islam for that teaching which their own creed failed to give them. Drink and gambling are the great curses of Christian lands, and do not exist where there is Muslim domination. Islam stands for progress, and so the world must evolve until it becomes far purer and far more enlightened, whilst Christianity has always repressed genius. Jesus, too, we know very little of, and so He cannot be a pattern to guide us, but we know every day of the life of Muhammad. He was persecuted for thirteen years, and showed exemplary patience and fortitude. Then, triumphant, his enemies at his feet, when he would have been perfectly justified in taking sweeping vengeance, he pardoned all. To be merciful one must have the opportunity and power to take vengeance and then forego it. We know that he had no false sense of pride, that he swept his own hearth and cobbled his own shoes, and this at a time when he was King of the whole of Arabia. He gave all his wealth to the needy and to free slaves, and his life was a model one from birth to death. Islam teaches nobility, self-sacrifice, and good works : these are the things that bring us to Paradise. Beliefs are nothing if not accompanied by good actions. Unity of God and Brotherhood of Man, this is the message of Islam to the West, and is it not a creed that anyone should be proud of ? I have never regretted that I became Muslim, I shall never be ashamed to confess God and our Holy Prophet. Ashadu an la ilaha il Allah, wa ashadu anna Muhammadar rasool Ullah.

“LET THERE BE NO COMPULSION IN RELIGION.”

THE above verse from the Holy Quran gives the complete lie to the deliberate misrepresentation concocted by interested persons to villify the faith which is surely spreading over the whole of the earth: the idea that Islam is spread at the point of the sword, and that it is the duty of all Muslims to extirpate unbelievers. This tale has been spread broadcast, and evoked such sarcastic comment from Carlyle in his “Heroes and Hero Worship.” It pictures the negro on his knees, the hut behind him a mass of flame, and a gigantic Arab standing over him offering the choice of the Quran or the sword. Really this has been overdone through fanatical zeal upon the part of the pious folk who wish to advance Christianity at the expense of Islam. If we look into the teachings of the Holy Quran upon this point, do we find any bloodthirsty orders to “Slay ye every one of them, take not one of them alive,” as we find in another sacred writing? What do we find? “Summon men to the way of thy Lord with wisdom and kindly warning,” “Dispute with them in the kindest manner,” “Wilt thou force men to become believers?” These passages speak for themselves. If we study the history of Islam and compare it with that of Christendom, we may be permitted to give the remarks of Christian writers upon this point. Mons. Jurieu says: “It is expedient to cure men of this prejudice—namely, that Mahomedanism is a cruel sect, which was propagated by putting men to their choice of death or the abjuration of Christianity. This is in no wise true; and the conduct of the Saracens was an evangelical meekness in comparison with that of Popery, which exceeded the cruelty of cannibals.” Chatfield says (“Historical Review,” p. 311): “Had the Saracens, Turks, and other Mahomedan tribes adopted the same conduct towards the Christians as the European natives had practised towards the followers of the Quran, it is probable that the Christian religion would have been extinguished in the East.” Thus we take outside testimony as to the conduct of Muslims in their religious dealings with people of other creeds. Let us look at Turkey, Persia, Northern Africa, the Balkan States, Southern Russia, or any country which was under Muslim rule; we find Christians living at peace, conducting their business, practising their religion, entering into the services of the Governments, even holding the position of Prime Minister and other high official posts. What a contrast we find in Spain, which was under Muslim rule for many hundreds of years. Under Muslim rule it led the van of progress in Europe; it was first in the sciences, in agriculture, and students from all quarters attended its colleges.

Toleration was universal. When the country was conquered by the Christians what a difference! The Muslims were massacred, forced to change their religion or meet death, and at last were compelled to leave the country, the Jews also meeting the same fate; and the exiles fled to Africa and Turkey penniless, from the country whose prosperity they alone had produced. During the Christian conquest of Sicily the Muslims and Jews shared a like fate, and even in our own day during the Italian attack upon Tripoli the Muslims were shot down in cold blood and their possessions taken from them. In the recent war in the Balkans the Muslim population were treated in like manner, and offered the choice of Christianity or death. Then the various States began to fight each other, and Catholics and Bulgarians were forced to adopt the Orthodox Greek creed or were shot. The very existence of the Christian churches and communities in Muslims lands is a monument of the toleration of Islam; but where are the mosques or Muslim communities in Spain, Hungary, and Sicily to-day, although these were Muslim States in the past? Sufficient proof is forthcoming to show that persecution has never been practised by Islam; but can the same be said of its sister religion?

Another great feature of Islam is that there are no huge organisations for its propaganda. Proselytising is the result of individual effort, and its immense success in all parts of the world causes wonder to all who do not understand its teachings. Prof. Arnold has written a wonderful book which should be read by all, entitled "The Preaching of Islam." It portrays the advance of Islam quite apart from any Muslim domination; it clearly shows the appeal that Islam has to people of all climes; and gives direct contradiction to the worn-out fable that Islam spreads by the sword. Again, let us take one or two examples of countries which are not, neither have been, under Muslim rule, and let us mark the progress of Islam. China affords us the spectacle of pacific evangelisation. There has never been any Muslim conquest of China, and yet, although the Christian missionary campaign commenced about the same time as Islam first reached China, we have the presence of between thirty to fifty million Muslims in that land, whilst the Christian numbers are insignificant. If we take the Malay Archipelago we find that although various Christian States have enjoyed for centuries paramount influence, yet there are millions of Muslims here. The Northern Provinces of Russia were never under Muslim rule, yet the Muslim population is very large, as also is the case with Siberia; and Japan is now a fruitful field for those Muslim propagandists who labour there whilst pursuing their ordinary occupations. Islam has no priesthood, and so no paid professional class for religious purposes; therefore, those who preach Islam abroad are often merchants, professors at colleges, professional men or students. Compare these isolated efforts with the large societies of

Christendom, with the large army of paid missionaries whose whole business is to preach and teach. Does not this prove that Islam is the religion of God, and that it is therefore ordained to spread over the whole of the universe? Truly does the Holy Quran say, "Truth has come, and falsehood shall vanish to return no more." Canon Isaac Taylor says: "It is not the first propagation of Islam that has to be explained; but it is the permanency with which it retains its hold upon its converts. Christianity is less tenacious in its grasp. An African tribe once converted to Islam never reverts to paganism, and never embraces Christianity. . . . How little have we to show for the vast sums of money and all the precious lives lavished upon Africa: Christian converts are reckoned by the thousands, Muslim converts by the *millions*. These are the stern facts we have to face. They are extremely unpleasant facts; it is folly to ignore them. We ought to begin by recognising the fact that Islam is *not* an anti-Christian faith, but a half-Christian faith. . . . There is nothing in the teaching of Mahomed antagonistic to Christianity. . . . Let us remember that in some respects Muslim morality is better than our own. In resignation to God's will, in temperance, charity, veracity, and in the brotherhood of believers they set us a pattern we should do well to follow." With these remarks of this eminent dignitary of the Church of England let us conclude, trusting that this deliberate campaign of falsehood and misrepresentation will cease, and that the day will come when Christianity, putting her own house in order, will realise that after all Islam was the religion taught by Jesus, as it was by Muhammad.

Since writing the above I have received instructions to present myself for military service under Great Britain, and add these few remarks whilst in uniform. Islam teaches the highest loyalty to the State, to quote from the words of one of its chief exponents: "Hence, in order to be Muslim in the truest sense of the word, we should render service to the Government even when it does not know it, and should banish from our minds all desire for requital, recognition, or gratitude. Our only consideration in serving the Government should be that God has, out of His Wisdom, placed us under it, and has entrusted to its care our properties, our lives, and our honour; therefore it behoves us to take such measures as conduce to its stability and welfare, without caring to let the Government know, and without cherishing any desire for reward or recognition."* Islam teaches loyalty to rulers, whether they be Muslim or of another creed or race.

NAUREDDIN CLIVE-HARRIS.

* From a lecture delivered by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, at Lahore, in 1912.

MISS GRACE ELLISON'S IMPRESSIONS OF HAREM LIFE, POLYGAMY, &c.

READING so frequently the deliberate misrepresentations which are spread broadcast concerning life in Muslim lands and Islamic institutions, it is worthy of note that anyone who takes the trouble to investigate personally is soon disabused of these terrible notions, but few are bold enough to write the truth upon these subjects, and thus it is refreshing to read the following from the pen of Miss Grace Ellison, the authoress. She says:—

In Roget's "Thesaurus" "harem" stands as a synonym of a house of ill-fame. When I came back from Turkey and announced the fact that I had been staying in a harem, I fear, now that I know what a harem is supposed to mean, that some people must have had a very curious idea of my morality. A short while ago, when I spoke on "Harem Life," the room was full of men, and not one woman had dared to come to hear what I might have to say.

For the sake of those who do not know, it will be necessary to again explain that the word "Harem" comes from the Arabic "maharam," and means private or forbidden. It simply is the term used to describe those rooms in a Turkish house exclusively reserved for the use of women. It does not mean a collection of wives, as so many people suppose. No man may cross the threshold of the harem unless he be a blood-relation of the lady of the house, and in many cases even cousins are excluded. As a matter of fact, it has exactly the same meaning as the Indian word "zenana," which stands for all that is most proper. There is just as much sense in saying that a Turkish man travels with his harem as in saying that an Englishman travels with his boudoir.

The only reason I can find that in any way justifies the popular idea of the impropriety of harem life is the fallacy that a Turk must necessarily have more than one wife. Yet how unjust is this supposition. The days of polygamy are past in Turkey, as almost everywhere in the East. When the great Prophet of Islam limited the number of wives to four, he was legislating for a people amongst whom the practice of polygamy

had been brought to its most awful aspects. The reforms instituted by him marked a very great improvement in the position of women. Also polygamy was an economic necessity among communities in which war was increasing the disproportion between the sexes. Mahomet, with his numerous wives, underwent self-sacrifice of no light character. I know, amongst my Turkish friends, men equally meritorious, although it would be difficult to find a European who would deliberately sacrifice his own comfort and feelings to provide for a homeless woman, as a Turk will do. Therefore, how unjust it is that the followers of so great a reformer as Mahomet, co-citizen of ours in this great Empire, should be judged solely by the circumstance that the law permits them to have more than one wife.

The great Prophet of Islam tried unceasingly to enforce "respect for women." His own daughter, "The Lady of Paradise," was an example of all that is pure and true and lovely in her sex. Speaking from personal experience, I found that Turkish men generally try to follow Mahomet's teachings with reference to women, and keep them protected even from the indiscreet glances of the opposite sex. All the restrictions of their private life are intended to keep them from the ugly side of the world, and to preserve in them all that is divine in womanhood. In Turkey the woman who, from one day to another, without a profession, without influence, without money, and without relations, has to turn round and do the best for herself does not exist; there is always someone to provide for her.

In corroboration of the above, we print the following conversation between Mme. Marcelle Tinayre, the talented French writer, and a Turkish lady, as it appeared in the *Daily Mail* :—

Do the Turkish women, jealously kept in their haremls, long for Western "civilisation," for European independence, for the European marriage system? Or do even the most educated among the Turkish ladies prefer, after all, their own destinies, surroundings, and circumstances?

They do not envy us, if we are to believe the Turkish lady whose views Mme. Tinayre relates in an interesting dialogue, from which we may quote the following :—

"We are satisfied with our fate," said the harem lady; "happiness resides within ourselves."

"You are the wife of an able and intelligent man, with

liberal views. He respects and trusts you ; but would he allow you to go out without the national veil ? ”

“ Certainly, if it were not for the fury of the mob.”

“ Would he admit his friends here ? ”

“ He does so . . . only we do not let everyone know it.”

“ Then you live in the European style ? ”

“ No. . . . I am ‘ old-fashioned ’ in many ways.”

“ What do you think of the life of European women ? ”

“ It must be very tiring ! ”

“ What of marriages ? We choose our own husbands. . . . Fiancés among us know each other before getting married.”
(Not so in Turkey.)

“ Do they know one another ? ” the Turkish lady asked ironically. “ Don’t they reveal to each other merely an artificial and deceiving ‘ surface ’ ? ”

“ I admit that ‘ fiancailles ’ contain an element of reciprocal comedy, wilful, yet unconscious ! ”

“ No, no, your fiancés don’t know one another any more than Turkish fiancés. Their unions, like ours, are a lottery.”

“ Yet they have the illusion of liberty, of the choice of love. That makes a great difference. Our young girls have a feeling of great and sweet pride during that brief period of ‘ royalty.’ The man asks for their love, as a supreme favour. Our women realise their own dignity, power and prestige, and the recollection of those happy hours often illumine a wedded life which may be dull and disappointing.”

“ Well, we have a different conception of love. We wish to love the man we marry. And we adore our children. Maternity is the one great love which we fully feel. . . . When one wants to love, one must love what one has.”

Meanwhile, many Turkish women are adopting European methods and acquiring European tastes, interests, and—education. And “ the number of Turks who marry European women is daily increasing.”

But Mme. Tinayre, in the concluding pages of her charming volume, cannot refrain from warning her Turkish lady friends against our civilisation. . . .

C.

THE PRESENT WAR AND THE PROPHET OF ISLAM.—I.

THE WOKING MOSQUE SUNDAY LECTURE SERIES.

(Delivered by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, on August 10, 1914.)

THE other day, only a few weeks ago, when I was speaking of the Holy Prophet Muhammad and his life as the best specimen of humanity, I was asked, in after-lecture questions, if Muhammad as a warrior was also a desirable model for human imitation? The grim development of the events of the last fortnight have amply supported what I then said in reply. The mad dogs of war are unchained, and the world unfortunately is going to see the most disastrous havoc ever wrought upon humanity since its creation. No one desires the state of war. It retards civilisation, and cripples human advancement. It creates misery, and endangers all comfort and happiness. Yet, with all our boasted civilisation and refined ideas, we are to-day within the iron clutches of war. We may blame the Kaiser or the Tsar as the immediate cause of this Western conflagration; but can one, even with a semblance of honesty, find fault with the action the British Government has been compelled so reluctantly to adopt in this unfortunate situation? We cannot admire Sir Edward Grey too much for all he did to avert or to localise the War; but he failed in all his noble efforts, and the events were so electric in their speed that within forty-eight hours a nation averse to war was dragged into it. The Foreign Secretary could not do better than to advise the course now so reluctantly adopted by the nation. It is in self-defence and for self-preservation, and could not arouse censure from any quarter. Even those members of the Cabinet who did not see their way to support Sir Edward were not so keen in their disapprobation of his measures. The Socialists have also seen the necessity of militarism at this juncture. It is a necessity: a question of life and death. It is an urgent call for a duty of sublimest character. Could religion say anything against the noble response which the English nation has given by resorting to arms? A creed is not worthy the name if it teaches otherwise. The Church is here alive to the situation. The clergy come forward in unison with the laity to help the furtherance of national existence, and bless the arms with their benediction, though perhaps at the cost of their Christian conscience. Was not the Holy Prophet Muhammad placed under similar and more unfavourable circumstances when he was driven to arms in order to protect his life and that of his followers? For fully thirteen

years they were subjected to the direst kind of persecution, which they bore with marvellous meekness and patience. A plan was started then to murder the Prophet, and, to thwart this heinous scheme, the Prophet fled from his native city. He found refuge in Medina for himself and his followers, but the enemy would not leave him even there. They wanted to pursue him to death. They came with arms towards Medina. They inflicted their first blow while the Prophet was at Mecca, and they came with the second after him. The "right cheek" had already been struck, and the left one was aimed at. Should he remain inactive, and turn his left cheek to the enemy? Protected under the happy wings of peace, one perhaps might not realise the situation of the Prophet when the enemy had finished nine days out of twelve days' journey from Mecca in their march against Medina, where the Prophet's clan lived; and he was thus forced to leave his city with his little band to meet the enemy at some distance from the city.

But the present war perhaps supplies us with an apposite illustration. The Germans did not leave Berlin to invade England, nor as yet have they reached the English seas. If they violated Belgian neutrality, it was done to work out their strategy to attack France from the north-side. And yet all this has been thought—and very rightly—to endanger English safety. A step to secure self-preservation has been thought to be necessary. It has been taken with the whole nation's support. It meets the approval of the Church as well; but is it consistent with the teachings of Christ, either in words or in spirit? I say no. History has repeated the events of thirteen hundred years ago, and the English nation has retraced the footsteps of the Holy Prophet of Islam. The Blue Book has been laid down on the table of the House of Commons in justification of the present step, and Sir Edward Grey and the Prime Minister, in their historic speeches to vindicate their actions, have simply vindicated the Holy Prophet Muhammad (glorified be his name!). Mr. Asquith, with all his Nonconformist conscience, has been forced to put the Sermon on the Mount behind his back and follow the Lord of Islam. Yes, it is a truism that to wage war in self-defence and for self-preservation is a necessity, an essential virtue and true righteousness. Religion is practice and not theory. Human vitality is the only criterion as to the sanity of its teachings.

That Muhammad fought in self-defence when all other peaceful means to preserve his very existence became impossible appears from the verses of the Quran under which he first took to arms by the order of God. The verses run thus:—

"A sanction is given to those who, because they have suffered *outrages*, have taken up arms; and verily, God is well able to succour them: Those who have been driven forth from their homes

wrongfully, only because they say 'Our Lord is the God.' And if God had not repelled some men by others, cloisters, and churches, and oratories, and mosques, wherein the Name of God is ever commemorated, would surely have been destroyed."

—The Quran 22 : 40, 41.

Muhammad and his followers "had been driven forth from their homes," they had "suffered outrages," their only crime being that they believed in one God. God must repel some men by others if the former intend to destroy the life and the property of the other. The very locality of the first three battles between the Prophet and his enemies decides this vexed question, and shows that the militarism of the Prophet was of a defensive kind and a necessity. The first battle took place at Bader, which stood at three days' journey from Medina, the seat of the Prophet, and nine days' journey from Mecca, the city of the enemy. The second battle was at Ohud, at one day's journey from Medina and at eleven days' journey from Mecca. The third was at Medina itself. The enemy came from Mecca while the Prophet was at Medina. Is it, therefore, difficult to ascertain who was the aggressor and who the defender?*

It is all very well to preach passive morality from the pulpit, but it is a dead letter if it has not seen practice. We need not impeach the soundness of what has been taught in the name of Christ. Suffice it to say that His followers never cared to obey Him in His teachings. Christianity was meek and gentle when in serfs and slaves, but no sooner did she reach the very first step of the ladder to ascendancy through the royal conversion of Constantine than she forgot the teachings of the Master. But she could not do otherwise ; what was taught was impossible,† and, there being nothing as its substitute, she had to use her own discretion, and reaction followed.

(To be continued.)

* Elsewhere we reproduce an extract from an able article from the pen of Maulvi Muhammad Ali, M.A., LL.B., Editor of the *Review of Religions*, which appeared in 1906 under the heading of "The Muslim and Christian Holy Wars."

† Here it would not be out of place if we reproduce the following article from the pen of "Philosophus," which deals with what has been said in the concluding portion of the above :—

IS THE PRACTICAL PORTION OF CHRIST'S RELIGION PRACTICABLE IN ITS ENTIRETY?

Jesus, as we know, was not only the founder of a religion, but also of a kind of socialistic republic. He despised riches himself, and impressed upon all His followers to do the same. Under His rule individual riches became common property. After His death His disciples endeavoured to perpetuate this republic. We read of Ananias and Sapphira being punished for keeping back part of the proceeds of

MUSLIM AND CHRISTIAN HOLY WARS.

. . . I will now consider the case of the Muslim holy wars. I have already said, and history proves this assertion, that the Muslims were compelled to fight against a powerful enemy who was carrying his persecution of the converts of Islam to the last extreme. The mighty persecution which was carried on against Islam by the unbelievers is not equalled even by the terrible persecution of the Jews by the Christians so far as the nature of the persecution is concerned. The number of converts was not very great and most of these became voluntary exiles when they saw their opponents bent upon extreme measures of persecution. Twice the Muslims sought refuge in Abyssinia whither they were unsuccessfully followed by the Quresh. The third time a place nearer home was chosen for refuge and the converts, one and all, including the Holy Prophet himself, fled to Medina. The Quresh who had pursued them so far as Abyssinia could not allow them to propagate Islam unmolested in Arabia itself, and accordingly they now resolved to exterminate Islam by dealing a decisive blow to the Muslim society. It was at this juncture in the persecution of the Muslims that they were allowed to fight against their persecutors who sought to turn them away from the new religion. Ample evidence

a piece of land sold by them. How long did this republic last? How long did people "sell all they had and give it to the poor"?

This republic, as founded by Jesus—to use a common phrase—"was too good to last." His ideas in this respect were altogether impracticable. The republic expired, not on account of any outward attacks or influences, but in consequence of its own inherent vitality and impossibility to exist, and our to-day's dreamers of "Christian Socialism" would do well to bear this in mind.

Having extreme ideas in one respect, it is but logical to presume that Jesus had extreme ideas in another. The latter, dispersed throughout the Gospels, are chiefly contained in His famous "Sermon on the Mount." Who will venture to say that these ideas or precepts are practicable in their entirety? Who will turn the left cheek when someone has smitten him on the right? Who will hand over his "cloak" to the thief who has robbed him of his coat? Who will go two miles with him who has compelled him to go one? Who will give to every man who wishes to borrow? Who will love his enemy and do good to them that hate and persecute them? Who will take no thought for to-morrow as to what he shall eat, or what he shall drink, or what he shall put on? What wise man will not lay up for himself treasures upon earth, and try and provide for a "rainy day," sickness, old age, &c., &c.?

Not only do we find none of these ideas carried out in practical life, but to enumerate them is sufficient to show their impracticability, except in isolated cases. Jesus preached an ideal which, however much we may, and do, admire in individual cases (as, for instance, with Him and Socrates), is not only beyond the reach of, but utterly impracticable for, mankind at large. As little as His republic could exist, so little could a world, as pictured and wished by Him, exist.

of this is met with in the Holy Quran, regarding whose reliability there can be no question. I have already referred to some of these verses in the last issue. Here I may refer to a few more. In ii. : 214, we read : " But they will not cease to war against you until they turn you from your religion, if they be able." This verse shows clearly that the unbelievers had taken up the sword to persecute the Muslims, and to force them to desert Islam and to revert to idolatry. The Muslims were very few compared with the unbelievers, but they defeated the unbelievers in several battlefields. But the Quresh only became more exasperated, and they were now bent upon destroying these Muslims by the sword. It was on account of the smallness of their numbers that some Muslims feared, and it is to this that the verses preceding the one quoted above refer : " War is prescribed to you ; but to this you have a repugnance : Yet haply you are averse from a thing, though it be good for you, and haply you love a thing, though it be bad for you ; and God knoweth, but you know not " (ii. : 212). The necessity of war on the part of the Muslims is also explained in the 213th verse, which says : " They will ask thee concerning war in the sacred month. Say : the act of fighting therein is a grave crime : but the act of turning men aside from the path of God, and unbelief in Him, and to prevent access to the Sacred Mosque, and to drive out its people from it, is worse in the sight of God." Thus it was the act of turning the Muslims aside from the path of God and preventing them from the performance of their religious duties, for which the unbelievers unhesitatingly used the sword, that necessitated war on the part of the Muslims. Any sensible person would see that under these circumstances ordinances relating to war were absolutely justifiable. The Muslims took up the sword not to force the unbelievers to accept Islam, but to resist being forced to desert Islam and accept idolatry.

Various other verses in the Holy Quran show that the one thing which the unbelievers desired to bring about by all their persecutions was to make the converts to Islam desert their faith. For instance, in iv. : 89, we read : " They (the unbelievers) desire that you should deny the truth of Islam as they have denied, and that like them you should also be unbelievers." And in ix. : 2, we have : " If they (the unbelievers) overtake you anywhere, they will prove your foes ; hand and tongue will they put forth to injure you, and desire that you become infidels again." The seventy-fifth verse of the fourth chapter testifies to the same effect. " But what reason have you for not fighting in the way of God (*i.e.* for the defence of Islam) and for (the deliverance of) the weak among men and women and children (who are being persecuted by the unbelievers), and who say, ' O, our Lord ! bring us forth from this city whose inhabitants are oppressors ; and give us a defender from Thy presence and give us a helper from Thy presence.' " Consider also the following

verses which show how many of those who were convinced of the truth of Islam were forced to remain unbelievers: "The angels when they took the souls of those who had been unjust to their own weal, demanded, 'What hath been your state? They said, 'We were the weak ones of the earth (and, therefore, could not resist the unbelievers).' They replied: 'Was not God's earth broad enough for you to flee away in? . . . Except the men and women and children who were not able through their weakness to find the means of escape, nor could they see their way to fly away. . . . Whoever flieth his country for the cause of God will find in the earth many refuges and abundant resources" (iv. : 97-100).

The verses quoted above will give the reader a clear idea of the circumstances under which the Muslims fought. The holy wars of Islam were undertaken with an object exactly the reverse of that with which the holy wars of Christianity were undertaken. The Christians sought to force their religion upon the idolaters and the Jews by means of the sword, and the Muslims only resisted, being forced to change their religion by the sword. Christianity began to fight when it had attained civil power, while Islam had to fight in the days of its weakness against mighty and powerful enemies. We further learn from the Holy Quran that the Muslims were required to fight only so long as religious persecution continued, and they had to stop when their was no persecution. The Holy Quran states this plainly on several occasions. Thus ii. : 193 runs as follows: "And fight against them until there be no more seduction from the truth and religion should be practised for God, but if they (*i.e.*, the opponents of the Muslims) desist (from persecuting the Muslims), then let there be no hostility save against the oppressors." As these words are often misconstrued, it is necessary to consider their significance at some length. 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 passage it means seduction, meaning the seduction of the Muslims from the true religion. Rodwell translates it as "seduction from truth," and gives the alternative significance "civil discord" in a footnote, the latter phrase being explained as meaning "their driving you out of Mecca." Whichever of these significances is adopted, the meaning of the verse would be that the Muslims should continue to fight so long as they are persecuted by their opponents on account of their conversion to Islam. This is the true significance of this word, as the context itself shows. But there is greater misapprehension regarding the meaning of the phrase *Wa yakaonuddeena lillabi*, which is ordinarily translated as meaning "and the only worship be that of God" or "God's religion (*i.e.*, Islam) only should prevail in the earth." This interpretation is clearly wrong, for it contradicts the very next words, which say that "if they desist, then there should be no hostility against them, for hostility should be

carried on only against the oppressors." Now if ~~the Muslims~~ were required to fight against the unbelievers until they all accepted Islam, the words "if they desist . . ." would not have followed the injunction. The Muslims are enjoined to cease all hostilities if the unbelievers desisted from persecuting and oppressing the Muslims, and hence the words "the only worship be that of God" do not carry the significance that Islam should be the only religion of the people. In consonance with the context these words only mean that there should be no hinderance in adopting the religion of Islam and performing its ceremonies. The Holy Quran, therefore, enjoined the continuance of war only so long as the persecution of the Muslims continued, and when perfect religious freedom was established, then there was no ground for carrying on religious wars. Resistance of persecution was, therefore, the only ground of Muslim Holy Wars.

That the words in dispute carry the significance pointed out above is also shown by the later history of Islam. If the Holy Quran had given an injunction to the effect that the unbelievers should be fought against until they all became Muslims, the Holy Prophet would have been the first man to carry it into practice. Now it is a fact that these verses were revealed in connexion with the earlier Muslim wars, and the only dispute about them is whether they relate to the battle of Badr or Ohud. But after neither of these battles do we find the Holy Prophet attacking the unbelievers first. The only instances on record show that the Muslims still defended themselves against the attacks of the unbelievers, as, for instance, in the famous battle of *Ahzâb*, when a ditch was dug round Medina as the only measure of safety against a mighty attack of the idolatrous tribes of Arabia. Hence this battle is known as the battle of the confederates, or the battle of the ditch. It was in the fifth year of Hejira, and two years after the battle of Ohud, the latest time which can be assigned to the revelation of the verse under discussion, that the Holy Prophet set out for a pilgrimage to Mecca with sixteen hundred companions. It was in the sacred months during which all hostilities had been suspended in Arabia from very ancient times, and this custom was respected in the whole of Arabia, so that no one dared to break it. But in the persecution of the Muslims, the Quresh paid no regard even to this usage, and accordingly when the Holy Prophet reached Hudaibiyya, the Quresh opposed his further progress, and would on no account allow him to visit Mecca. A truce was drawn up on this occasion, by which both parties agreed to discontinue all hostilities for a period of ten years. Such a truce was in perfect agreement with the injunction contained in the above verse if we adopt the right interpretation, for the Muslims were required to fight with the unbelievers only in case that the latter fought against them and persecuted them; but as they promised to cease hostilities and

persecutions of the Muslims, the Muslims also promised to cease fighting with them for a like period. But if the injunction is considered to carry the significance that so long as the unbelievers were not converted to Islam they should be fought against, the truce concluded at Hudaibiyya directly contradicted this Divine injunction, which required that fighting should not be stopped until Islam was the religion of the whole of Arabia. These and many other circumstances show that the injunction was never considered by the Holy Prophet to carry the significance which hostile critics force upon it, and that it only meant that the Muslims should continue to fight until they were safe from the persecution of the unbelievers.

The later wars of the Holy Prophet did not differ in character from the earlier ones, and the Holy Prophet did not undertake a single expedition to compel any tribe or people to accept Islam. Hostile critics make a difference between the earlier and later injunctions relating to war which occur in the Holy Quran, and while admitting that the earlier injunctions related only to defensive wars, or wars undertaken to resist persecution, they assert that the later injunctions laid down the principle of fighting with the unbelievers to compel them to accept Islam. But if there had been any such difference in the injunctions occurring in the earlier and later chapters of the Holy Quran, a similar difference should have been observed in the practice of the Holy Prophet, and in his earlier and later undertakings. For it cannot be doubted that it was the first duty of the Holy Prophet to carry out all such injunctions. Nay, the Holy Quran even tells the Prophet that the obligation to fight against the unbelievers lay only on him: "Fight thou in the way of God (*i.e.*, to defend Islam); no soul shall be compelled to fight except thyself, and urge on the believers; haply God will restrain the fighting of the unbelievers" (iv.: 85). Hence the injunctions to fight were addressed in the first instance to the Holy Prophet himself, and if we are unable to point out any difference between the character of his earlier and later wars, there can be no denying the conclusion that the later injunctions, like the former, related only to wars undertaken to defend the Muslim society, and to resist their persecution by the unbelievers. To show that there was actually no such difference, I need only refer the reader to the Holy Prophet's last expedition, which was undertaken in the ninth year of Hejira. This expedition is known as the campaign of Tabook, and the larger part of the ninth chapter—in fact, the whole of it from the 38th verse to the end—is devoted to it. It was in this battle that those who remained behind and did not join the Prophet's standard against the enemies of Islam were termed as hypocrites, against whom the Holy Prophet was commanded to "strive strenuously," as remarked in a previous article. Being the last of the Holy Prophet's campaigns, it may be taken as the most typical of all the Muslim holy wars. We have, there-

fore, to see whether this expedition was meant to compel any tribe to accept Islam, or whether it was to meet an attack of the enemy. To show this, I need not weary the reader by long quotations from historical works, as the two marginal notes made by Muir, "Gathering of Roman feudatories on Syrian border," and "Mahomet projects counter expedition. Autumn A.H. IX." are sufficient to prove that the expedition was defensive.

SOLDIERS AND MORALITY.

SEXUAL morality in modern soldiery is on its wane. But we cannot blame them too much. The present-day regimental system* is chiefly responsible for it. It is an abomination which fosters evil habits and kills all feelings of shame and continence. The system, however, is not without its justification in a way. Outdoor-soldier-life is presumably a plausible excuse. But the problem is not such as to admit of no other solution. Caliph Omar was a great general. He was the commander as well as protector of the morals of his soldiers. He introduced very many military reforms to secure chastity and purity of life in his armies. His measures may be utilised with necessary change. The following are read in the pages of our worthy contemporary the *Review of Religions*, Qadian, Punjab, India, which shows what measures were adopted by the great Caliph to meet the contingency which has introduced such an objectionable practice :—

Caliph Omar spared no pains to know the real condition of the people, and in order to keep himself informed of the true state of affairs he sometimes went about in disguise. One night, when he was making his rounds *incognito*, he heard a woman reciting some verses expressive of her longing for her husband that had been sent with the army. Caliph Omar, as a true Muslim, set great store by morality and was anxious to close every opening through which immorality might find its way into the Muslim society. He would not impose on his subjects, whether male or female, a burden which might prove too much for them. The recitations of the lady filled him with anxiety, not only for the chastity of that lady in particular, but also for that of other ladies whose husbands, like hers, had gone with the army. So his first concern was to do something to remove this unbearable burden from Muslim ladies and their husbands, and immediately on his return from the rounds he consulted an experienced lady as to the utmost limit of time for which a husband might remain away from home without exhausting the patience of

* See *Islamic Review*, Vol. II., p. 183, 184.

his wife. She suggested four months as a safe period, and Omar at once issued orders that soldiers should be allowed to return to their homes after every four months. He put the morality of his subjects above everything else. No consideration, however weighty, could hinder him from taking a measure that was meant to prevent his soldiers and their wives from falling into temptation. Compare the anxiety which Omar felt for the moral purity of his soldiers and their wives with the laxity displayed in this respect by the civilised nations of to-day. No great anxiety is felt for the moral purity of the soldiers or their wives at home. Nay, their open immorality is connived at as a necessary evil. In the regimental bazaars there is sufficient provision for the demoralisation and detestable pleasure of the soldier. Could Omar tolerate even for a moment such a filthy state of things? Could he permit the gross immorality that prevails in Christian countries nowadays? He would have cleaned the land of this filth in a few days by enforcing the strict law of Islam. He would not have exposed his soldiers to temptation. He would have thought it his first duty to safeguard the character of his soldiers against all kinds of evil influences. He would have provided them with lawful means for satisfying their natural desires. In his time white slave traffic would have been an impossibility. If the Christian Governments enforce the Muslim law, the lands that are now a sink of immorality will become as morally pure as Arabia was under Caliph Omar. Who could in his days venture to procure young and attractive girls for the demoralisation and detestable pleasure of the soldier? How soon the moral tone of the "civilised" countries would improve if the divine law of Islam should be made the law of these lands! The Christian lands are morally so corrupt that no human law can purify them. The wise among the Christians have been alarmed at the numberless evils that are undermining Christian society, and, seeing the utter incapacity of Christianity to cope with the situation, are trying to mend matters by making new laws which are a direct contravention of Christian religion. We believe the time will not be long in coming when they will see that the true remedy of these evils is to be found in the laws of Islam. It was Islam which carried the torch of light to Christian Europe when it was sunk in mediæval darkness, and the darkness that now prevails in Christendom is also destined to be dispelled by the light of Islam. The great bane of Christendom is a deplorable loss of the moral sense; Christians have ceased to regard vice with the horror with which Islam views it, and one would heartily wish that Christendom might take a lesson from Islam in the matter of moral purity.

AN APPEAL AGAINST WAR.

DEAR WOMEN OF THE WORLD,—

The horror of war is again upon us, war of such nature and magnitude as the World has never seen ; its cost in lives and treasure will be unparalleled.

War in any form is a crime against humanity, and modern warfare is a game fit only for demons.

For thousands of years man has talked of Peace, and is still talking, but if in the face of this world-catastrophe he is silent, it is time for women to come forward and say : There shall be no more war, we demand a truce *now*, and that, at once, an International Parliament be formed, to settle, now and always, all conflicting questions. Till a better plan of election be found, the members can be considered as already elected : the Kings and Rulers, the Viceroys and Governors ; from each Cabinet or its equivalent—the Lord Chancellor, the Premier, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and an equal number of members of the Oppositions who have held similar offices. Automatic election causes no delay. This Round Table will right every wrong. An International Army could as easily be formed.

Down the centuries woman has acquiesced in war, giving the sons born in agony to slay and be slain, as if that edict from Mount Sinai were not the unqualified "Thou shalt not kill" but its reverse. Woman would still give her nearest and dearest, still would enter into the fighting ranks herself, but with eyes open, knowing the path to be evil, and the halo of war the crown of shame of humanity. Man talks of heroic deeds done in war ; yes, we have heroes, many of them in our daily life. But place in one column the heroic deeds of war, their influence and consequences, and in another that dread catalogue of crimes which man, turned demon by war, has committed. War ! with it those dread school-masters Famine and Pestilence ! and lurking behind these terrible forms which appal the most callous imagination.

Possibly the most eloquent message the science of to-day has given us is that there is no waste—no waste but in the greatest asset of the World, human life. With most inimitable logic, man places checks on waste of life by ignorance or crime, and approves of methods which cause its wholesale destruction ; and on the battlefield it is not he who has rifled the treasure-house of its jewel who is killed, but he who steals some tawdry trash, for which the poor body has no further use.

Why we have been given this life we know not, we can only read the evidences before us, and feel assured it must be for some great purpose. If we have descended from the heights, or

risen from the slime, it matters not ; but, if it be the latter, none dare say that this Present is the summit of life. Whatever the *purpose*, war is its enemy, for war and its preparations hinder that great civilisation which we are so slowly approaching : when misery shall be no longer the portion of any of the sons of man, when the poor and the wretched and the skin-tortured shall tread the path of happiness. Even the finest man or woman placed in such surroundings, without hope, would sink into nothingness.

The responsibility for war is not on the Governments, not on Man, but on Woman, who for weighty reasons has been made the dominant factor in life, and aught she asks for in reason she is given without stint. There is no reason in war, it is made up of inconsistencies and the fruits are bitter even to the conqueror.

Women of the world, arise ! and in the name of the Great God Whom by many names we all worship, and in the name of that great Civilisation which is awaiting us, and which this terrible war would put back for many years, demand that war shall cease and that the nations shall make a lasting peace.—Yours in hope and faith,

KATHERINE HALKETT.

London, August 8, 1914.

ISLAMIC REVIEW.—The sentiments thus beautifully expressed evoke our commendation ; but, from the Muslim point of view, it was obviously necessary for Great Britain to declare war. Self-preservation is a natural instinct, and the very existence of England was threatened : thus we Muslims must support England to the utmost of our ability. Islam teaches that the use of arms in self-defence is perfectly legitimate, but not for aggressive measures. We invite the attention of Muslims and all others to the teachings of Islam upon these points. A Muslim must be loyal to the rulers, even should they be of a different race or creed. They are our natural guardians and protectors, they give us prosperity and security, and the free exercise of our religious beliefs ; and therefore it is our bounden duty, as the Holy Quran has so eloquently pointed out, to support the Government to the utmost of our ability. Muslims all over the British Empire are ready, and, should the necessity arise, will offer their lives, their property, and serve the State in any capacity that should be necessary, showing gratitude and at the same time performing their duty to the State. Great Britain is the greatest Muslim Power of the present age, and is referred to as such by Muslim writers : therefore, in supporting Great Britain we support our own Muslim Government.

MAXIMS OF WAR.

ABU BAKER, THE FIRST MUSLIM CALIPH, AND LORD KITCHENER.

THE following instructions were issued by Lord Kitchener to every soldier in the Expeditionary Army, to be kept in his active service pay-book :—

You are ordered abroad as a soldier of the King to help our French comrades against the invasion of a common enemy.

You have to perform a task which will need your courage, your energy, your patience. Remember that the honour of the British Empire depends on your individual conduct.

It will be your duty not only to set an example of discipline and perfect steadiness under fire, but also to maintain the most friendly relations with those whom you are helping in this struggle.

The operations in which you are engaged will for the most part take place in a friendly country, and you can do your country no better service than by showing yourselves in France and Belgium in the true character of a British soldier.

Be invariably courteous, considerate, and kind. Never do anything likely to injure or destroy property, and always look upon looting as a disgraceful act.

You are sure to meet with a welcome, and to be trusted. Your conduct must justify that welcome and that trust.

Your duty cannot be done unless your health is sound, so be constantly on your guard against any excesses.

In this new experience you may find temptations, both in wine and women. You must entirely resist both temptations and while treating all women with perfect courtesy you should avoid any intimacy.

Do your duty bravely.

Fear God.

Honour the King.

Commendable words, worthy of their author. A fine tribute to Islam and its whole maxims of war. One can easily trace the influence of Lord Kitchener's touch with Muslim life. War is, after all, war. It has its justifications, though in rare cases, and man as yet has failed to banish it from the surface of the earth. We, however, do need some maxims to regulate martial activities, and Islam does not fail to supply them to us. Comparisons are not necessary, but for the enlightenment of our readers we are tempted to reproduce here the charge with which

Abu Baker, the first Caliph, sent a Muslim campaign against Syria :—

“When you meet your enemies in the fight, comport yourself as befits good Muslims, and remember to prove yourselves the true descendants of Ishmail. In the order and disposition of the host, and in all battles be careful to follow your banners boldly, and be ever obedient to your leaders. Never yield to, or turn your backs on, your enemies ; it is for the cause of God that you fight. You are incited by no less noble a desire than His glory ; therefore, fear not to enter into the fight, nor let the numbers of your foes alarm you, even though excessive. If God should give you the victory, don't abuse your advantages, and beware how you stain your swords in the blood of him who yields ; neither touch ye the children, the women, nor the infirm old men whom ye may find among your enemies. In your progress through the enemy's land cut down no palms, or other fruit trees ; destroy not the products of the earth ; ravage no fields ; burn no dwellings ; from the stores of your enemies take only what you need for your wants. Let no destruction be made without necessity, but occupy the city of the enemy ; and if there be any that may serve as an asylum to your adversaries, them do you destroy. Treat the prisoners and him who renders himself to your mercy with pity, as God shall do to you in your need ; but trample down the proud and rebellious, nor fail to crush all who have broken the conditions imposed on them. Let there be no perfidy nor falsehood in your treaties with your enemies ; be faithful in all things, proving yourself ever upright and noble, and maintaining your word and promise truly. Do not disturb the quiet of the monk or hermit, and destroy not their abodes, but inflict the rigour of death upon all who shall refuse the conditions you may impose upon them.”

These maxims of Abu Baker have always been adopted by later Muslim generals. “Tarik, the first invader of Spain, commanded that no offence should be offered to the peaceable and unarmed inhabitants ; that only those who bore arms should be attacked ; and that plunder should be confined to the field of battle and to towns carried by assault.”*

The following is another piece of war instruction which El Hakim Bin Abdurraluman, the Moor king, gave to the Saracen generals in 963 :—

“If the enemies of the Law be not twice as many as the Muslims, he who turns his back upon them in the battle hath proved himself to be a vile coward ; he sinneth against the Law and hath offended against our honour. When taking possession of a city, let no man slay women, children, or old men ; neither shall any man attack monks vowed to a life of

* Dr. Abdul Majid in the January number of *The Law Quarterly Review*, 1912.

solitude save in cases where the latter are making a defence injurious to the Muslim cause. Do violence to none to whom you have given promises of security, but be careful to keep all engagements and fulfil all contracts.

"The safe conduct granted by the generals shall be respected by all; none shall disturb or offend any who have obtained such."

We cannot fail to appreciate the value of these human injunctions, but they all emanated from that large soul, the fountain of everything noble and good in humanity, who came into this world to give a perfect code to humanity, suiting all its ups and downs. The noble Prophet of Islam never failed to say the following to his Band of the Faithful when an expedition was sent against an enemy :—

"March in the name of God, and by His aid and by the religion of the Prophet; don't kill an old man who is not able to fight, nor young children, nor women . . . Be good to one another; because God loves the doer of good.
Do not kill any woman and do not kill any labourer."

THE ARAB WAKES.

"LE GHALIB ILLA ALLAH."

As has often been pointed out, great and epoch-making movements in the social realm are preceded by numerous minor changes of thought. These are accompanied by many minor movements, the whole series of currents, mental and material, finally uniting and bringing about a revolution with its vast and striking changes. Those changes themselves become the starting point of future events. The past is the great ocean on which floats the galleys of to-day; the present is only a continuance of the past. What we are we owe in general to all those who have preceded us. Small events, or what at the time seem unimportant, are often the leading factors in the general movement, sometimes culminating rapidly at others after a long course of variations.

In the early decades of the seventh century of the present era one of those revolutions was in progress in Arabia, itself the precursor of a further movement, with which it is my purpose to deal. This revolution was, in its first stages, a mental one—religious in its basic principle. An Arab of the tribe Kurayish, called Muhammed, raised his voice in defence of the pure religion of the "One God" Allah, as against the system of idolatry at that time prevalent among the people. By moral courage,

enthusiasm and Divine inspiration he made thousands of converts, and in due time brought all the tribes to his standard.*

During the course of his ministry he despatched envoys to the Sovereigns of Persia and Byzantium, and to various chiefs and princes, drawing their attention to the principles of Islam, and inviting them to become Muslims. A Messenger sent to the Prince of Bostra was treacherously murdered. This was followed by an expedition of the Muslims into Byzantine territory to punish the culprits. So began that vast movement—that last exodus of the Arab—which was to hurl him over continent and continent, and to place beneath his sway nations and empires hoary with years and illustrious with the past glory of victory and power. On the plain near Mutta the forces of Islam first came into conflict with the trained troops of the eastern empire, and received a check. Even the check had a bearing on the issue: the murder remained unavenged, and a further and stronger expedition would be necessary to bring the slayers to justice.

So the Prophet at a later period—after the submission of Mecca and the adherence of the tribes of Yemen and the east—mobilised a force for the purpose of punishing the people of the region involved. His sudden illness after the return from the final pilgrimage brought about a postponement of the expedition. His death, and the events which followed rapidly in Arabia, were still further determining factors in the great exodus of the Arab along the path so often trod by his forefathers and his kinsmen of Semitic race into the fertile regions of Mesopotamia and Syria. An exodus destined to spread further than any previous one, to touch all civilisation, and change the thoughts and customs of races, nations, and tribes; affecting permanently all knowledge, literature, art, science, and religion.

When the news of the death of Muhammed spread over Arabia there was consternation in the land. The roving tribes and even those of the towns were never at any time bound to each other by very strong ties, and now that the hand that had united and ruled them was gone deep murmurings were heard. Although the tribes were under the rule of the Muslims, the people, especially in the east, were at heart Pagans—a sprinkling of true Islamites being amongst them. So the cry went forth from those still desiring the old system: Can Islam be thrown off? A storm was brewing in the south, and in the east a cloud was gathering which threatened to envelop the Muslim world and to extinguish the light of the pure monotheistic ideal kindled by the hand of the Prophet, and to plant once more on the altars of the nation the idols of an earlier and a less enlightened age.

* For outline of his life see article "The Messenger" in previous numbers of *Review*.

In Medina dismay descended on the populace, the shadow of a terrible calamity seemed brooding over the city. We can only in part imagine the state into which the people were thrown on learning of the death of their ruler, who had been to them as a father, a guide, teacher and example, whose hand-clasp was warm and smile ever encouraging. Even strong Omar forgot himself, rushing in a state of excitement to the Mosque saying: "He is not dead but in a trance, and will arise again and root out the hypocrites."

At this crisis in the history of Islam one man stands out clear and striking in contrast to the other leader—Abu Bakr, the father-in-law of the Prophet. Arriving on the scene he calmed the people with the following memorable words:—

"Whoso worshippeth Muhammed, let him know that Muhammed is dead; but whoso worshippeth God, let him know that God liveth and dieth not."

After which he repeated passages from the Holy Quran in support of the statement.

Without going into the question of the Khalifate, it may be said that the Prophet did not directly nominate anyone to succeed him as ruler over the faithful. He had at the period of his illness appointed Abu Bakr to lead the prayers in the Mosque—nothing further. A dispute arose, therefore, in regard to who should take over the command. The men of Medina wished to appoint a leader from one of their own tribes, while the others declared that none but a Kurayishite should rule over the Muslims. The dispute was happily brought to an end by Omar, who nominated Abu Bakr as the first Khalif; he was supported by Abu Obeida, and the Chiefs of Aus and Khazraj soon followed suit. So Abu Bakr became the immediate successor of the Prophet.

It is interesting to learn the appearance and character of this man, whose policy was destined to affect the whole future of mankind. Fair, handsome of face, high forehead, with eyes wide apart, of small stature and spare frame. Steadfast in the faith, he was of manner kindly, gentle and courteous, yet firm and resolute of action when the safety or principles of Islam were at stake. Now over sixty years of age, he proved himself the man for the occasion.

His first action after his election was to despatch to the north the expedition under Osama already spoken of. When his companions remonstrated with him that by so doing he would leave Medina undefended and exposed to the attack of enemies, his reply was characteristic of the man:—

"Were the city swarming round with packs of ravening wolves, and I left solitary and alone, the force should go; not a word from my Master's lips shall fall to the ground."†

† Muir's "Caliphate," p. 9.

An example of his devotion to the Prophet, and of his undying faith in the God of Islam to preserve his servants.

The Khalif's instructions are also worthy of the man, and far in advance of the practice of the period, although practically similar in precept to previous commands issued by the Prophet. He said :—

“See that thou avoid treachery. Depart not in any wise from the right. Thou shalt mutilate none, neither shalt thou kill child, or aged man, nor any woman. Injure not the date palm, neither burn it with fire; and cut not down any tree wherein is food for man or beast. . . . And the monks with shaven heads, if they submit, leave them unmolested.” (Muir: “Caliphate.”)

Those instructions are on the same lines as other instructions to commanders given by him later :—

“If God should give you the victory, do not abuse your advantages, and beware how you stain your swords in the blood of him who yields, neither touch ye the children, the woman, nor the infirm old men. . . . Let no destruction be made without necessity. . . . Treat the prisoner and him who renders himself to your mercy with pity, as God shall do to you in your need, but trample down the proud and rebellious. . . . Let there be no perfidy nor falsehood in your treaties with your enemies, be faithful in all things, proving yourselves ever upright and noble, and maintaining your word and promise truly.”

A reader might well exclaim that in such a period a man who could so speak and so address his troops was not only superior to his age, but was not far from the kingdom of God. Osama and his expedition were absent for two months, during which time they severely punished the tribes on the northern frontier. In their absence Medina was on its defence, and proved successful in repulsing the attack of some of the revolted tribes. On the return of the expedition, the Muslims were in a position to take the field against the rebels. The Khalif despatched commands all over Arabia to bring the tribes once more under the banner of Islam. Amr, Nuhajir, Ali and Hodzufa were sent to the south and east. The expedition to the north-east was entrusted to that Khalid ibn al-Walid who under Muhammed earned the sobriquet “the Sword of God,” and well did he maintain that title as he strode to glory over the necks of the foes of Islam. Wherever he went red ruin lay behind him, and the River of Death ran deep. Victory after victory added new laurels to the Black Eagle banner. He overran north and east Arabia, subduing tribe after tribe, and

carrying destruction and dismay wherever he went, until his very name became a terror to his foemen.

During the closing stages of the life of the Prophet various men arose claiming to be prophets; they directed their energies in attempting to sweep away Islam. Toleiha and his men were the first to go down before the dashing Kurayishite as corn before the reapers. Next he was despatched against Museilma, who had gathered together a force of about forty thousand men. The armies met at Akraba, and a sanguinary conflict ensued. The "Sword of God" was again victorious, and the pretender slain. The battle is known to Arabian chroniclers as the "Garden of Death." The Muslims also suffered heavily. So large a number of the "Companions" of the Prophet was slain that, fearful lest the Quran should be lost, steps were taken to have the various parts collected. Up to this time there was no collected copy, part being written on leaves, skin, and probably bone, and the rest carried in the memory of the Companions.

The activity of Khalid and the other generals brought about the subjection of all the tribes, and when the first year of the Khalifate passed Arabia was once more under the sway of Islam. The main question now was how to hold them together. If the tribal feuds were to be abolished, the Khalif saw that it was necessary to employ them in some other sphere where they would act in unity. That sphere lay to the north: In the fertile plain of Mesopotamia, watered by the Euphrates and the Tigris, the home of Semitic civilisation centuries before, now under Persian rule; to Syria, with its thriving towns and densely populated cities, under the rule of Byzantium, all that remained of the power of Rome.

For long Rome and Persia had struggled for supremacy, both now lay exhausted. Persia, after the death of Chosroës Parveez, also being rent by internal feuds. The insults of the past also rankled in the Arab mind. The opportunity was come, the Arab launched himself upon the tide and caught the golden stream that was destined to carry them to the highest pinnacle of fame.

BEAUMONT HILL.

THE "MARE'S NEST."

AN article by me, entitled "Another Mare's Nest," appeared in the January number of the *Review*. It was a criticism of certain statements made by the Rev. St. Clair Tisdall in the *Moslem World*.* In the current issue of that periodical another article supposed to be a reply appears from the pen of the same writer. I purpose making a few remarks thereon, and would ask the indulgence of readers, as to keep this article within reasonable

* Vol. III. No. 4.

length I shall require to limit my quotations, and would suggest that readers have, if possible, the previous articles, both my own and Mr. Tisdall's, before them for reference.

Quotation.—"A Mr. Parkinson has taken up the cudgels on behalf of Mr. Tanir (whose book he has evidently never read)."

Comment.—From the above a reader would be led to believe that the writer discovered for himself that I had not read Mr. Tanir's book. If readers will turn to my article they will find that I pointed out that I had not done so. Further, it will be evident from the text that I was not defending Mr. Tanir. My article contained no such defence. A perusal will show that it was a correction of certain statements made by Mr. Tisdall. Is it not possible for a professional Christian to deal in a straightforward manner with criticism? Must he contort things and misrepresent an opponent?

Quotation.—"He (Mr. Parkinson) has proved to his readers that he has failed to read in their original languages any of the Oriental authorities from which all *reliable* knowledge of Oriental religions must clearly be derived, &c."

Comment.—How have I proved any such thing? To ascertain the *facts* one must go to the early legends or the sacred books. But the ability to read a book in the language it is written in will not give a reader the ability to interpret the meaning of the facts. To understand the facts, what is wanted is not a knowledge of many languages, but a thorough knowledge of the sciences of sociology and hierology. To be able to read, say, Huxley in English is no proof that the reader will understand him; indeed, he is not likely to do so, unless he has knowledge of biology. Neither would a reader of Newton understand him, unless he also knew mathematics. In the understanding of mythology far more than a knowledge of language is necessary, as I will prove. Nowadays, with so many good translations to be had, philosophy has become a minor factor. If it is necessary for people to be able to read the Old and New Testaments in the original languages before they can understand Christianity, then there must be few Christians to-day, and in the previous centuries fewer still, and that is really what Mr. Tisdall's "logic" amounts to.

Quotation.—"He does not profess to believe in Islam; nay, he begins by scoffing at belief in the virgin-birth . . . though it is taught in the Quran itself; but he rejoices in the opportunity of attacking Christianity."

Comment.—The first point I can confidently leave to those Muslims who know me, and who have read my writings. The statement that I scoffed at the virgin-birth *is a falsehood*.† The further statement that the Virgin-birth is taught in the *Quran* depends upon the rendering of the verse concerned. The

† It would be absurd for anyone to scoff at a solar-myth.

question, to judge from most commentators, hinges on the meaning of such phrases as :—

“Into whose womb we breathed our Spirit.”

“We sent our spirit to her.”

The statements standing alone might be read in numerous ways, as there are various meanings attached to the word “spirit” and the terms “breathing into.” Either the older mythological meaning impregnation by the God; or the later and higher sense, purified of myth, where the breathing into of the Spirit of God means purification, the giving of power to do a certain thing, of wisdom and goodness, of the attitude of God-fearing, of becoming pure of body and mind. To tell which meaning to read into the phrases the whole text must be considered, when it is at once seen that the mythological explanation is excluded by such statements as :—

“It beseemeth not God to beget a son.”

“He begetteth not, and He is not begotten.”

Then we have the case of John :—

“He (Zacharias) called upon his Lord, saying :

‘O, my Lord, leave me not childless’ . . . and
we made his wife fit for childbearing.”

No person would think of reading such a meaning into the Quranic text unless already possessed with the idea that the birth must have been due to impregnation by God—an idea that Christians borrowed from Paganism and attached to the birth of Jesus. May Christian scholars of to-day reject the miraculous birth and yet remain Christians? (See the latest appeal of Prof. Sanday, who rejects all the miracles contrary to Nature.)

As for my critic's other statement: “He attacks Islam.” If he has such a right, why should I not have the same privilege of attacking Christianity,† as he says? Are he and his coterie of the *Moslem World* the only people who are to have the liberty of attacking other people's beliefs, and to be allowed to make any statements they like, and those statements to remain unchallenged? I certainly refuse to accept such an intolerant and infallible claim.

On page 296 the writer remarks on statements on the Krishna legends. It is too long to quote, so I refer readers to his article. He quotes my statements from Andrade, Giorgi, and Oldfield, asserting that I put those statements forward as a proof that a Crucifixion myth existed early in India. Another misrepresentation of my position. A reference to my article will show I did no such thing. He had made the dogmatic assertion that there was no such myth, and I pointed out that, in the face of such evidence as given by those writers, no

† I should be inclined to put it, attacks the beliefs of Christians.

scholar would have made such an assertion—an instance of how he twists his critic's statements to his own purpose, knowing the great majority of his readers would never see my article.

Again, with his usual ability of evading the main issues, he passes over my reference to the legends surrounding the Birth, the earliness of which has been conceded by every scholar of note; the Kausa legend, the upbringing among shepherds, and the fact that the ethical teaching bound up with the cult is a development on strictly Hindu lines of Vedic thought; and that it is acknowledged by Senart and others that the close relationship of the Krishna and Buddha legends is to be explained in terms of borrowing by Buddhism from Krishnaism. There are numerous other points of minor importance.

Since my previous article was written, Dr. R. Garbe, the famous Indian scholar, has published a new series of articles on the subject.

* I here quote some of his results :—

“There is no proof of the presence of Christians in India before the first half of the third century” (p. 328).

“As early as the sixth century before Christ the Krishna cult must have flourished in its fullest bloom” (p. 342).

“Accordingly (from preceding arguments), in the second century before Christ, not only the powerful hero Krishna, but even the Krishna child, already played a significant rôle in Brahman, India, and indeed the *Divine child*, since Krishna had been worshipped as God as early as the sixth century B.C., in Buddha's native land” (p. 348).

To follow the significance of the above point the legends must be studied in their entirety, not merely from the point of criticism of the text, but from that of comparative mythology.

To return to Tisdall again :—

Quotation.—“Proof is needed of the early existence of the legends, and proof is the one thing lacking in Mr. Parkinson's article—that and logic.”

Comment.—I do not think that proof of any kind would satisfy the writer of the above. There is plenty of proof to be found in the writings of the leading scholars for anyone who wishes to find it. As for my *logic*, I am content to leave it to those *qualified* to judge. I have the impression that the majority of intelligent readers will prefer the scholarly expositions of such men as Garbe, Tiele, Senart, Robertson and others, to the smatterings of a Tisdall.

Quotation.—“As Christians our motto is, ‘Prove all things, hold fast by that which is good.’”

Comment.—Does this man imagine that Christians are the only people who are seeking to prove all things and searching

* The *Monist*, Vol. XXIII.—No. 3, p. 321; Vol. XXIII.—No. 4, p. 494; Vol. XXIV.—No. 1, p. 35.

for the good and the true? Has his Christianity never taught him to attribute to others that honesty of purpose he claims for himself? It must be a poor thing. Does he think the good is to be found in his system of misrepresentation and calumny of opponents? If so, he and I differ as to what is good.

Quotation.—"He has not succeeded in showing how the eighth child of Devaki and her husband Vasudeva could be considered 'virgin-born,' though he employs ridicule to supply his lack of evidence."

Comment.—His last assertion, as usual, is false ; if readers will turn to my article they will not find a word of ridicule. Had I "supplied ridicule," he is the last man to have any just reason for objection. A man who refers to the men he calls "my honoured hierologists" as "ignorant," "not honest," and their writings as "marked by ignorance and prurience," "ignorant blunders and dishonest pretences," and who refers to the beliefs of Hindus as "rubbish" when dealing with the Krishna legends,† is in the correct path for ridicule, and leaves himself open to even more serious charges.

As for the first part of the quotation, it leaves one wondering if the writer is even acquainted with the rudiments of the science of "Comparative Religions" (or Hierology, as I prefer to call it, after Tiele). I wrote quite distinctly : "A mythologist would have known that the determining factor was not whether Krishna was the eighth child or the eightieth child, but that it was the supernatural aspect of the birth—the impregnation of the mother by the God, without the interference of the human element." Mr. Tisdall appears to be completely ignorant of the fact that the title "Virgin" was in Paganism given categorically to mother-goddesses and goddesses of many amours. They were fabled to renew their virginity even as the earth—the mother *par excellence*—renews its virginity every spring. An instance of this renewing can be found in the Mahabharata, which Mr. Tisdall claims to be so well acquainted with.

Vyasa saw the maiden Satyavati and was enraptured with her and besought her love.

"She would accede to his wishes only on condition that after bearing him a son she might again recover her virginity."

Her wish was granted. She bore a son, called Dvaipayana. He grew to manhood and became an ascetic.

"But Satyavati, having resumed her virginity, became later the wife of Shantanu, the King of Kuru."‡

Mr. Tisdall next (p. 298-9) devotes some length to the Finnish legend of Mariatta, explaining that the correct spelling

† See his first article in the *Muslim World*.

‡ See Winternitz ; I have followed Earle's translation.

is *Marjatta* (might I point out to him that the correct spelling of Muslim is "Muslim," not "Moslem"? If a Christian is at liberty to use a stereotyped form in the one case, surely I am in the other. Personally, I am not particular how a writer spells a name so long as I understand whom he is referring to.) He concludes by asserting :—

"When the matter is *studied*, therefore, it is evident that the legend . . . is not pre-Christian, but is, on the contrary, derived from the Gospel narrative and a mistaken etymology."

Comment.—If the above was correct, it would only prove how completely the Finns rejected the Christian legend and gave it a pagan setting. But the argument is not convincing. There are elements it does not explain. The name *Marie* and its variants was common to mythology centuries before Christ: Myrrha was the mother of Adonis, the slain "Lord." Maia, the mother of Hermes, the Greek "Logos." Maya, the virgin-mother of Buddha. The idea of the sudden transportation of the Divine child is a universal astronomic myth, and was common in Greece.* The idea of the child being hidden in a swamp or marsh practically settles the question; it could not have been borrowed from the Christian legend. Isis flies to the swamps of the Delta to bear Horos. Moses and Sargon are found among the bulrushes; the variants are numerous. The *stable*, or *manger*, was practically universal as the birth-place of the solar-child.† The rational view would be that the Christian and Finnish myths were derived from earlier forms, varied by filtering through different culture mediums. The Finnish is the more primitive form. It is an axiom of all leading mythologists that in general the myth is formed to explain the ritual.

Quotation.—"Classical scholars may judge from his mistaken reference to 'Græco-Roman mythology' in Juno's case how trustworthy are his assertions."

Comment.—Well, I am not infallible, and I have no desire to be so. I fancy if I knew everything and never made any mistakes I should feel bored. To read the above one would imagine I had committed some terrible error. It so happens there is a slight error of detail. I, of course, wrote from memory. I said :—

"Juno (Hera) . . . brought forth Vulcan by smelling a plant."

Now Hesiod tells us in his *Theogony* how Hera (Juno) bore Vulcan "without being united in love."

* The Finnish completely varies from the Christian, being nearer the Greek and Syrian forms.

† The ceremony of "sprinkling," or "baptism," is also older than Christianity, and could more readily have been borrowed from the mithraic rite of purification.

Ovid tells us in his *Fasti* how Juno bears Mars *virginally*, being "impregnated by the touch of a flower."

Readers will now see the extent of my error, a slight lapse of memory. The correction does not help my critic in the least. At the same time I hope readers will always draw my attention to such errors—it would be too much to hope that I should never make any, I am only human.

Quotation.—"There is a vast difference between *virgin-birth* and any other 'supernatural' birth. . . . To confuse virgin-birth with other supernatural methods of birth is not conducive to clearness of thought, yet Mr. Parkinson, &c."

Truly it is not necessary to call attention to the fact that the word *virgin* has a clear and definite meaning."

Nowadays, when we speak of a woman as a virgin, we mean that she has had no sexual connection with the male. We may, therefore, call the first fruits of the womb, after connection, as virgin-born (although it is not common to do so). In such circumstances all first-born children would be virgin-born. If such a reading is applied to Jesus it will be evident that all first-born children would be on the same level with Him, and the whole structure of Christianity as taught and believed in would be shattered to pieces, the Divinity of Jesus would collapse like a house of cards.

In antiquity all mother-goddesses and goddesses of many amours were described as virgins, renewing their virginity after every amour. This, of course, presented no difficulty as the whole thing was metaphor. Again, mortals fabled to be impregnated by the god were also described (or understood) as virgins, and the offspring said to be virgin-born. The last is the category in which Christian tradition has placed Jesus. It was a common thing in the days of Paganism for rulers or great men to be deified either before or after death, and to be fabled as "virgin-born," such as C̄yrus, Plato, many of the Pharaohs and the Roman emperors. The point may be too deep for a missionary, but the ordinary reader will, I hope, understand it.

It has to be remembered that the legends in their primitive forms arose in savage man as part of his struggle to read Nature and the moving panorama of natural phenomena. Conception, embryological development and related details were hidden from him. The primitive man saw no connection between the act of impregnation and the birth of the child. That only came later, dawning slowly as experience grew. To credit the early progenitors of the human race with the scientific knowledge of the present, and to attribute to them the ability to apply exactly the same meaning to things, is to misread history and misunderstand mind. If early man had such ability as to think exactly as the modern, there would not have been any such problems as those confronting us. It was inability to do so

that created the legends. He personified all natural phenomena and described the movements of material things in the language in which he described human actions.

The Rev. St. Clair Tisdall does not seem to understand the first elementary generalisation in the science of sociology—that of mental development. His statements that the Hindus and Buddhists never believed such legends are, on the face of the evidence, absurd. The legends could no more have been incorporated in the cults and persisted without being believed, than their variants could have been incorporated in and persisted in the Christian cult had they not been believed in.

Quotation.—"Cyrus gives us his genealogy in one of his inscriptions. . . . He calls himself 'son of Cambyses' . . . Herodotus . . . and Xenophon . . . agree. . . . *No hint whatever* of virgin-birth or even of anything supernatural about it."

Comment.—From the above the reader would imagine that the writer is familiar with the writings of the famous Greek, Herodotus of Halicarnassus (B.C. 485-425), he even gives the references (I., 91, 107, 108). He does not seem to have paid much attention to the text, for he omits to mention that the great majority of the legends referred to by me are to be found in the same book (p. 107-130), others are given by Diodorus Siculus, who follows earlier writers.† An examination will show that the legends quadrate largely with the Christian cult, but more closely with the Krishna. Herodotus, of course, does not expressly state that Cyrus was virgin-born. But neither do Matthew nor Luke in the Jesus birth-story expressly state so, any further than that his mother was a virgin, and that he was the first-born. The same applies equally well to the Cyrus legend. The dream of Astyages quadrates with the dream of Joseph, and portrays the same supernatural aspect of the birth: the child born to be ruler. It is mere childishness, therefore, to write in the strain of Mr. Tisdall. As I have already pointed out to the multitude, the terms "virgin" and "virgin-born" were categorically given in all such cases, whether the historian expressly states so or not. What Cyrus put on his inscriptions does not touch the matter; he did not make the legends about himself. They arose among the people and were attached by them to his history, as in the case of many before and after him. The legends were a conglomeration gathered from many cults.

Quotation.—"It would really be worth my critic's while to study a subject before writing on it."

Comment.—It would really be worth my critic's while to study and try to understand "a subject before writing on it."

Quotation.—"As for 'Mr. Vivian's' book, if Mr. Parkinson

† The principal is the crucifixion myth

will refer to Mr. Howard Nask's . . . he will see that 'Vivian' has unblushingly copied wholesale from Doam."

Comment.—That is, I am informed by "Mr. Vivian," at least the third time Mr. Tisdall has made such an accusation. Mr. McCabe pointed out his error on the first occasion. I did so on the second. In spite of this he still repeats, the last time hiding behind another writer. I leave him there. The author spoken of (Mr. Vivian) published his work* under a pen-name. When a man does so it is understood to be literary etiquette to refer to him by that name, yet time and again Mr. Tisdall breaks the rule and refers to him by his own name. I hesitate to write the word that characterises such action. Lastly we have some rambling to the effect that "the 'Encyclopedia Biblica' is *not* considered by any scholar as settling the question"; I should think not. Then there is a reference to Professor Harnack's writings on the subject. I did not say the above work settled the question. There is a vast deal of ground to be covered yet. The Higher Critics do not seem to me to go far enough, though no doubt they will in time. Every decade sees a further advance, and the tide is against the standpoint of Mr. Tisdall, not with him. Professor Harnack is a very good historian in his special field; out of it he does not count. But, even though I was unable to investigate the matter for myself, I do not see why I or any other person should accept Harnack's views as against, say, a dozen other scholars as good as he in his own field, and in many other related fields far abler.† The world moves, and man moves with it. Every generation sees progress, belief in the old superstitions and old legends grows weaker and weaker; they are being more and more relegated to the background. The banner of Truth is flying in the breeze, and the dawn of a brighter and a nobler day is breaking.

I have to apologise to readers for the length of this article, yet it might have been made longer. I have simply sketched some points. It was necessary, of course, that I should show to the ordinary layman the calibre, mental and ethical, of the man who misstates, misrepresents, and miscalls his opponents, and yet poses as a teacher of religion and morals, and even attempts to dictate to the Muslims what they should and should not believe.

J. PARKINSON.

* "The Churches and Modern Thought."

† Readers, of course, would be wrong to suppose that the Professor's views are on a level with Mr. Tisdall's; they are not.

ISLAM.

LA RELIGIO DE LA HOMARO.

"ISLAM" estas la nomo donita de la Sankta Profeto Muhamad al la religio kiun li predikis en Arabujo antaŭ ol tridekcentjaroj. Gi estas ĝia propra nomo, kvankam ke multaj popoloj nomas ĝin "Mahamedanismo" kiu estas nur Europa vorto kaj tute ne prava, kaj estis donita ĉar oni diras "Christianity," "Buddhism," ("Kristaneco," "Buddhismo") kaj tiel plu. Sed la religio ne komencis nur kun Muhamad sed estis la sama fido predikita de ĉiuj profetoj, de Adamo, Buddhao, Konfucio ĝis Moseo kaj Jesuo, de ĉi profeto en la parto de la universo. Plu ol tio ĝi estas la natura religio de ĉiuj infanoj kiuj naskigas, kaj Muhamad ne estis la fondinto sed la lasta predikanto de la universa kredo. Por tiu resonado Islamo ne estas fremda religio al ĉi, sed la unua kaj la lasta eldiraĵo de la Dio mem. Unue Islamo estas la religio de paco. Muslimo estas li kiu estas en harmonio kaj paco kun liaj ĝevivantoj. La saluto estas "Paco estu ĉe vi" kaj la respondo "Kaj ĉe vi estu Paco" de ĉiuj Muslimoj kiam ili renkontas. Por esti ĉe paco kun Dio kaj homaro estas la esenco de la religio de Islamo. Oni devas vivi laŭ la ordonoj de "Allah" (Dio) kaj fari nur bonajn al la homaro kaj li estos ĉe la Dio en la venonta ekzistenco. Oni devas fidi je la "Unu Dio," nek de du aŭ tri aŭ ĉe plu da dioj sed nur "Allah" "La Sola Dio." Li donacis al la homaro ĉion kion ili bezonis antaŭ ol vivo sur tiu ĉi tero komencis, kaj sen ĉi rekompenco de viro mem. Li estas la malsevera, la kompatinda, donaculo, unu kiu kaŭzas ĉia verko de homo fruktigi. Li ne koleras kontraŭ ni sed nepre devas puni nin se ĉi ajn agoj meritas punon, sed ĝi estas la natura rezulto de ĉi ajn propraj eraroj ne de desiro de Li. Lia Amo estas por ĉiuj kreitaĵoj nek sole por ĉiuj kiuj estas bonaj. Kaj Islam ne fidigas je eterna turmentado en la venonta vivo. Dio estas la ĉiam-kompatinda kaj helpas ĉi vivo de ĉi raso nek sole la Judoj aŭ Kristanoj kiel multaj diras. Ni ne kredas ke Li elektis nur la Judoj kaj al ili sendis Liajn Profetojn kaj lasis la plej granda parto de la mondo sen gvido. Tute ne: Islam diras ke Li estas la "Dio de la ĉiuj universoj," kaj pro tio, se ekzistas logantojn sur Mars aŭ la planeto tiam li sendis al ili profetojn ankaŭ. La Sankta Profeto Muhamad estas persono tuta konata al ĉiuj historio, li ne estas nebula persono, sed ĉi ago de ĉi vivo estas sciigita. Li estis dum ĉi vivo Rego, Juristo, pastro, poeto, komercisto, terkulturisto, patro kaj estaĵo sen ĝepatroj, venkisto kaj ĝeneralo, profeto kaj edzo. Pro tio ĉi li estas ekzemplo por ĉi viro sur la tuta mondo. Se ni dezirus scii kion fari ĉi tamen, ni devas

esti pli ol predikanto, kaj tial li ne estas tiel bona eksempla por ni. Ankau, li ne edzigis, kaj ne sciis la plej granda aĵo de la Dio "Perfekta Amo." Lia vivo estis mallonga, kaj li ne skribis ĉu unu vorton por instrui liajn sekvantulojn. Ili diris ke nur lia krucigo povas savi la mondon. Tiu ĉi estas granda eraro, por ĝi ne efikis por la personoj kiu vivis antaŭ ol li, kaj ni ne povas pensi ke Dio ĵugus ilin alia ol tiuj kiuj venis en la mondo post lia krucigo. Kaj ankau estis milionoj da popoloj kiuj ĉu ne audis pri ĝi. Ne Dio ne nasigis nin en stato da peko, sed ni naskigis pura, senpeka, kaj estas nia agoj dum la tuta vivo kiu levigis au mallevigis nin en tiu ĉi mondo kaj la venonta. Islam diras ke ni estas ĉiuj Filoj de Dio, ne unu persono, kaj ankau ke Dio ne edzigis kun monda virino kaj havis filon, tiu ĉi estas vera blasfemo. En la Sankta Kurano ĝi diras "En tiu ĉi Libro estas sufico por savi la tuta mondo," kaj se unu agas laŭ ĝia eldiraĵo ĉu devas nepre plibonigi la stato de lia kunvivantoj, kaj esti kun ili vera Frato. Fakte Muslimoj estas Fratoj en la vera senco de la vorto. Islam ankau malpermesas alkoholismo kaj tial savas Muslimoj landoj tiu ĉi malbeno. Ĝi ankau ne permesas ludoj de sanko. Ĝi igas nin preĝi kvin tempoj tage, kaj ke ĉiu ago ni faru devas esti laŭ la volo de Dio. Nia kredoj ne estas bona se ili ne laborigas nin. La Santa Kurano diras "Ne gravas se vi nomas vin Kristano, Muslimo, Judo au alia, se vi fidas je Dio, la venonta vivo, kaj pro tio agas prave, ne timu por la proksima tempo post tiu ĉi mondo." Oni povas vidi ke la nomo estas nenio, estas la agoj kiuj estas la grandaj aferoj, por alporti nin pli proksima al Dio. Ankau ĝi diras "Ne koleru nek batalu pro diferencoj en religio." Tial vi povas kompreni kiel popoloj de ĉiuj religio vivas pace en ĉiuj Muslimaj Landoj kvankam ke ili ne akceptus Islam. Islam diras ke ĉiuj devas labori por la bonigo de ĉiuj, oni devas respekti la gepatroj kaj maljunaj personaj. Ĝi ne konsentus kun anarkismo, sed diras ke ĉiu estro devas esti sekvota, kaj ni devas obei al li, ĉu se li ne estas de nia koloro au religio. La preĝoj povas esti dirita ie, ĉar ĉi estas la Dio. Personoj kiu ne komprenas Islamon ofte diras ke ni adoras la sunon, au Muhamud, sed tiu ĉi estas falsa, ĉar ni adoras nur la Unu Dio. En Islam viro kaj virino estas egala, kaj diras ke "Paradizo estas ĉe la piedo de la patrino."

Iuj diras ke Islamo estas fremda religio al Eŭropo, sed ankau en tiu senco estas Kristaneco, ĉar Jesuo estas viro de Azio kaj ankau viro de koloro. Se oni diras ke Islamo estas ne tiel bona kiel Kristaneco, mi deziras ke ili diru al mi Kio estas Kristaneco? Ĝi ne estas la religio de Jesuo, kaj ili nun diras ke ili ne scias la aŭtorojn de la libroj en la Biblio, kaj kiel ili povas diri ke io au alia estas Kristaneco. Ne! Islam povas doni al ni Libron de la buso de la Santa Proĝeto mem, kaj Islam estas la fino de ĉiuj religioj, kiel Muhamad estas la Fino de la Profetoj de Dio.

KHALID SHELDRAKE.

ثم الذي يتكره لا بد له من ان يتكرر التوراة والانجيل وجميع الكتب السماوية .
 بل وجميع الانبياء ومن كان كذلك فقد يسلم الله ايما نه ولا
 ينقذه فعله بلما نه الى صدقت موسى صدقت عيسى كن الذي
 لا يصدق اقرارهما في حق سيدنا محمد ص فقد انكرهما . ومن
 هنا ان سيدنا ونبينا محمدا صلى الله عليه وسلم اوجب بان نصدق ^{نؤمن}
 بجميع كتب الله وجميع انبيائه ورسله كما قال تعالى (الذين آمنوا بجميع ما
 انزل اليه من ربه والمؤمنون كل آمن بالله وملائكته وكتبه ورسله
 لا يفرق بين احد من رسله وقالوا سمعنا واطعنا غفرانك ربنا
 واليك المصير) فقد ظهر وبان كالشمس في رابعة النهار ان من صدق
 واتبع سيدنا محمدا صلى الله عليه وسلم فهو يهودي نصراني
 حقا لانه صدق التوراة والانجيل فيما اخبرا فيهما سيدنا موسى
 وعيسى عليهما السلام فطوفي لنا معشر المسلمين ثم طوفي لنا لانا
 صدقنا موسى وعيسى وجميع الانبياء والرسل وجميع الكتب
 السماوية وانا نعمل بتعاليم جميع الانبياء وصدقناهم فيما
 اخبروا في حق سيدنا ونبينا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم وانا لا نفرق
 بين احد منهم وايضا انا امرنا بان نشفق على خلق الله ونرحم
 عليهم وان لا نخقرهم بل نذكر كبيرهم ونحسني الى صغيرهم وان
 نحبت للجميع خلقنا محبة لانفسنا من الخيرات قال رسول الله
 صلى الله عليه وسلم خير الناس من نفع الناس وقال المسلم من سلم
 الناس من يده ولسانه فثبت ان مذهبنا الاسلام هو الحق
 وان نبينا محمدا صلى الله عليه وسلم رحمة للعالمين لانه معكم الخير
 لكافة الناس فبشرى ثم بشرى لمن صدقه وآمن به —
 (المنزح) محمد عبد المحيى عرب الخوينرى (مولد فاضل)

كتصديقهم بالقرآن الكريم كما قال الله تعالى (قد لرا آما باللة وما أنزل
 إلنا وما أنزل إلنا إبراهيم واسمعل راسحق وبقوب وال سباط وما
 اوقى موسى وعيسى وما اوقى النبىون مى ربهم لا نفرق بين احد
 منهم ونحن له مسلمون) امثل هذا النبى الكريم الرزف الرجم صاب
 مكارم الاخلاق يعادى لا والله بل يصدق ويتبع لانه موجب
 للرحمة والبركة خاصا باليهود والنصرى حيث انه اقام عزه مسمدا
 مرسى عليه السلام ورفع بهتان المفتري عن الصدقة مرسى
 وقع اعتراضات المعتزىنى على ولادة سيدنا المسيح ونبوته
 بل انه صلى الله عليه وسلم اقام عزه جميع الانبياء والرسل حيث
 انه صدقهم فى تعاليسهم وما اخبروا به فليخفى على من له
 بصيرة وفطرة سليمة اخلاق سيدنا ونبينا محمد صلى الله عليه
 وسلم لانه عديم الظير فيما اسفاه على اليهود والنصرى
 ما قد راحل الانسان الكامل المكل الطاهر المطهر حق قدره
 ولا تخفى ان الانبياء عليهم الصلوة والسلام يكونون وسقى البطون
 كرمى الاخلاق انظروا الى الانباء الذى فى التوراتى حق سيدنا عيسى حيث قال
 نبيى الياسى قبله فكان برززه ومظهره نعى لان الله تعالى يصف نبيا بصفه
 غيره من الانبياء ولا جل ان يكون برززه وكذل سيدنا موسى اخبر نبيى سيدنا محمد
 على جبل فاران فى عشق الف قدوسى (شش و باب ٣٣ اية ٢) وكذل سيدنا عيسى
 بشر سيدنا محمد فى قوله فار قليط (يوحنا باب ٥ اية ٣٦) فقد بين على ان
 اخلاق الانبياء وسيدة صافية فانظروا الى انباكم فى حق سيدنا محمد كيف وقع
 كما اخبرنا لما سب من اليهود ان يفرحوا بذلك مرسى صدق فيما اخبر وكذل انبى النصرى
 ان يفرحوا ان عيسى صدق فيما اخبر مرسى بل ان سيدنا ونبينا محمد صلى الله
 عليه وسلم مصداق مصداق جميع ما اخبرت به الانبياء والرسل

سُرُورٍ وَحُبُورٍ فَأَنكَشَفَتْ² تِلْكَ الظُّلْمَةَ بِوُجُودِهَا لَأنَّ اللَّهَ تَعَالَى رَحِيمٌ كَرِيمٌ لَطِيفٌ بَصِيرٌ بِعبَادِهِ يَنْزِلُ الْغَيْثَ بَعْدَ الْحُلِّ وَيُظْهِرُ الرِّيمَةَ الْعَامَّةَ بَعْدَ الظُّلَمِ قَالَ تَعَالَى وَرَحْمَتِي وَسِعَتْ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ فَهَآكَتِبُهَا لِلَّذِينَ يَتَّقُونَ وَيُؤْتِرُونَ الزَّكَاةَ وَالَّذِينَ هُمْ بِآيَاتِنَا يُؤْمِنُونَ الَّذِينَ يَتَّبِعُونَ الرَّسُولَ النَّبِيَّ الَّذِي جَاءَ بِهِ مَكْتُوبًا عِنْدَهُمْ فِي التَّوْرَةِ وَالْإِنْجِيلِ يَا مَرْحَمًا بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَبَيْنَهُمْ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَتَحِلُّ لَهُمُ الطَّيِّبَاتُ وَتَحَرَّمَ عَلَيْهِمُ الْخَبَائِثُ وَيُضَيِّعُ عَنْهُمْ إِصْرَهُمْ وَالْإِغْلَالَ الَّذِي كَانَتْ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَمَّا بَعَثَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى مُسَيِّدَنَا وَنَبِيَّنَا مُحَمَّدًا صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ سِرَاجًا سَنِيرًا رَحْمَةً لِلْعَالَمِينَ فَأَخْبَرَ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ حَقِيقَةَ الْمَذْهَبِ وَقَالَ أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِنَّ فَضْلَ اللَّهِ عَامٌّ وَنِعْمَهُ شَامِلَةٌ لِجَمِيعِ الْخَلُوقِينَ اسْتَوْجِبُوا حُرْمَتَهُمْ فَفَكَّرُوا بِقَوْلِهِ تَعَالَى رَبُّ الْعَالَمِينَ وَعَالِمُوا أَنَّ مَا فِي السَّمُوتِ وَمَا فِي الْأَرْضِ مِنْ الْمَنَافِعِ لِجَمِيعِ الْأَقْدَامِ بِالتَّسْوِيَةِ ثُمَّ قَالَ أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِنِّي رَسُولُ اللَّهِ إِلَيْكُمْ جَمِيعًا وَإِنَّ اللَّهَ أَرْسَلَنِي لِأُزِيلَ الشُّرُوكَ وَالْكَفْرَ وَالتَّعَصُّبَ وَالظُّلْمَ بِأَنِّي بَعُثْتُ لَكُمْ مَكَارِمَ الْأَخْلَاقِ ثُمَّ إِنَّ اللَّهَ تَعَالَى وَصَفَنِي بِقَوْلِهِ وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَاكَ إِلَّا رَحْمَةً لِّلْعَالَمِينَ وَقَوْلَهُ وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَاكَ إِلَّا حَافَّةً لِّلنَّاسِ بَشِيرًا وَنَذِيرًا فَلِذَلِكَ إِنِّي مَبْلَغٌ لِّجَمِيعِ النَّاسِ بِأَنَّ اللَّهَ تَعَالَى رَبُّ الْعَالَمِينَ وَفَضْلُهُ وَنِعْمُهُ وَرَحْمَتُهُ عَامَّةٌ لِلْخَلَائِقِ أَجْمَعِينَ - وَإِنَّ اللَّهَ تَعَالَى مُتَكَلِّمٌ فِي كُلِّ زَمَانٍ وَإِنِّي مُصَدِّقٌ لِّجَمِيعِ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ وَارْتِسُلَ إِلَيَّ مُوسَى بِكِتَابِ اللَّهِ جَمِيعًا فَانْظُرُوا إِلَى سَعَةِ قَلْبِهِ الْمُقَدَّسِ الْمُطَهَّرِ فِي تَصَدِيقِهِ جَمِيعَ الرُّسُلِ وَالْأَنْبِيَاءِ مِنْ غَيْرِ طَلَبِ جَاهٍ أَوْ مَقَامٍ عَالٍ ثُمَّ إِنَّهُ أَوْجَبَ عَلَى جَمِيعِ الْمُسْلِمِينَ بِأَن يُزَمِّنُوا بَنُو حِمْيَرَ وَبَرَاهِمَ وَمُوسَى وَبِشَاطِينِهِمْ مِنْ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ وَارْتِسُلَ كَايِمًا نَهَى بِهِ وَكَذَلِكَ أَنْ يُصَدِّقُوا التَّوْرَةَ وَالْإِنْجِيلَ وَجَمِيعَ الْقُرْآنِ السَّعْوَِيَّةِ

الحمد لله رب العالمين

ان بعثة الانبياء عليهم الصلوة والسلام رحمة للعالمين وكل واحد منهم يبلغ ما امر به ويدعو الى الحکم الذي ارسل به كما ان عليه السلام ارسل الى بنى اسرائيل خاصة فقبلوا منه اسم الله يا هوى فقط ولذلك فلهما اننا نحن المقربون ونحن المنعمون وما سائر الناس فطرو دون من الحضرة الاحدية وان الفضل والنعم كلها مختصة بنى اسرائيل واما غيرهم فلا كما شهد عليهم قول نحن ابناؤ الله واهبائه وكذلك قالوا ايضا وقالت اليهود ليست النصارى على شيء - وكذلك الفرقة التي قبلت المسيح عيسى ابن مريم عليه السلام منهم تمسكوا بقوله انى بعثت لجمع شمل بنى اسرائيل فقط فقوله هذا حق وصدق وكذا قول موسى عليه السلام حق وصدق لا نهما بلقما ارسلنا به من جانب الله تعالى بنى اسرائيل خاصة لا غير وانهما اذا رسالات ربهما كما بلغت الانبياء عليهم الصلوة والسلام رسالات ربهم على قدر ما امروا به - ولكن اليهود والنصارى استنبطوا بان جميع نعم الله تعالى وفضله مقصورة عليهم ودون غيرهم من خلق الله تعالى بل انهم تصوروا جميع الخلق اذلاء صاغرين ولذلك قالوا نحن ابناؤ الله - وقالوا لنى يدخل الجنة الا من كان هودا او نصري ولذلك انهم يتعصبون بالشدة على من سواهم بل انهم يعتقدون ايداء سائر الاقوام من بعض خدمات دينهم ومن هناك قد فتحت ابواب الظلم والالام والتشدد على مخلوق الله تعالى وما هذا الا من التعصب المفرط والفرق المذهب ولذلك اقتضت رحمة الله تعالى بعباده على ان يرسل اليهم السراج للنير ليخرجهم من الظلمات الى النور ومن المصائب والشدائد الى الحل

اسلامک ریویو کی قیمت میں اضافہ

موجودہ ضرورتوں کے مقابل رسالہ کا حجم کافی نہ تھا اسلئے سروسٹ رسالہ
قریباً ڈیوڑا کر دیا ہے۔ آئندہ ممکن ہے بہت جلد حجم اور بڑے یار سالہ مہینہ میں
دو بار ہو جائے قیمت سال روان اس وقت بعض سے بحاب پانچ روپہ وصول
ہو رہی ہے۔ اور یہ قیمت رسالہ سات روپہ کر دی ہے۔ اسلئے میں ان احباب
کے خدمت میں عرض کرتا ہوں کہ یہ رسالہ تاجرانہ اصول پر نہیں چلایا گیا۔
غرض یہ ہے کہ اسکی قیمت سب کا بیان مفت غیر مسلم دنیا میں تقسیم ہوں۔ اسلئے
رسالہ کی اس غرض کو مد نظر رکھ کر اگر یہ احباب خود بخود زائید قیمت لے لیاں
میں پیچیدہ بین نوادوں کی غنائت والہ میں یہ امر ہی خدا پر چھوڑنا ہوں۔ یہ رسالہ
تو یہی مافی عوفہ ہے کہ اسلام کا خوشنہ چہرہ نہ صرف غیر اسلامی دنیا پر چمکے
لگتا ہے بلکہ خود انگریزی خوان مسلم طبقہ اسلام کا عاشق ہوتا جاتا ہے
خود بخود قلوب میں تبلیغ دین کا خاص جوش پیدا ہو رہا ہے۔ کل اسلامی دنیا
از سر نو اصلی اسلامی زندگی کی طرف آ رہی ہے۔ جن خیرداران رسالہ کا سال
کسی درمائی ماہ سے شروع ہوا ہے وہ بھی اگر گذشتہ سن کا نمبر منگو اور حباب
شروع سال سے درست کر دین تو رسالہ سے بہت سبب ہو بلکہ موحا ہو گیا۔
لیونکہ متفوق حباب علی کی زیادتی کو چاہتے ہیں اور یہاں گالاش نہیں۔
یہی غرض تو یہ ہے کہ حقدار ممکن ہو یہ رسالہ مفت تقسیم ہو۔ سو اس میں
جو یہ امانتہ بنائے وہ عند اللہ اپنے آپ کو ماحور سمجھے۔

خواجہ کمال الدین Khwaja Kamaluddin

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

To meet the complaints of such of our readers and subscribers as may not happen to receive particular numbers of the *Islamic Review*, the undersigned requests them to inform him to once.

SH. NOORAF MAD, Manager.

The Mosque, Woking, England.