

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ  
نُصَلِّي عَلَى رَسُولِ الْكَرِيمِ

# THE ISLAMIC REVIEW

VOL. IX]

FEBRUARY 1921

[No. 2

## CONTENTS.

Mr. H. Omar Flight .. .. .	<i>Frontispiece</i>
Notes .. .. .	42
Slavery. By KHWAJA NAZIR AHMAD .. .. .	46
The Prophet in War-time. By MAULVI MUSTAFAKHAN, B.A. .. .. .	66
Our Duty To-day. By KHALID SHELDRAKE .. .. .	71
Thoughts of a Muslim. By YUSUF AL-KAZIMI .. .. .	74
A Fallacy. By MAULVI MUSTAFAKHAN, B.A. .. .. .	76
Correspondence.. .. .	79
Review .. .. .	80

## THE HOLY QUR-ÂN

With English Translation and Commentary, printed on high-class India paper, and bound in green flexible leather, price £2; cloth bound, 30s. Postage and packing for both qualities: United Kingdom, 2s.; abroad, 4s. Prospectus and sample pages sent free on application. Prices in India: India paper, Rs. 20; cloth bound, Rs. 16. Apply in India to Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat-Islam, Ahmadiyya Buildings, Lahore. Orders from India, Burma, Ceylon, etc., should be sent to the Lahore office only.

**Friday Prayer and Sermon.**—At the London Muslim Prayer House  
—111, Camden Hill Road, Notting Hill Gate, London—every Friday,  
at 1.30 p.m.

**Service, Sermon and Lectures** every Sunday at the Mosque, Woking,  
at 3.15 p.m.

## NOTES

### The Khwaja in Java.

A correspondent writes from Java :—

"I am glad to inform you that our Maulvi Khwaja Kamal-ud-din is in good health since his arrival at Java, and according to the Muslim daily paper, *Oeteesan Hindia* (Messenger of India), published at Seerabaia, in which place our Khwaja is at present, on the night of November 29, 1920, there was a large gathering of about four thousand Muslims to celebrate the Maul-ud-din Nabi in the famous mosque named Ampel of that place, and our Khwaja advised all Muslims here to study carefully and diligently the contents of the Holy Qur-án. He was glad to see that the entire population of Java, numbering 48 millions, are Muslims.

"I do not know yet when our Khwaja will visit my town, but he wrote me that he will stay in Weltevreden for a short time, then will depart for India."

Another correspondent of the same place sends us the following poem which was composed on the happy occasion of the Khwaja's visit to Java :—

We have no trumpets to sound a welcome,  
We have no guns to fire salute;  
We have few full and hailing hearts  
And tongues—alas, they are mute!

Our hearts send forth a welcome-music,  
A music unheard by fleshy ears,  
It flows deep down into the soul  
Like angels' music of the spheres.

The angels' music 's the fitting welcome  
To greet thee, Khwaja, in this land,  
Who comest to illumine benighted regions,  
The torch of Islám in thy hand.

Kamal, what wonders you have wrought;  
You are welcome thrice, again—  
Oh, heaving, surging, burning hearts  
Burst forth to welcome thee again!

### Hindu and Muslim Unity.

In a recent issue of the *Moslem World* we have the following remarks about the question of the Hindu-Muslim unity :—

We read in one of our Indian exchanges that a Mohammedan missionary from North India, Mr. Khwaja Kamal-ud-din, has been giving a series of addresses in Madras. At one of these addresses, at which a Brahman presided, he is reported to have made the following remarks :

## NOTES

"The Hindus and Mohammedans could easily come together in a bond of union if they recognized each other's prophets. There was no harm for Mohammedans in considering the Hindu prophets as their prophets and *vice versa*. He did not want that a Hindu should become a Moslem or a Moslem a Hindu. What he wanted was only co-operation between the two. Madras had always been distinguished for its religious zeal, and thanks to the work of Mrs. Besant, the ridges which separated one mind from another were being broken. He would ask them whether it would not be possible to create a sort of league, the very first declaration of which would be that the signatory would accept Moses, Jesus, Ramachandra, Krishna, Buddha and Mohammed as true prophets and messengers of God, would accept all the great books of religion as books of God, that the Qur-án was the final revelation of the Divine will, and that he would refrain from speaking ill of other religions. He would assure them on behalf of the Moslems that for their part they would pledge not only to accept Krishna and Ramachandra as prophets but in addition to abstain from kine slaughter. He for his part would resolve from that day not to have anything to do with beef throughout his lifetime. If there was any likelihood of their inaugurating such a brotherhood as he had outlined, he would promise he would bring tens of thousands of men to sign the pledge."

This is a significant sign of the times ; but no one can say how far Mr. Khwaja Kamal-ud-din represents the followers of Mohammed. We rejoice in the desire that prevails amongst thoughtful men of all classes that all should unite for the benefit of India. That union cannot take place on the lines laid down by Mr. Kamal-ud-din, for those prophets he has linked together do not all teach the same message. There are fundamental differences that cannot be ignored.

It is indeed surprising to us as to why there can be no unity between the advocates of the two different religions, when there can be union between the two different nationalities. We have got international laws, we have got now international tribunals ; and we have got the League of Nations, which is a living reality of our modern times. Do we not recognize the entities of the different nations in our international laws ? Have we not condescended to represent the interests of different nationalities in the League of Nations ? Can we not do the same in the League of Faith ? The contention that "the prophets do not teach the same message" hardly appears to be valid and pertinent. The fact that their teachings were different does not rebut the truth that they were all from one God ; the difference of their teachings being only due to the different ages in which they were raised.

### The Influence of Islam.

The Christian missionaries have written so much against the influence of Islam, but the Christian writers of unbiassed mind have invariably admitted the wonderful part which Islam has played in forming the character of its followers. Those who have read the annals of the Rise, Decline and Fall of the Khilafat by Muir must be impressed with one idea : that Islam raised the wild children of the desert from

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

the abyss of degradation to the zenith of civilization. As for the more recent times, the following remarks of Captain C. W. J. Orr will be read with great interest, which we quote from the *Moslem World* :—

The religion of Islam, wherever it prevails, whether at the courts of Constantinople, Delhi or Morocco, or in the less ostentatious governments of West Africa, is uniform, both in its practice and in its influences on the minds of men. The "dead hand of Islam" is sometimes spoken of, as if the religion were a blight which withered all progress amongst the nations who profess it, though the Arabs in Spain held aloft the torch of civilization at a time when the rest of Europe was wrapped in darkness. But even if it be true that Islam lays a dead hand on a people who have reached a certain standard of civilization, it is impossible to deny its quickening influence on African races in a backward state of evolution. Amongst the pagan tribes of Northern Nigeria it is making its converts every day, sweeping away drunkenness, cannibalism, and fetishism; mosques and markets spring into existence, and the pagan loses his exclusiveness, and learns to mingle with his fellowmen. To the Negro Islam is not sterile or lifeless. The dead hand is not for him.

### A Mosque in Paris.

In *The Times* of January 5, 1921, we read the following :—

Plans for the erection in Paris of a mosque, which is to be the spiritual home in that capital of the many Moslems who own allegiance to France, are making considerable progress.

Some time ago Parliament authorized a grant of 500,000 frs. (£8,300) for this purpose, and it is believed that at an early date the City of Paris will give a site, probably near the Invalides, so that the white dome of a Moslem mosque and the gilded dome of the tomb of Napoleon, the first Frenchman in modern times to conceive the project of a Franco-Islamic alliance, will arise above the lower roofs side by side.

The work of construction will be given to Moslem architects, and Moslems in Algeria, Morocco, and Tunis are to be asked to contribute 150,000 frs. (£2,500) in each country towards the expenses. Algeria has already, indeed, shown her interest by nominating the *Imam*. With the mosque is to be associated an institute which will be equipped with lecture rooms and facilities for study, so that young Moslems at the Sorbonne may there continue their Qur-ānic studies, and there will be a big room for the exhibition of Oriental arts and crafts.

The French Government deserves our hearty congratulations on this wise proposal, which is calculated to contribute immensely to cement the relations of the Muslims to France. To the Muslim, his religion is the dearest thing in the world; and anything done towards it is sure to win his heart. The mosque in Paris will decidedly be a befitting monument to the memory of the Muslims who fought and died for the honour and integrity of France.

England is often said to be the greatest Muslim power in the world, because she rules over the largest number of the Muslims. The services of the Indian Muslims in the great world-war have been universally admitted, and the Government of India have more than once officially recognized

## GOD IS LOVE

the great sacrifices of the Indian Muslims, which were some times even against their religious sentiments. We can only hope that England will like to follow the example set by her great ally, and will build a mosque in London in the honour of those who fell in the war for the honour of the British Crown. The suggestion of building a mosque in London, as a matter of fact, was advanced in official quarters by the Right Honourable Lord Headley some time ago. But it is to be regretted that nothing has been done so far. Now France has set an example, and England is only expected to follow it, as she has been now saved the worry of initiative which she deplorably lacks.

### Lord Headley's Marriage.

We are exceedingly glad to learn that the Rt. Hon. Lord Headley has been recently married to Mrs. Barbara Bayton. We heartily congratulate our brother on this happy occasion. We quote the following from the *Birmingham Gazette and Express* :—

“ Lord Headley and his bride, whose wedding on Friday took Society by surprise, spent the first few days of their honeymoon in Birmingham.

“ As this year's president of the Society of Engineers, the bridegroom was the principal guest at the annual dinner on Saturday of the Birmingham Association of Mechanical Engineers, and it was probably for this reason, as much as to escape from a crowd of well-wishers in London, that Lord and Lady Headley journeyed to Birmingham a few hours after the marriage ceremony.

“ The bridegroom is a man of distinctive character and personality, possessing a wide knowledge of men and affairs. During an hour's chat with him at the Queen's Hotel, writes a *Gazette* representative, he discoursed on many topics, though of none did he speak with greater enthusiasm than that of the Moslem faith. . . .

“ The principles of Islam in their relation to marriage were, he said, quite simple, and did not affect the validity of any marriage, even if the bride was not of the same faith.

“ The bridegroom and bride had known each other many years, having first met at an anti-German meeting. Both possess literary gifts. Lord Headley has written books on engineering and boxing. Lady Headley is the authoress of several books dealing with Australian life, and also a stirring three-act play, ‘ The Surrender. ’ She is a great personal friend of Mr. Hughes (the Australian Premier), and is reputed to be very wealthy.”

# SLAVERY

## IV

BY KHWAJA NAZIR AHMAD

(Continued from the January number)

### Position of Slaves under Islam.

FROM all that has been said, it is clear that it is a gross misrepresentation to associate slavery with Islam as a permanent institution. Islam only tolerated it as a temporary measure, and eventually laid down explicit laws for its ultimate abolition. The opponent of Islam cannot point out any moral code in regard to the treatment of slaves, laying stress only upon the duties of the slave to the master ; but on the contrary it has directed masters to be kind to their slaves. Whereas the Christian Bible fails to say anything in favour of kind treatment to slaves, the Holy Qur-án enjoins it in forcible words.

Islam attaches the same importance to the worship of God as to considerate treatment of slaves. For we find in the Holy Qur-án : " And serve Allah and do not associate anything with Him, and be good to the parents and to the near of kin and the orphans and the needy and the neighbour of (your) kin and the alien neighbour, and the companion in a journey and the wayfarer and those *whom your right hands possess* ; surely Allah does not love him who is proud and boastful." <sup>1</sup> Thus by linking together in one sentence the worship of God and good treatment to His creatures, among whom slaves are particularly mentioned, the importance of being good to bondmen has been made manifest. It further lays down that the *poor* must not be despised, for the *proud* are disliked by the Almighty.

Let us now see how this precept, and many more in the Holy Qur-án, which enjoin kind treatment to slaves, have been amply elucidated and explained in the reports of the Holy Prophet. In the *Bukharee* we are told that the Prophet (may the blessings of Allah be upon him) said : " Verily your slaves are your brethren ; God has placed them under you ; whoever then has his brother under him, he should feed him with food of which he eats, and clothe him with such clothing as he wears. And do not impose upon them a duty which it is beyond their power to perform, or if you command them to do what they are unable to do, then assist them in that affair." By such commandments the Holy Prophet put the universal brotherhood into actual practice. Slaves were even to wear the same clothes and eat the same

<sup>1</sup> The Holy Qur-án, iv. 36.

## SLAVERY

food as their masters. The position of slaves was, in fact, enviable rather than degrading. The slave was not a dumb worker for his master, but his counsellor as well. The Holy Prophet said, "When the slave gives his master good advice or counsel and is sincere in worshipping God, he has a double reward." The slaves could "make contracts and accept liabilities" on behalf of their masters.<sup>1</sup>

There are so many traditions enjoining kindness to slaves that we are forced to the conclusion that no philanthropist, even to-day, dare preach, leaving aside practice, the equality between masters and slaves in such forcible words as by the Holy Prophet. The fourth Caliph, Ali, reports the following saying of the Holy Prophet: "Fear God in the matter of prayers and in the matter of those whom your right hands possess." The following reports of the Holy Prophet, which throw a flood of light on the position of slaves in Islam, have been quoted by Lane (*Arabian Nights*) and Hughes (*Dictionary of Islam*):—

"He who beats his slave without fault or slaps him on the face, his atonement for this is freeing him."

"A man who behaves ill to his slave will not enter paradise."

"Whoever is the cause of separation between mother and child, by selling or giving, God will separate him from his friends on the day of resurrection."

Could there be anything clearer than these sayings of the Holy Prophet? All these traditions afford the most conclusive evidence of the fact that slaves enjoyed perfect equality of position with their masters in all respects. Nothing is more impressive than the following saying of the Holy Prophet: "Verily my friend Gabriel continued to enjoin on me kindness to slaves, until I thought that people should never be taken as slaves." There has never been a benefactor of humanity whose anxiety for the slaves was so great as was that of the Holy Prophet Mohammed (may blessings of Allah be upon him). When questioned as to the number of times a master should forgive his slave, the Holy Prophet is reported to have said: "Forgive thy slave seventy times every day if thou desirest to be rewarded with a good reward for what thou forgivest." His gentle heart did not even bear the slave to be called by that degrading appellation. He, therefore, for affection he had for his brethren in bondage, said: "Let none of you say *abdi* (my man-slave), *amti* (my maid-servant), but let him say *ftai* (my young man), *ftati* (my young maid), and *ghulami* (my young man or my young boy)." The latter three words are applied to slaves as well as free men, while the former two are applicable to slaves only.

From his sayings, when we come to his practice, we find

<sup>1</sup> *The Encyclopædia of Islam.*

him to be the first man to act upon these injunctions. He at once set free those whom he got in his possession as slaves. Although he was the head of the republic at Medina, yet he never thought it below his dignity to personally do the household work. Gibbon, while commenting on his character, says: "The author of a mighty revolution appears to have been endowed with a pious and contemplative disposition. . . . He avoided the path of ambition and avarice. The good sense of Mahomet despised the pomp of royalty; the apostle of God submitted to the menial offices of the family; he kindled the fire, swept the floor, milked the ewes, and mended with his own hands his shoes and his woollen garments. . . . On solemn occasions, he feasted his companions with rustic and hospitable plenty; but in his domestic life many weeks would elapse without a fire being kindled on the hearth of the Prophet. The interdiction of wine was confirmed by his example; his hunger was appeased with a sparing allowance of barley bread; he delighted in the taste of milk and honey, but his ordinary food consisted of dates and water." <sup>1</sup> Surely a man of such character need not have any slaves. There were fourteen or fifteen persons who served the Holy Prophet on various occasions. Besides this, the greatest among his followers deemed it an honour to do him any piece of service. But notwithstanding all this, he would himself attend to all the ordinary household duties. He would take, when riding, anyone behind him. Ans, one of his servants, relates many anecdotes of his kind treatment. He says: "I served the Holy Prophet for ten years, and he never said to me so much as *uff* (an expression of displeasure or contempt); and he never said to me when I did a thing, 'Why hast thou done it?' nor, when I omitted to do a thing, did he say, 'Why hast thou omitted to do it?' and his treatment was best of all men."

Zaid, "the freedman of the Prophet," was seen by some members of Bani Kalb, the tribe to which he belonged. The Kalbites "told his father they had discovered him, and he at once hurried to Mecca. 'Give him his liberty for the ransom we will pay,' said he to the Prophet; but Zaid declared that he preferred to remain with Mohammad." <sup>2</sup> Because of his good treatment Zaid preferred to remain with the Holy Prophet rather than with his parents. Then we have the conclusive evidence of Aysha, who reports: "The Holy Prophet never beat any of his servants or any women."

Throughout his life, Mohammad (may blessings of Allah be upon him) did not wrong anyone, nor illtreated any person. As soon as he was aware of his approaching death,

<sup>1</sup> Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.

<sup>2</sup> *Encyclopædia of Islam*, by Doctors M. Th. Houstama, M. Seligsohn, T. W. Arnold, R. Bisset and H. Buir, vol. i, p. 17.



## SLAVERY

he entered the Mosque at Medina and addressed the people thus : “ ‘ If there be any man,’ said the apostle from the pulpit, ‘ whom I have unjustly scourged, I submit my own back to the lash of retaliation. Have I aspersed the reputation of a Musulman ? Let him proclaim *my* faults in the face of the congregation. Has anyone been despoiled of his goods ? The little that I possess shall compensate the principal and the interest of the debt.’ ‘ Yes,’ replied a voice from the crowd, ‘ I am entitled to three drachms of silver.’ Mahomet heard the complaint, satisfied the demand, and thanked his creditor for accusing him in this world rather than at the day of judgment.”<sup>1</sup>

The noble example of the Holy Prophet was followed by the early Muslims. Abu Bakr, one of his chief supporters, “ was very susceptible of the purely moral thoughts in the Prophet’s preaching, proving this by purchasing the freedom of several slaves, and by similar other actions.”<sup>2</sup> The freedom granted to a slave by Zanba’, in obedience to a command of the Holy Prophet, is another example which clearly shows that harsh treatment was absolutely forbidden. This slave was not only freed, but he and his family were granted maintenance even after the Holy Prophet’s death by Abu Bakr.

The example of Abul Haisain, who finding himself incapable of carrying out the Holy Prophet’s injunctions in regard to the kind treatment of his slave, set him at liberty, is too well known to be mentioned here. On another occasion Abu Mas’ud freed his slave under somewhat similar conditions.

Ali is reported to have said : “ Verily I am ashamed of myself when I take as a slave a person who says, ‘ God is my Lord ’.”

Gibbon relates a well-known incident of the benevolence of one of the sons of Ali. He writes : “ In serving at table, a slave had inadvertently dropped a dish of scalding broth on his master ; the heedless wretch fell prostrate, to deprecate his punishment, and repeated a verse of the Koran : ‘ Paradise is for those who command their anger : ’—‘ I am not angry ; ’—‘ and for those who pardon offences : ’—‘ I pardon your offence ; ’—‘ and for those who return good for evil : ’—‘ I give you your liberty, and four hundred pieces of silver.’ ”<sup>3</sup>

It is also reported that Abu Huraira once saw a man was riding while his slave was running after him. He said to the man, “ Take him behind thee on thy beast, O slave of God ; verily he is thy brother, and his soul is like thy soul.”

“ It is related also of Zainul-Abidin that he had a slave

<sup>1</sup> Gibbon’s *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.

<sup>2</sup> *Encyclopædia of Islam*, p. 80.

<sup>3</sup> Gibbon’s *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.

who seized a sheep and broke its leg ; and he said to him, ' Why didst thou do this ? ' He answered, ' To provoke thee to anger. ' ' And I, ' said he, ' will provoke him to anger who taught thee ; and he is *Iblis* (Devil) ; go, and be free for the sake of God. ' "

An incident concerning the Caliph Omer illustrates well the position of " slaves " under Muslims. In the siege of Jerusalem, Abu Obeida was requested that the city would be surrendered provided the Commander of the Faithful himself settled the terms. Thus on Abu Obeida's request " the conqueror of Persia and Syria " set out with an attendant from Medina. He was mounted on a camel, which carried besides his person, a bag of corn, a wooden dish and a leathern bottle of water. The accommodation being insufficient to carry them both, they decided to ride in turns. It so happened that just when they reached Jerusalem the servant had his turn, so the Caliph dismounted and began running after the camel, while his servant was on the camel, till they reached the camp of Abu Obeida. The latter, fearing that the inhabitants of Jerusalem might look with contempt upon the Caliph, submitted that it was not becoming of him to run in this fashion, while his servant was riding. Upon this the Caliph Omer said : " No one said this before thee, and this thy word will bring a curse upon the Muslims. Verily we were the most degraded of all people, and the most despised and fewest of all. It was God who gave us honour and greatness through Islam, and if we seek it now in other ways than those enjoined by Islam, God will again bring us into disgrace. "

I will relate some more historical events only to illustrate how Islam brought the slaves on an equal footing with their masters.

Zaid, " the freedman of the Prophet, " was often entrusted with the command of troops, and the noblest captains served under him without demur. Osama, his son, was honoured with the leadership of the expedition against the Greeks. At this time the Holy Prophet died. Abu Bakr, who succeeded him, refused to take away the command from him and personally walked a considerable distance in company of Osama, while the latter rode. Gibbon relates another well-known incident in which a slave was entrusted with the command of troops. In the siege of the Castle of Aleppo, Abu Obeida appointed Dames, a gigantic man of servile birth, to break through the garrison. Certain Arabs hesitated to act under his command, but " Abu Obeida admonished his brethren not to despise the baser origin of Dames, since he himself, could he relinquish the public care, would cheerfully serve under the banner of a slave. " When Youkinna, the valiant and hereditary chief of the Christians, " had been made captive and freed, the general

## SLAVERY

of the Saracens expressed his regard for the most humble merit by detaining the army at Aleppo till Dames was cured of his honourable wounds."<sup>1</sup>

Again, when Amru went to Egypt, he sent a party to the Roman Governor of Egypt to negotiate peace. The head of this party was a freed Abyssinian slave named Ubadah. When the party came in the presence of the Governor, he desired the Abyssinian to be removed. But on being informed that Ubadah was their chief and would speak for them, and that they were bound by what he said, expressed his great surprise, and admitted that the excellence depended upon a man's worth and not his colour or country.

In Islam, slaves, male or female, were treated as members of the family. Thus we find in the Holy Qur-án: "And say to believing women that they cast down their looks and guard their private parts and not display their ornaments except that appears thereof, and let them wear their head-coverings over their bosoms, and not display their ornaments except to their fathers, or the fathers of the husbands, or their brothers, or the sons of their husbands, or their brothers, or their brothers' sons, or their sisters' sons, or their women, or those whom their right hands possess, or . . ." <sup>2</sup> Here the slaves or servants are mentioned particularly among other nearest relatives. That this class included both male and female slaves is quite evident from the following incident, recorded by Al Beedawi: "Prophet Mohammad (may blessings of Allah be upon him) once made a present of a man-servant to his daughter Fatima; and when he brought him to her, she had on a garment which was so scanty that she was obliged to leave either her head or feet uncovered. And the Holy Prophet, seeing her in a great confusion on that account, told her that she need be under no concern, for that there was none present besides her father and her *ghulam* (young manservant).

These various instances are sufficient to establish that slavery as tolerated by Islam had nothing in common with the slavery known to the West. The following remarks from the pens of Christian writers will not be out of place:

"The slavery of Mohammadan East is usually not the slavery of the field, but of the household. The slave is a member of the family, and is treated with tenderness and affection. The Koran breathes a considerate and kindly spirit towards the class, and encourages manumission."<sup>3</sup>

Rev. William Goldsack writes in *Mohammad in Islam*: "To his credit, be it said, he taught his followers to be kind

<sup>1</sup> Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.

<sup>2</sup> The Holy Qur-án, xxiv. 31. <sup>3</sup> *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

to their slaves, and even went so far as to teach that the emancipation of a slave was an act pleasing to God."

Rev. Dr. Power, in his *Religion of the Koran*, says: "By . . . securing the position of slaves who had borne children to their masters, and by giving both these classes admission to such religious consolations as Islam afforded, Mohammed undoubtedly improved their position in Arabia."

Lane writes in his *Arabian Nights* that slaves "are generally treated with kindness" in Egypt. Regarding other countries he says that "the general assertions of travellers in the East are more satisfactory evidence in favour of the humane conduct of most Muslims to their slaves." As for the injunctions contained in the Holy Qur-án and the traditions, he remarks that "these precepts are generally attended to either entirely or in a great degree."

Hughes even has to admit in his *Dictionary of Islam* that "the treatment of slaves in Muhammedan countries contrasts favourably with that in America, when slavery existed as an institution under a Christian people."

Stanley Lane Poole, in *Mediæval India*, says: "Whatever may be said against the slave system, in the East it tends to the production of great men."

We read in *Hilchoth Mail'noth Aniiim* (c. 8): "The ransoming of captives takes precedence of the feeding and clothing of the poor, and there is no commandment so great as this."

Rev. Dr. Tisdell, in *The Religion of the Crescent*, says: "Muhammad did not introduce the evil; nay, he seems to have done something to mitigate it. He directed the Muslims to be kind to their slaves, to feed and clothe them properly, and praised those who on certain occasions manumitted them."

Dr. T. W. Arnold, in *Preaching of Islam*, writes: "As organized by Muhammadan Law, slavery was robbed of many of its harshest features, nor in Turkey at least does it seem to have been accompanied by such barbarities and atrocities as in the pirate states of North Africa. The slaves, like other citizens, had their rights, and it is even said that a slave might summon his master before the Qádi for ill-usage, and that if he alleged that their tempers were so opposite that it was impossible for them to agree, the Qádi could oblige his master to sell him." The same writer further tells us that the master "indeed often promised to set any slave free, without the payment of ransom, if only he would embrace Islam; but, on the other hand, would also freely emancipate his Christian slave, even though he had preserved his religion, provided he had proved himself to be a faithful servant, and would make provision for his old age."

\* Also see *Menavino*, p. 96; John Harris, *Navigatim Atque Itinerantium Bibliotheca*, vol. ii, p. 819.

## SLAVERY

C. Snouck Hourgionje, while discussing the position of slaves under Islam, writes: "They are received into the family of their masters, and, after a few years' servitude, are received into society as free men generally; they are even convinced that slavery has made men of them. . . . In general their lot is not a heavy one; their food is ample. After their liberation the labourers seek work as hirelings, water-carriers, etc.; they generally prefer the guardianship to go on. . . . Domestic servants are almost regularly freed at the age of twenty. . . . The well-to-do owner also feels obliged, if possible, to give his faithful servant a home of his own, and the liberation of a slave in itself is considered to be a good work; the family tie remains as strong as before.

"Hardly any office or position whatever is unattainable for the freed slave; they compete on equal standing with the free-born, and the results show that they are not the worse for the strife, for amongst the most influential citizens, proprietors of house property and of business, they have many representatives.

"Taken all in all, the condition of the Muslim slave is only formally different from that of the European servant or workman."

In spite of all these facts and in contradiction to all these Christian writers whom I have quoted, Sir William Muir, in his *Life of Mahomet*, says: "Under the thralldom of Mohametan masters, it is difficult to conceive more signal degradation of the human species. They are treated as an inferior class of beings. Equally restricted as under the marriage contract, (females slaves) are expressly excluded from any title of conjugal rights.—The subject is not one which I can explain or illustrate without offence to decency. The reader must believe at second-hand that the whole system is vile and revolting.—The female slave is at the absolute disposal of her master, to be toyed and sported with purely at his pleasure."

Unworthy to blacken the shoes of the Holy Prophet, Muir tries in vain to blacken his character, this being more congenial to his taste than a fair and candid argument. In the arsenal of the Church, which once bristled with all the magazines of destruction, there remains but one thing—Slander. Now, although there are many Christians who are good and honest men, and conscientiously teach the mythology of Christianity and are earnestly striving to save mankind, yet the conclusion is forced upon us that as a class they are the most hypocritical and criminal class of men. With the ghoulishness of hyenas they have often dug into the graves of noted personalities. "Once a donkey kicked a lion, but the lion was dead." Nay, the lion is not dead. Islam is a "real and living force."

The spirit of the Holy Prophet has been so imbibed in the Muslims, or more correctly, so mighty was the Divine magnetism which the Holy Prophet possessed, that with regard to better treatment of slaves his followers have surpassed all the other nations of the world.

But let us examine the unfounded charges contained in Sir W. Muir's above-quoted passages. In the first place he requires us to believe blindly in everything he says; perhaps due to the Christian influence in which he has been brought up. But why should we rely on *second-hand* knowledge, especially when it has passed through a biassed mind? The only authority in such matters can be the Holy Qur-án. It is an admitted fact that before the advent of Islam female slaves were compelled to live by prostitution, the gain being taken by their masters. This practice was first of all abolished by the Holy Qur-án. For we read: "And do not compel your slave girls to prostitution when they desire to keep chaste, in order to seek the frail good of this world's life. . . ." <sup>1</sup> At the same time the Holy Qur-án enjoins upon the Muslim to marry slaves, if they had any. Thus it says: "And marry those among you who are single and those who are fit among your male slaves and female slaves; if they are needy, Allah will make them free from want out of His grace; and Allah is Amply-giving, Knowing." <sup>2</sup>

Thus marriages between the free and slaves of either sex were allowed. Further, we find in the Holy Qur-án: "And whoever among you has not within his power ample-ness of means to marry free believing women, then (he may marry) of those whom your right hands possess from among your believing maidens, and Allah knows best your faith; you are (sprung) the one from the other; so marry them with the permission of their masters and give them their doweries justly, they being chaste, and not fornicating, nor receiving paramours; and when they are taken in marriage, then if they are guilty of indecency, they shall suffer half the punishment which is (inflicted) upon free women. This is for him among you who fears falling into evil, and that you abstain is better for you, and Allah is Forgiving, Merciful." <sup>3</sup> This verse lays down the conditions under which the female slaves may be taken in marriage. It is clear that a slave girl is not a concubine according to the Islamic Law. A master cannot, of course, have sexual intercourse with his female slave without taking her lawfully as a wife, as otherwise it would be fornication, which is condemned in this very verse. There is not a single verse to which an adverse critic can point to, which may sanction what is called concubinage. On more than one occasion,

<sup>1</sup> The Holy Qur-án, xxiv. 33.    <sup>2</sup> The Holy Qur-án, xxiv. 32.

<sup>3</sup> The Holy Qur-án, iv. 25.

when the establishment of conjugal relations with slave girls is mentioned, their taking in marriage is clearly indicated.<sup>1</sup> The condition that female slaves should only be married in the case that a man has not the means of marrying a free woman becomes clear when we take into consideration the fact that a female slave, being of a lower class, naturally is not so expensive to maintain as a free woman. The female slave receives her dowry, and owing to her inferior position her punishment for adultery is to be less than that of a free woman. In the case of a master marrying his own female slave, the only right that the master can claim is that he does not stand in need of the permission of anybody else, but still he must take her as a wife. Then we are told that a Muslim female slave is to be preferred to an idolatress. Thus we read: "And do not marry the idolatresses until they believe, and certainly a believing maid is better than an idolatrous woman, even though she should please you; and do not give (believing women) in marriage to idolaters until they believe, and certainly a believing servant is better than an idolater, even though he should please you. . . ." <sup>2</sup> It may be added that all those people who have been given scriptures—e.g., the Jews, the Christians, etc.—are treated differently <sup>3</sup> from those who have no Divine revelation.

On the other hand, the Jewish law prohibits intermarriage with all other people,<sup>4</sup> and even Paul strictly prohibits intermarriages with all unbelievers: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness, and what communion hath light with darkness?" <sup>5</sup>

But the Christian missionaries, despite of all these facts, would misrepresent Islam. Here is another example. Canon Sell, who pretends to know more about Islam than he actually does, says: "The sanction given (by Islam?) to the unlimited concubinage was even a worse mistake. It is sometimes urged in its defence that the 'social evil' is less in Muslim lands than in others; but 'concubinage' does not materially differ from prostitution, and whilst the latter is strictly forbidden by the dominant religion of Europe, concubinage is as directly permitted by Islam." Can there be any more proof of ignorance on the part of Canon Sell? Does not he know that prostitution and concubinage are not one and the same thing? If he has not intentionally perverted the truth, then for the guidance of this innocent sheep of Jesus I will request him to come out of his clerical robes for awhile and see Europe and "its dominant religion" through the spectacles of a fair-minded,

<sup>1</sup> See the Holy Qur-án, ii. 221, iv. 24, iv. 3, etc.

<sup>2</sup> The Holy Qur-án, ii. 221.

<sup>3</sup> The Holy Qur-án, v. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Deuteronomy vii. 3-4.

<sup>5</sup> 2 Corinthians vi. 14.

impartial European. Did Luther find it possible in the sixteenth century of the Christian era to disallow concubinage on the authority of the New Testament? What will our Canon say if it is pointed out to him that in accordance with the declaration of the seventeenth Canon of the First Council of Toledo (A.D. 400) the laymen and the inferior priests were allowed to have concubines besides their legal wives, and that the term concubine was extended to the prostitutes not kept in house?<sup>1</sup> Will our worthy Canon blame his own predecessors, the Christian Fathers, for allowing this practice, which was, no doubt, according to his own words, equivalent to prostitution?

Let us now turn for a while to prostitution. Does Canon Sell really believe that "the dominant religion of Europe" has put a stop to this horrible institution? Fortunately, I do not belong to any of the Western *civilized* nations, and consequently cannot appreciate "lying for the glory of God." It is an acknowledged fact that some of the Christian Fathers explicitly recognized prostitution as an absolutely necessary evil. Among them was St. Augustine, "who saw that its suppression would stimulate more destructive forms of immorality. Gradually charity degenerated into patronage. . . . Before the Middle Ages the institutions and ministers of the Church became a by-word for vice, . . . prostitution prevailed everywhere throughout the Middle Ages. It was not merely tolerated, but licensed and regulated by law. In London there was a row of brothels or 'stews' in the Borough near London Bridge. They were originally licensed by the Bishop of Winchester . . . and subsequently sanctioned by Parliament. . . . On the Continent much the same state of things prevailed during the same period. Prostitution was both protected and regulated, and in many cases it constituted a source of public revenue."<sup>2</sup> Is the present state of European countries any better so far as prostitution is concerned? In France the criminal law takes no cognizance of the prostitution. The German law not only allows prostitution, but under the title of *Lalbehe* (half-marriage) concubinage is practised even to-day. The Austrian law forbids prostitution, but the police are empowered to tolerate it under certain conditions. The English law certainly regards prostitution as a public nuisance, but has it checked its progress? "The police everywhere complain of the amount of clandestine prostitution which they cannot control, and which tends to increase under the system, while the roll of inscribed women dwindles." Perhaps the learned Canon would now refer to America. The mention of "Broadway" and "Bons Ayres" might make him realize the folly of even entertaining such a thought.

<sup>1</sup> *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

<sup>2</sup> *Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. xxxii.



## SLAVERY

This reference to the fearful prevalence of prostitution in the Western countries will be sufficient to serve as a reply to our Canon's undue praise of Christianity. He must either rely on the abstract teachings of Christ, which neither prohibit polygamy nor concubinage, or if he refers to the moral effects of "the dominant religion of Europe," then he cannot disown prostitution, which has from time immemorial prevailed in the Western countries. The growth of prostitution has been the necessary consequence of prohibiting polygamy. As the one began to be looked down upon, the other became prevalent.

Turning to Islam, we find that concubinage, in its generally received sense that it conveys to the West, is not applicable to any Islamic institution. Whether the woman is free or not, the "cohabiting of a man and woman who are not legally married" is strictly forbidden in Islam. If the word concubinage is taken to denote a *legal union or a marriage* with a person of inferior social position, then it is certainly permitted by Islam. The fact that the person of an inferior condition can be male or female removes the ambiguity. But the concubinage allowed by Islam is neither prostitution nor adultery, because the inferior class cannot by "offering their body to indiscriminate sexual intercourse for hire" gain anything. Nor is it adultery, because in Islam the children of such a union inherit, but the issue of an adulterous connection cannot inherit the father.

As has already been stated, the Holy Qur-án ordains that Muslims should marry their righteous male and female slaves.<sup>1</sup>

The possession of a female slave *ipso facto* gives the master the right to have sexual intercourse, even after her marriage with another man. But evidently this is adultery, which is condemned by Islam. Such is the testimony recorded by the Holy Qur-án on this question. The only tradition recorded on the subject is: "The Holy Prophet, (may blessing of Allah be upon him) said: Whoever has a slave girl and he educates her and gives her a most excellent education, and instructs her in high accomplishments and makes her instruction most excellent, then frees her and then marries her, shall be entitled to a two-fold reward. . . ."<sup>2</sup> These words imply a lot more than a mere inducement for good deeds. They enjoin that the master who intends to marry his female slave should educate her, instruct her in high accomplishments, in fact should make her his equal, free her, and then marry her.

It has been asserted by some of the opponents of Islam that even the Holy Prophet had concubines. To them I

<sup>1</sup> The Holy Qur-án, xxiv. 32.

<sup>2</sup> *Sahih Bukharee*.

submit the following tradition, which throws light on the subject : " Ans reports that the Holy Prophet (may blessing of Allah be upon him) stayed between Khaiber and Medina for three days, Safiyya being conducted to him there on the occasion of his marriage. I invited the Muslims to the wedding repast, in which there was neither bread nor meat. The cloth was then spread, and over it were thrown dried dates and cheese and clarified butter. This was the marriage feast of the Holy Prophet. Then the Moslems talked among themselves, saying, whether she would be treated as one of the mothers of the faithful (i.e. as a free woman) or as one whom the right hands possess (i.e. as a slave). And they said, ' If she is veiled she will be one of the mothers of the faithful, and if the veil is not cast on her she will be one whom his right hand has possessed.' When the Holy Prophet set out on his journey, he took her behind him and drew a veil between her and the people." This tradition gives rise to many important conclusions. Firstly, the veil formed the only difference between the free and those whom the right hands possessed. Secondly, it shows clearly that when the master of a female slave intended to take her as his wife he was bound to set her free first, and then only could he marry her. Safiyya, as a matter of fact, according to another tradition recorded in the *Bukharee*, had been set free before the marriage. It is also evident that there was no difference in the marriage of the free and slaves, otherwise the Muslims would never have been under the misapprehension. Jawairiyya and Safiyya were the only two wives of the Holy Prophet who were taken from among the prisoners of war. Jawairiyya, too, was set at liberty before marriage. Mary, the Copt, who was sent by the King of Abyssinia, and who is sometimes erroneously termed as a concubine, was also, like all his wives, admitted to the distinction of the veil. This fact has been recognized by all the historians. It is, moreover, a fact which is admitted even by such bigoted Christians as Sir William Muir, that the Holy Prophet did not keep male or female slaves, and that he emancipated them as soon as they came into his possession.

Having discussed the various aspects of slavery, I now come to the question of emancipation. As already pointed out, the object of Islam was to bring the servile class on an equal footing with their masters and then to emancipate them. It has already been shown how Islam elevated the slaves legally, morally and socially. It is clearly laid down in the Holy Qur-án that the freeing of slaves is a good deed in the sight of God. It also states that the Muslims should help such slaves as desire to gain their freedom. Thus we read : " And let those who do not find a *match* keep chaste until Allah makes them free from want out of His grace, and (as for) those who ask for a writing

## SLAVERY

from among those whom your right hands possess, give them the writing if you know any good in them, and give them of the wealth of Allah which He has given you. . . ."<sup>1</sup> This verse lays down two conditions for manumission: firstly, that the slave set at liberty should not be worthless, i.e. he should only be freed if his master knows him to be a useful member of society; and secondly, that he should not be turned out penniless, so as to give him a start in the world. It is easy to see that but for these two conditions the emancipation of slaves would bring more harm than benefit to society and the freed man. Bukharee relates that Abu Zarr asked the Holy Prophet: "Which slave is it most excellent to emancipate?" The Holy Prophet replied: "The one that is highest in price and most highly estimated and loved by his master." Thus in Islam the gradual emancipation of slaves and their elevation ran side by side. In one of the earliest chapters of the Holy Qur-án it enjoins the emancipation of slaves in the following words:

"But he would not attempt the uphill road,

"And what will make you comprehend what that uphill road is?

"(It is) the setting free of a slave.

"Or the giving of the food in a day of hunger,

"To an orphan, having relationship,

"Or to the poor man laying in the dust."<sup>2</sup>

The doing of good to the *oppressed*, the poor and the orphans is called an uphill road, because of the difficulty it involves. The constant reference to the helping of the poor and the orphans and the setting free of slaves brings to light the force put forward by the Holy Qur-án on the subject. Islam is the only religion which enjoins the duty of granting freedom to the slaves, and the Holy Prophet Mohammad (may blessing of Allah be upon him) is the only reformer who set the noble example of freeing all his slaves that he ever had, and helping in the freedom of others.

Yet the Christian missionaries laud the anti-slavery endeavours of Christianity, and blame Islam for not taking any steps to uproot slavery. There is even a suggestion that such precepts regarding the nobility of liberating slaves as exist in the Meccan Chapters were abrogated by later revelations.<sup>3</sup> A preposterous statement in view of the plain directions, which run thus: "Alms are only for the poor and the needy, and the officials (appointed) over them, and those hearts are made to incline (to truth) and the (ransoming of) captives and those in debt and in the way of Allah and the wayfarer: an ordinance from Allah; and Allah is Knowing, Wise."<sup>4</sup> The chapter to which this verse

<sup>1</sup> The Holy Qur-án, xxiv. 33.

<sup>2</sup> The Holy Qur-án, iii. 11, 16.

<sup>3</sup> See *Wherry*.

<sup>4</sup> The Holy Qur-án, ix. 60.

belongs was revealed near the end of the Holy Prophet's life, and was revealed at a time when Muslim state, with full authority, had been established. By the "alms" is meant the *obligatory* alms (Zakat), called the *poor-rate*, and not voluntary alms. The verse defines the object for which the poor-rate is to be spent. Besides these injunctions for the gradual emancipation of the slaves, it was compulsory, under certain circumstances, for persons who had the means to free slaves. Thus we read the following in the Holy Qur-án :

"And it does not behove a believer to kill a believer except by mistake, and whoever kills a believer by mistake, he should free a believing slave, and blood money should be paid to his people unless they remit it as alms. . . ."<sup>1</sup>

"Allah does not call you to account for what is vain in your oaths, but He calls you to account for making of deliberate oaths ; so its expiation is the feeding of ten poor men out of middling (food) you feed your families with, or their clothing, or the freeing of a neck. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

"And (so for) those who put away their wives by likening their backs to the backs of their mothers, then would recall what they said, they should free a captive before they touch each other ; to what you are admonished (to conform) ; and Allah is aware of what you do."<sup>3</sup>

Such are the clear injunctions of the Holy Qur-án for the emancipation of slaves. When we turn to the traditions we find the Holy Prophet laying the same stress on the subject. I have already quoted one of his sayings which runs thus : "Verily my friend Gabriel continued to impress upon me the necessity of kindness to slaves, until I thought (that he meant) that people should be no more taken as slaves." The authenticity of this tradition is beyond any question, as he himself acted upon these words and freed all his slaves. Thus the statement in the Holy Qur-án, "Certainly you have in the apostle of God an excellent example,"<sup>4</sup> was verified in his lifetime. His perfect example induced all those he came in contact with to set free their slaves in large numbers, so far as it was consonant with the then state of society. When a slave proved himself to be sufficiently diligent, he was set free with a gift. Abu Huraira, as token of gratitude on embracing Islam, liberated his slave who had come with him to the Mosque. Slaves used to come to the Holy Prophet with their complaints, and not infrequently were made free men. Freeing a slave was considered to be a great virtue. In *Bukharee* the following is recorded : "Whoever frees a slave, God shall protect every one of his limbs from fire for every limb of the slave set free." Bará, son of 'Anzib, reports : "A

<sup>1</sup> The Holy Qur-án, iv. 92.

<sup>2</sup> The Holy Qur-án, v. 89.

<sup>3</sup> The Holy Qur-án, lviii. 3.

<sup>4</sup> The Holy Qur-án, xxxiii. 21.

## SLAVERY

person came to the Holy Prophet (may blessing of Allah be upon him) and said to him, 'Point out to me a deed which should bring me nearer to paradise and take me away from fire.' The Holy Prophet said: 'Free a slave and ransom a captive.' There is also a tradition which says that "the most beloved of all deeds with God is the freeing of a slave." Emancipation of slaves was especially enjoined on particular occasions. "Asama, daughter of Abu Bakr, reports that we were enjoined to free slaves whenever there was an eclipse."<sup>1</sup> Imam Razi relates a tradition that a person said to the Holy Prophet: "Tell me of a deed by which I shall enter paradise." The Holy Prophet replied: "Though thy words are brief, the question is great; free thy slave and ransom the captive if thou desirest to enter into paradise." The man questioned: "Do not these expressions, freeing a slave and ransoming a captive, both mean the same thing?" This question was actuated by the idea that in Islam no slaves were known except those taken as captives in *bona fide* legal warfare. But the reply of the Holy Prophet was: "Not so! By freeing a slave is meant that you should free him, and by ransoming a captive is meant that you should assist him in the payment of the sum which he is required to pay by the deed of manumission."

The Holy Prophet himself assisted many slaves to pay their ransom. It is reported that he helped Salman of Persia in his freedom by planting three hundred palm trees with his own hands. This was one of the conditions of manumission, the other being the payment of a sum, for which the Holy Prophet exhorted his companions to raise a subscription, through which Salman got his liberty. The splendid example of the Holy Prophet was followed by his companions. Ayesha assisted Barira, a female slave, in getting her freedom. Abu Bakr, as already stated, spent forty thousand drachms at Mecca in purchasing their emancipation. Slaves were set free for certain sins. If a slave was beaten by his master, he was set at liberty. A person who was beating his slave was discovered by the Holy Prophet, and perceiving from afar that he would be in a great wrath, he immediately cried out: "He is free now for the sake of Allah, O Prophet of God!" "And had you not set him at freedom," was the reply, "you would have met with severe punishment." Ans was compelled by Caliph Omar to execute a deed of manumission in favour of Sirin, who deserved this because of his education. Imam Malik notes the case of a female slave who was beaten by her master. The case was brought to the notice of the Caliph Omar, and the slave was immediately set free. On another occasion a woman executed a deed of manumission

<sup>1</sup> *Sahih Bukharee*.

for her slave, with the condition that the payment should be made in the usual monthly instalments. This slave suddenly became rich and wished to pay his mistress the residue of the sum at once, but she insisted upon the monthly instalments. Caliph Omar, on hearing the slave's complaint, ordered him to pay the amount into the treasury, and then informed the woman that her slave was freed, and that she could take the money from the treasury all at once or in monthly or annual instalments. These facts show that slaves could compel their masters to execute a deed of manumission if they were able to pay the ransom. If a female slave was taken in marriage by her master she was considered by this right to have earned her freedom, and her children were born free.

The war prisoners, according to the military laws then obtaining, were looked upon as slaves of the conquerors. They were invariably set free by the Holy Prophet, except when the heinous nature of the crimes called for an exceptional punishment. Eighty men who came to fight the Holy Prophet when he conquered Mecca were taken captives and freed. In the battle of Honein six thousand<sup>1</sup> were made captives from the Hawazin, and all of them were set free by the Holy Prophet without even exacting any ransom. In fact, the Holy Qur-án itself recommends the free discharge of war prisoners.<sup>2</sup> Once the Holy Prophet ascended the pulpit and addressed the Muslims: "After due praise to God, I inform you that your brethren have come to you repentant, and I have come to the conclusion that these captives should be given back to them. Whoever of you then loves to do it as an act of kindness, let him do it, and whoever desires that he should be paid the ransom, him will we pay out of what God will give us." All the Muslims obeyed the commandment of the Holy Prophet, and released the prisoners without exacting any ransom.<sup>3</sup>

On another occasion, in the campaign against the Banu-Mustaliq, the Holy Prophet, after paying ransom, himself married one of the captives, named Jawairiyya bint Al-Hárris. "This induced the Mussulmans to set free the other women who had fallen into their hands; for, said they, it is not fitting that the women of a tribe to which our master has become allied should be our slaves."<sup>4</sup> Lake furnishes us with further proofs that captives were freed on rendering some public service. He tells us how the Holy Prophet "released such prisoners of war as could read and write as soon as they had taught a certain number of boys to do the same; if any were willing to remain and take charge

<sup>1</sup> Through a misprint this figure has been given as six hundred in the previous instalment.

<sup>2</sup> The Holy Qur-án, xlvii. 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Sahih Bukharee*

<sup>4</sup> *Encyclopædia of Islam*, vol. i, p. 16.

## SLAVERY

of schools they were liberated at once.”<sup>1</sup> In spite of these facts the Christian missionaries hold Islam responsible for slavery; and one of them has the audacity to say that “slavery is so interwoven with Islam that its abolition strikes at its very foundation.” He further tells us that “Muhammad himself had slaves, and his example has ever since been followed by most of the Muslims.” If we consider the darkness prevailing in the world in the sixth and seventh centuries of the Christian era, and the enlightened injunctions laid down by the Prophet Mohammad (may blessings of Allah be upon him), it is easy to trace the source from which the light came and illuminated the heart of that man who was born and bred in the wilderness of a dark age. He was not a mere idealist to preach the impossibilities like Jesus. With the Divine sight he saw the needs of the slaves, and gave injunctions so well fitted to bring about their final emancipation. Only a real benefactor of humanity could practise himself and teach others to give away wealth for the love of Allah in freeing those enemies who had slain his own brethren.<sup>2</sup> Can this man, who did so much to abolish slavery, be blamed for ingrafting it upon the religion he preached and cherished? Let the adverse critics find any fault with the path pointed out by the Holy Prophet, in which he and his companions walked.

In conclusion I would like to say that slavery tolerated by Islam in its earlier stages cannot at all fall under the description of slavery of the West.<sup>3</sup> It is not, as in the

<sup>1</sup> Lake's *Islam, its Origin, Genesis and Mission*.

<sup>2</sup> The Holy Qur-án, ii. 177.

<sup>3</sup> Christians from time to time have proudly proclaimed the slave trade as a political achievement. Various efforts were made by the European powers to gain by this horrible traffic. “Portugal planted,” writes William Stephens, in *The Slave in History*, “forts from point to point along the coast, and ships purchased slaves from Portuguese dealers. The ‘sole rights’ were leased to them, and they essayed to keep them till 1668. Then the Seville merchants put in a claim. Afterwards France and England had their share, . . . the Dutch too had their forts. Spain seized an opportunity to purchase back all agreements. Then came the Utrecht negotiations. Louis XIV, who had been a shareholder in the Guinea Company, gave his support to England.”

After the Peace of Utrecht (1712) Queen Anne went down to the House of Lords and communicated the terms. “Here are some of the English gains as she announced them,” records Stanhope, in *Queen Anne*. “Spain would yield to us the fortress of Gibraltar, the whole island of Minorca, and the monopoly in the trade of negroes for thirty years.” This issue cannot be better told than in the words of Bancroft, the historian of the United States: “Her Britannic Majesty did offer and undertake, such are the words of the treaty, by persons whom she shall appoint, to bring into the West Indies of America belonging to His Catholic Majesty, in the space of thirty years, 144,000 negroes, at the rate of 4,800 in each of the said thirty years; paying, on 4,000 of them, a duty of thirty-three and a third dollars a head. The *asientists* might

civil law and patristic Christianity, "a constitution of nature." In Islam the slave of to-day is the grand-vizier of to-morrow. He may marry without discredit his master's daughter, and become the head of the family. Slaves have ruled kingdoms and founded dynasties. Subuktegin, the father of Mahmud of Ghazni, "a Turkish slave of Alptigin, Governor of Khorásán under Abd'ul Malik Núh, King of Sámání dynasty of Bokára, was raised to high office in the State by Alptigin's successor, Abu' Ishák. He, in 360 A.H. (A.D. 977), by the choice of the nobles of Ghazni, became their ruler. . . ."<sup>1</sup>

Kutubaddin, the first King of Delhi, and therefore the true founder of the Muslim Empire in India, was a slave. All his successors but the last were slaves, and for this very reason the dynasty has been called *Khandan-i-Ghulaman* (the Slave dynasty). Stanley Lane Poole relates many interesting stories in *Mediæval India*. He says that Altamash, one of "the slave rulers," refused to take Balban because of his shortness and ugliness.

"'Master of the world,' cried the slave, 'for whose sake have you bought these other servants?'

"'For mine own,' said Altamash.

"'Then buy me for the sake of God!' cried Balban.

"'So be it,' said the Sultan, and the ugly slave was set among the water-bearers."

He rose and lived to rule for forty years, half as minister and half as king. Can Christianity point to such records as these? Can Christianity show in the pages of her history as clear, as humane an account of her treatment of slaves as this? In the Christian countries we come across nothing else but horrible crimes, associated with this institution, which with its entwining folds and slow tortures has been to the Christian world what the serpent was to Laocoon.<sup>2</sup> The Lynch Law of the United States is a living

introduce as many more as they pleased at the less rate of duty of sixteen and two-third dollars a head. Exactest care was taken to secure a monopoly. No Frenchman nor Spaniard nor any other persons might introduce one negro slave into Spanish America. For the Spanish world in the Gulf of Mexico, on the Atlantic, and along the Pacific, as well as for the English colonies, her Britannic Majesty, by persons of her appointment, was the exclusive slave trader. England extorted the privilege of filling the New World with negroes . . . The sovereigns of England and Spain became the largest slave merchants ever known in the history of the world."

The Abbé Raynal, with the aid of Diderot, in 1780 estimated that 9,000,000 of negroes had been exported from Africa to the various American colonies, north and south. "The gross returns of English merchants," calculates Bancroft, "for the traffic in that number of slaves may have been not far from 400,000,000 of dollars."

<sup>1</sup> *Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. xv, p. 286.

<sup>2</sup> "Did ever nation struggle into history with fetters so heavy as bound these negro slaves?" asks William Stevens of the Christian civilized people. He goes on to say that "they were gathered at the



## SLAVERY

example of the treatment which the negro slaves received at the hands of the Christians. The following is taken from the *Globe* of January 27th :

### "NEGRO TAKEN FROM GAOL AND BURNED AT STAKE."

"A negro, who had been arrested on the charge of murdering a white man and his daughter, was carried off from the gaol last night by an infuriated mob, who then burned him at the stake."

An impartial person, after comparing the present condition of these "free" negroes of America with that of

first from villages far apart, the few that knew each other were separated, they were mixed and remixed in an awful conglomerate of what appeared to be soulless humanity. They were torn from their native customs and set to alien task, with the whip as measuring rod.

"In the settlement of groups so heterogeneous, sold and resold, it was almost inevitable that a system of severity should spring up and rule; . . . the spirit which made the slave, and was in all times reckless of life and un pitying, governed his history to the last. If the man who became the slave lost, as old Homer thought, the half of his manhood, the man who became master lost not infrequently the whole, as even the ancients testified.

"An almost ferocious tone characterized much early legislation. The *Code Noir* of the French colonies, in 1724, ordained that the slaves of different masters caught assembling day or night should be whipped or branded with *fleur-de-lys*; and in case of frequent transgression suffer death. The penalty for striking a master, so as to cause a bruise or 'effusion of blood'—a black eye, shall we say, or a bloody nose?—was death. A runaway slave, absent a month, might have his ears cut off, or be hamstrung, or branded. Under the British Government, by an Act of Virginia, approved by Anne of monopoly fame, anyone might kill a runaway slave who had been proclaimed, 'by such way as they thought fit.' Iron collars were often worn, with spikes affixed. In Jamaica a runaway slave might have one foot cut off after thirty days' absence. Runaway slaves not claimed, became the king's, and might be sold in support of the Government. . . ." He further tells us that "in Jamaica the amount of field labour allotted by law was nineteen hours a day during crop time, and fourteen and a half during the remainder of the year." An order was sent to all the Crown colonies limiting the hours of labour to a bit shorter period. The Governor of Demerara kept back this order for some time. As no announcement was made, some slaves from various estates met on a Sunday. The next day the Governor, hearing what had happened, rode out with cavalry; "the negroes gathered half-armed; the troops converged and fired; a sharp conflict ensued. Not a single white soldier lost his life; two hundred negroes were slain; no mercy was shown to the prisoners. Martial law was proclaimed. (This account compares well with the recent Punjab riots in India.) The white officers were feted by the white people, and presented with swords and plate, but filled up a record of infamy in the trials, floggings and executions they ordered. Seventeen prisoners were sentenced to lashes numbering from two hundred to one thousand, and to work in chains; ten, within a week, receiving six hundred or seven hundred, and two almost the whole at once. Forty-seven were adjudged to death; the bodies were gibbeted in chains, and the heads of others impaled, making ghastly the highways." Such are the

the "slaves" under Islam, can at once infer, as did C. Snouck Hourgionje, that "Public opinion on Muslim slavery in Europe has been led astray by confusing American and Oriental conditions; on this account the English regulations for the prevention of the slave trade have been wrongly applauded." He later admits that "the condition of the Muslim slave is only formally different from that of the European servant or workman." It is therefore quite clear that Islam did not sanction the institution of slavery, but only tolerated it for some time, and gradually took effective measures to abolish it altogether.

## THE PROPHET IN WAR-TIME

By MAULVI MUSTAFAKHAN, B.A.

### VI

#### THE TRUCE OF HUDAIBIYYA

SIX years had now passed since the Holy Prophet and his companions had left Mecca for the sake of their faith. Mecca was not only their dear home, but it was a religious centre as well. The precincts of the sacred KABA—the

wonderful records of Christianity, as to how she civilized the negroes. The following advertisement for the arrest of runaway slaves will not be without interest:—

Woolman, in his *Journal*, under date about 1740, while writing against slavery, inserts: "To be sold, a schoolmaster, an indented servant, that hath got two years to serve." Here is another from a Virginia paper of eighteenth century concerning a "negro fellow" named Bob: "The said fellow is outlawed, and *I will give ten pounds reward for his head severed from his body, or forty shillings (two pounds) if brought alive.* He has been burnt in one hand, and I suppose some evil-despised person has given him a pass, that he may pass for a freeman."

Or here is another from North Carolina, touching one "Zeb":—

"He is a very good cooper by trade; he is remarkably black, plays on the violin, and has a great deal to say for himself. As he is outlawed *I will pay twenty pounds proclamation money, out of what Acts of Assembly allows in such cases, to any persons who shall produce his head severed from his body, and five pounds proclamation money, if brought home alive.*"

The runaway slaves became outlawed after three months of absence. "They were put to death by a variety of tortures. Some were hanged, some beheaded, some burned, and some fixed alive upon gibbets.

"These atrocities of punishment were not exceptional. They correspond with the earlier statement of Père Labat, who describes how insurgent slaves in the English Islands were put into iron cages so small that they could not move, and then hung on the branch of a tree and left to perish from hunger or rage. *Ou appelle cela mettre un homme au sec.*"

I need not now refer to "Freetown" of Sierra Leone, which was selected as an experiment for colonization of the destitute negroes, under the governorship of Zachary Macaulay, and its fate at the hands of the French Commodore and the French crews under him.

## THE PROPHET IN WAR-TIME

first house built for the worship of one God, by Abraham—formed the glorious centre of their associations, round which gathered the history of their nation, and which was the object of worship of the whole of Arabia. But a pilgrimage to this shrine was denied to them for full six years. Since the emigration, the Muslims were busy in defending themselves against the aggressions of the enemies, and could not think of paying a visit to that ancient city, round which the hoary traditions had cast the halo of sanctity. Naturally the Holy Prophet and the Muslims longed to see the place. The shrine of Kaba belonged to the whole Arab nation, and the Quraish were only its custodians, and had no power by the law of the country to prevent anybody from paying a visit to the sacred building, who came with a view to fulfil a religious duty.

The Holy Prophet accordingly announced his intention of paying a visit to the shrine of Kaba for a pilgrimage. The Muslims at once responded to this call, and about one thousand people became ready to accompany the Prophet. Preparations for provisions and the animal sacrifice were rapidly made. As the whole party was going to a pilgrimage, the Holy Prophet gave orders that no one should take arms, which were complied with. But the reverse which the Quraish had experienced at the battle of Moat was still rankling in their hearts; and when they heard of the Holy Prophet's intention of pilgrimage, they decided that the Muslims should not be allowed to enter the shrine. They posted themselves with a big army, some miles in advance of Mecca, to oppose the Muslims. The Holy Prophet sent some envoys to the Quraish, with the message that he and his followers had come to perform the pilgrimage and with no hostile motives. But the Quraish would not listen, and dispatched a small band of soldiers who fell upon the camp of the Muslims. These were immediately arrested, but were afterwards released through compunction. The Holy Prophet again sent *Usman* to the Quraish, to bring home to them the advisability of concluding peace for some years. Some of the firebrands objected to this proposal, but sober-minded people voted for peace. At last the treaty was concluded, by which it was agreed that all hostilities should cease for a period of ten years. The terms of the treaty were:—

(1) That the Muslims should go back to Medina, without performing the pilgrimage this year.

(2) That they may come next year, and stay for the space of three days, at the expiry of which they should return.

(3) That they should come without arms.

(4) That they should not take any of the Muslims residing at present at Mecca with them; but should any

of the Muslims of Medina like to stay at Mecca, he will not be interfered with.

(5) Should any individual from among the Muslims or idolaters go to Medina from Mecca, he will be returned to the Meccans; but should any Muslim of Medina go to Mecca, he will not be returned.

(6) Any tribe desirous of entering into alliance either with the Quraish or with the Muslims should be at liberty to do so.

These terms, as can be seen at a very cursory glance, were extremely prejudicial to the interests of Muslims; yet the Holy Prophet agreed to them, so that the land, which had been the scene of continuous bloodshed, should be relieved of the curse of warfare. The Muslims after the signature of this treaty, which is known by the name of the place at which it was signed as the *Truce of Hudaibiyya*, returned to Medina. While on the way, the Holy Prophet received this revelation:—

“Certainly WE have given you a clear victory.”

According to Bukhari, the victory referred to here is no other than the treaty signed at *Hudaibiyya*. The fact that there was no actual fighting has led many commentators to think that the words contain a prophecy which was subsequently fulfilled with the conquest of Mecca. But the *Truce of Hudaibiyya* was in itself assuredly the real moral victory for the Muslims, because it opened the way of the propagation of Islam, by stopping the hostilities, and thus giving a chance to the sober-minded people to ponder over the merits of the religion against which they had hitherto wielded sword under the baneful influence of heated brains.

The peace dispelled hatred and contempt, and brought about the feelings of mutual understanding and consideration. The idolaters began to come in contact with the Muslims, and the high standard of the character of the latter, achieved under the spiritual influence of the Holy Prophet, had a tremendous moral effect on the former. As a result of this, large number of idolaters came over to Islam, and the truth of the prophetic words was thus demonstrated. It is *the* point which deserves the serious consideration of those who think that the spread of Islam is due to the sword. Islam gained more converts during the time of peace than during the war-time; and it is a sure testimony of the fact that it does not stand in the need of any physical force for its propagation. Islam wielded sword in defence only, and when the enemy wanted peace, the Holy Prophet accepted it on the most disagreeable terms, because a Muslim is essentially a “peace maker.” As a matter of fact, the proposal of peace was advanced by the Holy Prophet himself, and the enemy, taking ad-

## THE PROPHET IN WAR-TIME

vantage of it, proposed very hard terms, yet the Holy Prophet accepted them as he loved peace and hated war.

### EMISSARIES OF ISLAM TO THE RULERS OF THE WORLD.

The *Truce of Hudaibiyya* gave the Holy Prophet for the first time the opportunity of pursuing his wish to invite the rest of the world to the Catholic religion, which he hitherto had preached to the people of Arabia. He sent several envoys to the neighbouring sovereigns, asking them to adopt Islam; the most noted of these being Heraclius, the Emperor of Byzantium, and the Khusru Perwez, the Kesra of Persia. Khusru was a haughty king, and was then in the flush of his victories over the Romans. When he received the epistle of the Holy Prophet he found that his name was placed after that of the Prophet, according to the custom of correspondence then obtaining among the Arabs. This hit the pride of Khusru, and in a state of fury and rage he tore into pieces the letter of the Prophet. The news of this contemptuous treatment of the letter was brought to the Holy Prophet, who quietly remarked: "Thus will the Empire of Kesra be torn into pieces." The history of the world bears testimony to the truth of these prophetic words. Heraclius, however, treated the Prophet's messengers with great respect, and expressed a desire "to sit at the feet of the last apostle of God," whom he was expecting, but he never knew that he would appear from Arabia.

Thus the *Truce of Hudaibiyya*, which was described as "the clear victory" in the divine words, really proved a stepping-stone to the progress of Islam, not only in Arabia but in other countries as well. In Arabia itself the number of the converts to Islam began to increase considerably, as the people began to think seriously about the religion and shook off the old prejudices. Further, the idolaters happened to come in contact with the Muslims, and were attracted by the force of the character of the latter. These facts give a direct lie to those who assert that Islam has been spread by the sword. The history has so often repeated the lesson that the triumph of Islam lies through peaceful means, and not through war. Even in the time of the Holy Prophet, we see that Islam progressed by leaps and bounds, not in the time of warfare, but after the cessation of hostilities by the treaty signed at *Hudaibiyya*. The reason for it is not far to seek. Islam, as its very name implies, is a religion of peace, and it flourishes only in peaceful times. The opponents of Islam who say that it has spread through sword are quite wrong. Similarly the Muslims who think that Islam will make progress by wielding sword are mistaken. Its past history goes to prove that it has always made

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

its way through peaceful means. Even in our more recent times, we have seen that whenever the Muslim nations have taken up arms, they have invariably sustained serious reverses.

### THE BATTLE OF KHAIBAR.

“ Khaibar ” is a Hebrew word meaning a fortified place. This name was given to a fortified territory which lay, studded with forts and castles, in the midst of fertile, green forest of palm trees about 200 miles away in the north-east of Medina. We have already seen that it was the usual resort of the Jews ; and the Banu Nazir, when expelled from Medina, took refuge in Khaibar. It was, so to speak, the Jewish centre, and the various branches of Banu Quraizah and Banu Nazir lived there.

The Jews, as we have already seen in this narrative, were not on friendly terms with Islam. They had tried their best to impede the growing influence of the new religion, which they thought was undermining their aristocratic position. The Jewish machinations were all inspired by this motive, and they were in reality the great enemies of the Muslims. Further, the reverses they had suffered at the hands of the Holy Prophet were still causing a rancour in their hearts. It will be remembered that when Banu Nazir were expelled from Medina, they set out in a grand procession with little grief for their banishment, probably thinking that they would be able to re-enter the city with victorious arms.

The Jews of Khaibar now, with the alliance of Banu Ghalfau and other tribes of the desert, continuously worked for the formation of another coalition against Islam. When the news of these hostile intentions reached Medina, the Holy Prophet, at the head of about 1,600 men, advanced against the enemy to check their progress and frustrate their designs. While the Muslim soldiers were marching on they were singing, according to the Arab custom, the war songs, one of which may be rendered here :—

Those who want to oppress and create trouble for us must bear in mind that we are not going to be overawed by them. But, O God ! we do need Thy assistance.

These words clearly show that the Muslims were in the risk of being attacked by the Jews of Khaibar, and therefore were advancing in defence. When the enemy learned of the Muslim advance, they at once solicited the assistance of their allies. “ The Bani Fezara hastened to their support ; but afraid of the Muslims turning their flank and surprising their flocks and herds in their absence, speedily retreated.” The Jews only had to bear the brunt of the war. Although the intentions of the Jews were decidedly of the hostile character, yet as they did not actually attack the Muslims

## OUR DUTY TO-DAY

so far, the terms of the peace were offered to them by the Holy Prophet, but were refused. The opposition of the enemy was formidable; yet after a long defence, fortress after fortress opened its gate to the Muslims. The last of all was Al-Kama's, which held on for a long time, but at last fell to the gallant attack led by Ali. The victory was now complete, and the enemy surrendered unconditionally. The Holy Prophet accorded a general forgiveness. The lands and the immovable property were guaranteed to them, on the condition that they would remain on peaceful terms with Islam. THEY WERE GIVEN PERFECT RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, AND WERE ENTITLED TO WORSHIP GOD AS THEY WISHED. As they did not accept the religion of Islam, but were only brought under the protection of the Muslim Commonwealth, they were exempt from every obligation to contribute to the support of the State. They were, of course, expected to pay one-half of the produce of their lands in return for the protection they would henceforth enjoy.

The battle of Khaibar had one salient feature which distinguished it from all other battles which the Muslims had fought and won. It was the first battle in which a non-Muslim tribe was made subject to the Muslim Government. The Jews of Khaibar were given perfect freedom to keep and exercise their religion, and this fact can well speak for the tolerance of Islam, which has been so grossly criticized by the hostile critics of Islam.

---

## OUR DUTY TO-DAY

IN the Western World material science is developed to a very high standard, and the undoubted advancement has brought us many advantages and blessings. In medical knowledge we have progressed far, and students from all countries flock to our colleges. From another point of view this also has produced something which is most regrettable to a serious thinker, it is a retrogression of spirituality. Although far ahead in some matters, yet as far as religion goes, there is a decided falling off in the membership of every Church of the Christian persuasion. In fact to-day the Western World is under the influence of a wave of indifference. It is said sometimes that education kills religion. One must put that statement to the test. If a religion is based upon a true revelation and is logical, practicable, and suited to the needs of the human race as a whole, then education can be nothing else but a blessing to the people who profess that creed. On the other hand if the religion is simply a matter of belief in certain dogmas which were codified by certain learned priests at some remote period,

and is unscientific and unsuited to the needs of mankind, then there is no necessity to wait for the process of education to kill that religion, it will lose its followers and gradually die a natural death. Everyone consents that education is a blessing. It is given to man for his upliftment and happiness. Despite the old saying "Where ignorance is bliss 'tis folly to be wise," the sensible man to-day readily assimilates all the knowledge he possibly can through every channel. Ignorance is as a cloud covering the intelligence, impeding all progress, and strangling soul, mind, and body in its journey to eternity. Knowledge is as the sun in its noon-day glory, illuminating the dim recesses of the human spirit and physical frame, revealing the secrets of nature, and helping mankind on the upward path towards the realms of peace and full enlightenment. The religion which fears education is no guide for mankind, and if education kills that religion then something that is faulty and incomplete has been swept away by the heaven-sent gift of reason. In the West it is not exaggerating to say that Christianity is slowly but surely dying. We find that Christendom to-day is divided into two classes—those who believe and those who are indifferent. The believers are in the minority, and are divided between the Catholic Church, the Orthodox Greek Church, and the 490 odd different sects of Protestantism. Of these Churches the Catholic Church has lost but few adherents, the Orthodox Church is mainly the basis of certain nationalities, whilst the different sects of Protestantism are to-day fighting for a bare existence. Really the people of the West are indifferent to religion, and when you read in certain papers as to the division of mankind into religions and you see the number of Christians quoted, it is necessary to remember that these figures really are inflated, that they include all the inhabitants of a certain country which has one of the different Churches of Christianity as its State religion. It is only right to remember that thousands of these so-called Christians really have no religion at all; they are of the type known as "nominal" believers, which is a polite way of saying that they are really indifferent. The bulk of these people never enter a church or chapel to attend a service. They do go sometimes when they are married or to attend a funeral, but that is about all. Ask them any point of doctrine, question them on theology, raise a question of the doctrines of the Christian teaching, and you will find that they neither understand these things nor trouble about them.

This is the state of affairs in the West, and it is necessary to sound to-day a note of warning to the peoples of the East that they should not follow in the footsteps of the peoples of the West. May I speak frankly to all my brethren of Islam, and tell them that they would not be true believers



## OUR DUTY TO-DAY

if they ever ceased to follow in precept and practice the eternal truths revealed to mankind by Allah through the blessed lips of Muhammad (on whom be peace!), the last and greatest of the Prophets. ✕ Our duty is to learn, to understand, and practise Islam, then to act as an example and guide to others. Anyone may call himself Muslim, but "No man is Muslim until his heart and tongue are so." Let us not rest content in the first stage of spiritual evolution just *believing*, but progress so that we reach the plane of knowledge and eventually find ourselves fully illumined in the height of Realization. Let us think of the people of the West, they are even faltering over the first step—Belief, so how can they possibly attain Realization? Muslim and Muslima beware! Do not think that material advancement is all that matters, this world is as the passing false dawn and occupies a fragment of eternity. Now let us reason together as to whether we of Islam are really doing our duty. Our holy Prophet preached to the world his glorious message from above, but are we doing all we can to enlighten humanity to-day? Are we led astray into by-paths? Politics are human and must be faulty, they are the question of an individual opinion, but Religion is divine and perfect. Why do we to-day ask favours from the non-Muslim nations? Why are we weak instead of being the strongest nation on earth? Is it because we suffer from the blight of indifference? Whatever answers may be given to these questions, if faults exist they are *ours*, if we are weak to-day it is *our own doing*, but one thing stands out clearly—Islam is perfect. Back! back! to the Islam of our holy Prophet! Cut down false ideas which impede our path! Shun idle and useless superstitions! Let us *practise* Islam, and we shall be invincible. To-day in England there is a Mission to combat false dogma, remove prejudice, and refute misrepresentations levelled against Islam. This Woking Mosque is a challenge to the thinkers of the West, it calls to the indifferent to hear the new message, to the adversary to level the spear and fight out the question "What is truth?" To-day, ye Muslims, your battles are being fought in the West by a handful of pioneers. I ask you, "Do you care?" Do you realize that it is our duty to bring the light of Islam to the people of the West, to convert a possible enemy into a loving brother? Why do we worry about the future, unless it be that we are failing in our duty to-day? Ye inheritors of the great tradition, be worthy! Remember that you are entrusted with the preservation and propagation of the message of Allah, that every man has his portion of this responsibility and cannot shirk it unless he becomes infidel. Oh! my brethren, back again to the days of our holy Prophet (on whom be peace and eternal felicity!), back to the days of the Khalifs! Open your hearts and

minds to understanding, and hold fast to the Holy Book. Let us remember that the world is not yet Muslim, that we must all do our share to hasten the great day when the azan will ring out from every city in the world with its call to all men to commune with Allah ! We must not sit idle, but work for the triumph of truth. You desire to conquer the whole world and, Muslims, you *can* do so, but your minds must be concentrated upon the work. There is no need of navies or armies, but the weapon is in our hands always, it is the precious gift of Truth : the Opener of Hearts has vouchsafed us this illumination, our weapon is the Holy Qur-án, the Book of Books, the guide, the blessing, the argument. With this we can conquer the hearts and minds of men, and make the sun of Islam shine in the darkest depths, uplifting, purifying and uniting mankind. Awake, ye Muslims ! Help to convert the West into a Dar-ul-Islam in reality and truth. Ye will then have performed your duty, and your reward will be the blessing of Allah in this world and the next.

KHALID SHELDRAKE.

---

## THOUGHTS OF A MUSLIM

BY YUSUF AL-KAZIMI (*A British Muslim*)

THE old ecclesiastical writers were generally men of narrow mind and cramped intelligence, but now and then there were some of whom it may be said that their narrowness was not as extreme as that of the general run of their fellows. Among these we may number Spanheimus who, writing of the Apostle of God (whom may God bless), said :

“He was richly endowed with natural gifts, beautiful in person, brilliant of intellect, pleasant in manner, showing generosity to the poor, courtesy to all, courage against enemies and above all, reverence to God’s name. He was severe against the perjured, adulterers, murderers, slanderers, prodigals, the avaricious, false witnesses, etc. He was a great preacher of patience, charity, mercy, beneficence, gratitude, honour to parents and superiors and the praises of God ” (*Hist. Eccles.*, see vii, cvii).

This is fine testimony and remarkable when we remember how the blind theological fury of the old writers usually made it a point of honour with them to excel in heaping every abuse and calumny on the Prophet. We can understand the cause of this fury of the Churchmen, and to-day we can almost be amused by it. And even the above quoted writer could not entirely withstand the promptings of Orthodoxy, so in another place he calls Muhammad “a wicked

## THOUGHTS OF A MUSLIM

impostor.”<sup>1</sup> Not “mistaken,” mind you, or even “deluded,” but “a wicked impostor !” How strange was the mentality of the ecclesiastical apologist !

\* \* \* \*

I have been reading H. G. Wells' *The Future in America*. He gives in his usual inimitable style a very graphic and powerful description of the position of the negroes in that Land of Liberty (“God's Own Country”). The negro problem is certainly a difficult one, the difficulties mainly arising of course from the unjust attitude of the whites. It came to my mind how quickly would Islam resolve these difficulties ! Imagine the United States became a Muslim country. Who can doubt that there would cease to be a negro problem ? The pious Christian may say, “Oh, but if America were truly and completely Christian all would be well.” But I am not supposing that America became truly and completely Muslim. I am only supposing that she became Muslim in an ordinary and incomplete way like other Muslim countries, with all man's imperfections and vices still at work ; *even then* the negro problem would be solved.

*That is the difference between Islam and Christianity.*

\* \* \* \*

A little time ago we could read in the papers that a young Egyptian lad, whose age was given variously as from 15 to 18, was found wandering at Kingston by the police. He knew no English whatever, but an interpreter was found, through whom he narrated his tale. He said that he had come to this country with an English doctor as his servant ; that his master had paid him no wages and had ill-treated him so that he had run away. This statement of the boy may or may not have been true ; if it were, it was but in keeping with the bad record of the Christian in his dealings with his domestic servants whether of his own or another race. However, that is not the point which I wish to bring out here. The papers went on to tell us that an English lady who had been in Egypt, hearing of the case, wrote and offered to take the boy to her home as her servant and pay him reasonable wages, and that he accepted. So far, so good. But we are further told (*Westminster Gazette*) that the gentleman who acted as interpreter announced to the Court that he had told the boy that if he did not accept he would be put in prison for a year. This effort, we are told, “caused much amusement in court.”

Now I must assert that I see nothing amusing in this. Rather I feel a great indignation at the abuse of the dignity of a Muslim, and at such want of kindness to a boy utterly alone in the strangest of strange lands, knowing no word of

<sup>1</sup> Astaghfir Ullah.

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

the language and possibly a victim of ill-treatment. People should understand that a little forlorn Arab has as much right to the truth as anyone on this earth.

\* \* \* \*

I often think it is a pity that our Orientals resident in England should nowadays almost invariably assume European dress in every detail, even to the headgear, though but a few years back turbans and fezes were quite a frequent sight in the London streets.

One important consequence that would follow from the appearance in our streets of men garbed in other fashions than our own uninspiring garb, would be that it would be brought home to our own people that there do exist not only peoples but civilizations other than our own Western twentieth-century brand. As it is, our people scarcely realize this, and as the men of culture they meet of other races almost invariably choose to adopt the passing exterior ways of Europe, there is a tendency for people to conclude that such civilization as they possess they owe to the fact that they have adopted our civilization, and are civilized only in so far as they have adopted it. Thus I heard a young man recently say of the Japanese in England, "How eager they are to notice everything done at any social function! *One can see they are new to civilization!*" This of a nation of whom Lacfadio Hearn said with superb exaggeration, "The Japanese are the only civilized nation since antiquity." This young man did not, mind you, say new to *our* civilization, that would have been true enough, but simply new to civilization. And he was not a man lacking in education and knowledge, but a B.A. of one of our chief universities.

It would be good for the enormous pride of the European if he were to see daily men as cultured and capable as himself who yet followed other ways than his own in personal matters instead of striving to imitate him in every detail as at present.

---

## A FALLACY

BY MAULVI MUSTAFAKHAN, B.A.

THE Christian writers of modern times often commit a very common fallacy when comparing the Christianity of the present day to Islam. They ascribe the material advancement of the Christian countries to the dogmas of Christianity and the political stagnation of Islam to the Holy Qur-ān and its teachings. Any thinking man will at once perceive the fallacy which lies at the very root of this sort of reasoning. The past history of Christendom can

## A FALLACY

eloquently answer this objection. During the mediæval ages the whole of Europe was in lethargy and ignorance, in spite of her being Christian. If Christianity has played ANY part whatsoever in the modern civilization of Europe, why did it not achieve anything in the dark ages, when the people were perhaps more spirited Christians, and the churches were thronged with worshippers. It is a curious fact that the progress in civilization and the decay in the Church have invariably been simultaneous. To-day the Church is getting hoarse by crying that people have lost faith, they have given up Christianity, they do not attend churches, and so forth ; and yet the world is progressing on with leaps and bounds ; while in the dark ages of Europe, when the Church enjoyed the highest powers, not only spiritual but temporal as well, all the Christian countries were in a state of horrible degradation.

But the case of Islam is quite different. From the very beginning it has been the great champion of learning and science, and its past history bears testimony to the indisputable fact that the Muslim kings have rendered great service to promote culture and learning. It is admitted, even by European historians, that Europe's present civilization is due, to a great extent, to Islamic influence. During the Abbasi Caliphate hundreds of books were translated from Greek and Latin ; and the Muslim rulers of this dynasty were well known for their love of science and knowledge. Some of the names of the different branches of science and arts that flourished during the Muslim rule have still the impress of the Arabic origin. Algebra, for instance, retains up to now the Arabic name, and proves that this branch of mathematics owes its origin to Islam.

Despite these indisputable facts, a writer in the *New Statesman* has got the wonderful audacity to say that "Muhammadan people are the best equipped among the enemies of what we should call European civilization, and the most inclined among the backward nations to fight with fierceness against progress." But as this assertion was giving a direct lie to history the writer has been constrained to admit in the same breath that :—

(i) Islam took over the progress rôle. It recovered and published some of the Greek works on science *which Christian fanaticism had relegated to oblivion.* (Italics are mine.)

(ii) It stimulated new expression in architecture, in fabric of the loom, in ceramics, literature, music, sport, games, and horticulture ; it encouraged exploration of the new barbarous or isolated countries from Madagascar to New Guinea, China, and Tartary. *Its influence on Europe at the time of the Crusades led almost as a consequence to the European renaissance in the arts, in science, and in industries.* (Italics are mine.)

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

It is strange indeed that in the face of these clear admissions and historical facts the writer arrives at the queer conclusion that Muslims are the greatest enemies of civilization. If history can serve the purpose of education, if we can learn the future from the past (and assuredly it is one of the chief functions of history to give us an insight into the future), then we cannot but infer from the past annals that Muslims can never be a stumbling-block in the path of the world's progress.

The writer has made another curious statement in regard to the Muslim rule in India, and has depicted it as a period of seven hundred years of "appalling misery, much depopulation, massacre, plundering, persecution, and unrest." I think the writer ought to have revised his manuscript before its publication. He has committed a historical blunder of immense magnitude in remarking that for seven hundred years India has been subject to a tyrannical government. He should have known the simple fact that the reigns of Akbar the Great and his immediate successors have been looked upon as periods of great prosperity and good government, even by the most hostile critics of Islam. Akbar, the first great Mughal emperor, was so popular among the Indians that the proud Rajput rulers of Rajputana, who were claiming their descent from the sun and moon, readily agreed to give daughters in marriage to the emperor; and these matrimonial relations with the ruling princes of India consolidated the Mughal Empire.

The chief grievance of the writer against Islam, however, is the "secession with the past which it produces." This "grievance," I think, should be more prominent in regard to Christianity of the present day, which has put up very curious dogmas quite inconsistent with the past history of the human race. It has attributed such qualities to Jesus Christ which cannot be borne out by any ecclesiastical history of the past. St. Paul gave quite a new turn to the teachings of Jesus Christ, who was originally a sincere teacher to Jews, and his religion a branch of Judaism. But who does not know that the Christianity of modern times has produced a split with Judaism and gave the gospel of Jesus a new phase of which he himself never dreamt in his lifetime?

## CORRESPONDENCE

## CORRESPONDENCE

*To the Editor of "THE ISLAMIC REVIEW."*

SIR,—In view of the profound veneration we have for all the members of our Prophet's family, both my friend and co-worker, Sliman, and myself were pained at the reproach made by the *Islamic Review* concerning the statement of inebriety of the father of great and noble Lady Khadidja in our *Life of Mohamed*. It is to the original Arabian authors, who related that incident, which we have simply translated, that the reproach should be made, and, amongst others, particularly to one of two most ancient and most trustworthy historians of the *Sira*, the celebrated Ibn Sa'ad.

Here are the very words written by him in his *Thabaquat* :

1. According to the testimony of Khaled ben Khedach ben Adjelan and Matmer ben Sliman :

"Now, the father of Khadidja was so filled with wine as to fall under its empire ; thereupon he called Mohamed and married him (to his daughter), who covered the old man with a cloak and, when he came to himself, he said : ' What be this cloak ? ' He replied : ' Thou hast been covered by thy son-in-law, Mohamed.' Whereupon he grew angry."

2. From the testimony of Mohamed ben Amar :

"Then Khadidja poured out wine to her father until he fell into inebriety."

It is true that, further on, Ibn Sa'ad quotes other testimonies pretending that Khoniled, father of Khadidja, had already died before the war of Fadjer, and that Khadidja had been given in marriage by her uncle, Amron.

It would probably have been preferable to have adopted this last version, and, if it had been a matter of pure sentiment, we would certainly have adopted this course, but seeing that our work was destined to a large extent for the European public, we feared to run the risk of being reproached with impartiality by eliminating all the details subject to criticism, and thus cause people of good faith to suspect its veracity.

It may be further added that there are still other incidents which, after much hesitation, we allowed to remain, feeling ourselves covered by the authority of ancient authors, excellent Musulmans who had reported them.

We say, in fact, in our book : "The rare honour of the historians of Mohamed is manifested by the great respect they show for his memory, that they refused to discuss his conduct.

"The historians of the other Prophets constitute themselves in reality critics of their acts when they cut out from

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

their lives all that they esteem susceptible of belittling them in the eyes of posterity.

"In the recital of the incidence that served as pretext to the pamphlets of the enemies of Islam, we discover the most indisputable proof of the sincerity of the historians of the Arabian Prophet."

We have sought to give a brief outline of the method we have followed in the composition of our work, and we hope that our co-religionists of the *Islamic Review* will measure us out due justice.

E. DINET.

ISLAMIC REVIEW.—We are glad to note that M. Dinet has admitted the validity of our remarks in the light of a more reliable report by Ibn Sa'ad, who says on the testimony of Mohammad bin Umar that Khadyja's father died before her marriage with the Holy Prophet. But it would have been better if the same correct report had been mentioned along with the other one, the insertion of which was deemed [necessary by the authors to establish their impartiality. We hope this little omission will be rectified in the next edition of the volume, which, in other respects, is very commendable.—[Ed.]

---

## REVIEW

*The Literary Year Book for 1921.* London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 68-74, Carter Lane, E.C. 4.

MR. MARK MEREDITH, M.E.A., M.I.S.A., has brought out a new edition of the *Literary Year Book* for 1921 with many improvements and useful additions. The aim and object of the editor has been throughout to render service to the embryo as well as to distinguished writers. The book is indeed indispensable for those who are interested in journalism, and wish to make it their living. The information embodied in this volume is vast and useful, and both the authors of established reputation and the correspondents of the newspapers can make use of it with much benefit.