

THE ISLAMIC REVIEW

VOL. X]

APRIL 1922

[No. 4

CONTENTS.

Mr. William Burchell Bashir Pickard, B.A. (Cantab.)	<i>Frontispiece</i>
Notes	146
The Invisible hath Written. By BASHIR	149
Democracy in Islam. By FAIZ MOHD. KHAN	150
Holy Anecdotes. By BABAR	152
Christianity in Her Own Land	155
Notes from Friday Sermons	158
The Dean of Carlisle and the Divinity of Christ.. .. .	163
Table Talk—The Problem for a Freethought Socialist	170
The Sufi's Diary	171
The Secret of Existence. By KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN	176
What They Think of Us!	183
Correspondence	190
Reviews	191

THE HOLY QUR-ÂN

With English Translation and Commentary, printed on high-class India paper, and bound in green flexible leather, price £2 10s. ; Pluvinsin, £2; cloth bound, 30s. Postage and packing for both qualities: United Kingdom, 2s.; abroad, 4s. Prospectus and sample pages sent free on application. Apply to "Islamic Review," The Mosque, Woking, England, and in India to Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Ahmadiyya Buildings, Lahore, or to "Isha'at-i-Islam" Office, Azeez Manzil, Lahore.

Friday Prayer and Sermon.—At the London Muslim Prayer House
—111, Campden Hill Road, Notting Hill Gate, London—every Friday,
at 1 p.m.

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

Mr. V.

Mr. V.
French descent.
born in London.
at the City of London.
Carpenter scholar, and captain.
Association football elevens), and at Queens' College,
Cambridge.

He took an Honours Degree in Classics (Classical Tripos, 1911), and, after leaving college, had some experience as a schoolmaster at Wallingford Grammar School.

He entered the Colonial Civil Service under the Uganda Protectorate Administration in 1912), and later served with the Uganda Protectorate Field Force as Assistant Intelligence Officer, when his health broke down and he returned to England on leave.

On his recovery, he resigned his appointment and enlisted in the Middlesex Yeomanry on the outbreak of the war. He saw active service in France with the Middlesex Regiment and the 53rd Trench Mortar Battery. He was wounded in action near Arras, and became a prisoner of war in May, 1917. On the conclusion of peace he was repatriated and entered the Government service, obtaining an appointment as Assistant Administrative Officer in the Profiting Act Department under the Board of Trade, but has since resigned, and is now studying at the University College, London. He declared his faith in Islam in January, 1922.

Divinity of Christ.

The pronouncement of the Dean of Carlisle on the subject has aroused a lively discussion in the Church here. It shows how shaky is the foundation of a religion which receives its shape from the human mind. The various utterances made by men of

NOTES

responsibility and culture in the Church here on the subject, which we produce elsewhere, may be read with some advantage by our readers.

Divine Sonship of Jesus.

Canon Alexander, quoted elsewhere,¹ in his efforts to prove the Divinity of Christ, would carry us to the days of the Pauline Epistles, as he finds in them the claim of Jesus to Divine sonship accepted. But he forgets to note the polytheistic tendencies of that time, when the claims of others to Divinity had as well commanded acceptance from credulity and ignorance elsewhere. Egypt, Greece, Persia and India were not lacking in their belief in the Divinity of their respective heroes. Canon Alexander cannot, with all his culture, afford to worship the past in every respect and make his position, therefore, tenable in the light of logic and reason, solely on this ground. Besides, he must be aware that the designation of "Son of God" given to Jesus was not his exclusive acquisition. Every godly person was so called by the Israelites. Even the God of the house of Jacob used the same language. "Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even my firstborn" (Exodus iv. 22). "Also I will make him (David) my firstborn" (Ps. lxxxix. 27). "He shall build an house for my name; and he (Solomon) shall be my son" (Chronicles xxii. 10). "I have said, Ye are gods; and all of you are children of the most High" (Ps. lxxxii. 6). Here the judges are not only called children of God but gods as well. Even the "wicked" (Isaiah xxx. 1) have been named children of God of course "rebellious." With literature rife with such phraseology, and where God has frequently been styled as Heavenly Father, the term Son of God cannot involve the meaning of a special kind of Divinity for Jesus, if he has been so spoken of in the said Epistles or elsewhere. The term really

¹ See page 155.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

means and implies nearness to God. The expression, "Our Father in Heaven," "My Father" and "Your Father," "My God" and "Your God," clearly imply the Fatherhood of God and Brotherhood of Humanity, even on the authority of Jesus himself.

Why Call it a Religion from God?

Christian doctrines are again in the melting-pot to suit modern minds. No other religion has met so many changes in its basic principles, from Paul up to the present time. If a desire and an attempt at modernization, *ipso facto*, condemns the previous views to be faulty, it shows that Christendom has always been in the path of error. It proves that the religion in the West is a man-made institution, which like the enactments of legislative assemblies needs amendments and repeal with every new cycle of thought. Then why call it a religion from God?

"You will not find Change in the Laws of God."

So says the Holy Qur-án. The whole of nature bears testimony to the immutability of the law pertaining to things created by God. Anything from God is unchangeable. Why not the same in the case of religion if it is from God? In this respect Christianity has been a helpless victim to incessant change. Every gust of new thought must change it into a newer form if the human mind plays a great part in its construction, as Canon Alexander has recently admitted when dealing with the question of modernizing Christianity. Islam is unique in this respect, as all other religions have more or less undergone changes. For 1,300 years it has remained immune from change. In fact it is above change, and this in itself speaks volumes to prove its Divine origin.

Spiders' Houses.

The house of a spider is the frailest of houses. Every gust of wind causes its breakage, but the spider

THE INVISIBLE HATH WRITTEN

is ever busy to reconstruct it. It is always undergoing alterations. But it suits the new conditions for the time being. Another passing gust and a new move. The reason is obvious; the use of material things by most creatures in constructing their houses and the utilization of God-made things, hence their stability in proportion. But the spider brings all the material he uses for his house out of himself. Just as frail is the fabric of the religion which receives its inspiration from the mind of man. Religion from God is the house hewn in the rock of adamantine truth, and is opposed to change or destruction. We read in the Qur-án, "The parable of those who take guardians besides Allah is as the parable of the spider that makes for itself a house; and most surely the frailest of the houses is the spider's house; did they but know" (Sura xxix. 41). "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church," cannot apply to the Christian Church, by reason of its instability of thought and constant change. It could not have been applied to a man-made Church, and must have referred to a faith without change and one having permanence. This religion is Islam, which is the religion from God, and is without change.

THE INVISIBLE HATH WRITTEN

ALLAH, ALONE hath set the stars
With trembling brightness in the void.

The mighty mountains, cold, serene and chaste,
Snow-shoulder'd, wear their majesty from HIM.

HE—ALLAH—ONE—ALONE,
Curtain'd the dim-lit forest depth,
And domed the spacious heaven o'er the wide, grey
steppe.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

The circumambient, all-encasing air
Is ALLAH'S only, zephyr and hurricane are His.

The rippling river and the laughing fountain,
The surge tremendous of the eddying ocean,
Alike are ALLAH'S—beauty and might are His.

The painted peacock proudly dight,
Emblazon'd o'er with eyes of light ;
The lofty eagle, emperor
Of airy thrones impregnable ;
And that sweet warbler from the wood at eve,
That melts with harmony the listening air,
Each unto ALLAH several glory gives.

The works of man ; his ardent beauty ;
The deathless tracteries of golden language,
Fashion'd in fadeless glory by a master mind ;
These do but dimly shadow forth
The sacred writings, surely writ
In cadences celestial
By the INVISIBLE, OMNIPOTENT,
ETERNAL and OMNISCIENT,
The BOUNTIFUL, the MERCIFUL,
Ever for ever through the Universe.

BASHIR.

DEMOCRACY IN ISLAM (IN THE DAYS OF 'USMAN)

“THE word of the people is final, and I must submit to it,” said Talha to 'Usman, one of his rivals for the office of Khilafat.

Talha was a proud asset to Arabia, and naturally his individuality functioned to claim no small influence on the executive, legislative and social side of the Khilafat. The people looked at him with a reverential eye, and his glorious past had certainly crystallized him as one of the few living specimens

DEMOCRACY IN ISLAM

of the unshaken pillars of Islam. Undoubtedly, he stood in the field of rivalry as far as the political aspect of his relation with 'Usman was concerned, but he disdained to create dissension among people to further his cause by mobilizing the store of his influence against 'Usman.

Umar (may his memory be sanctified), the preceding Khalifa, on his death had evinced his intention that the Khalifa should be chosen from among the six prominent and ablest men in his judgment, of whom the two were 'Usman and Talha. The people assembled together in the Mosque of the Prophet to decide which one to select as the fittest man to rule over their destinies. The choice of the people fell on 'Usman, and the Muslim commonwealth was loud in its praise of 'Usman, the *Ghani*, the rich.

Talha was detained by an urgent piece of business, and he arrived at Medina only to find that 'Usman had been elected and the people had taken the oath of allegiance. Talha, however, took the oath of allegiance as well; which he could have refused and brought the unanimity of the election to question. Formidable as he was to work out his schemes if he cared to give way to his passions, he directly went to the successful candidate and said: "The people, I hear, have taken the oath of allegiance to you." 'Usman was quick enough to see the underlying current of thoughts which possibly might be raging in the breast of Talha. "If you refuse to take the oath," he declared, "I am willing to vacate the office." "No," came the instantaneous reply from the noble Talha, "the word of the people is final; you deserve their confidence, and I must submit to it."

This sane conduct of Talha was not without parallel in Islamic history, which in alliance with legend has brought down to us quite a number of interesting events during the early period of the Khilafat. The welfare of the people, over whom

ISLAMIC REVIEW

the early Muslims were called upon to rule both temporally and spiritually, was to them a stern reality which was to be faced through its manifold vicissitudes.

A governor of Kufa was alleged of drink by the floating rumour. One morning he happened to lead the early prayers. At the end of the two *rak'ats*, he showed the signs of the previous night's indulgence. People approached the Khalifa with this complaint, to which he could not give satisfactory explanation. 'Usman had him punished publicly for the crime, and dismissed him from the office. This is somewhat a radiant contrast to the modern sight where tyrants, in the disguised garb of administrators, butcher the people in cold blood, with some pretence in the form of a "menace to the State." In Islam the man who does wrong meets an equivalent punishment, regardless of his position or status.

FAIZ MOHD. KHAN.

HOLY ANECDOTES

"Paradise lies at the feet of mothers."—SAYINGS OF MUHAMMAD.

"My mother! My mother!" exclaims the great Prophet of Arabia, as his eyes fall on the dear face of a Bedouin woman. His bosom is heaving with deep emotions, his heart is aglow with filial affection, and in a transport of joy he warmly embraces the new-comer. He is the chosen of Allah and the beloved master of devoted followers; notwithstanding the grandeur of his spiritual as well as temporal position, he is all reverence, love and devotion towards this lady. He spreads out his own mantle for her to sit upon—a mark of exceptional veneration. What a touching sight—the meeting of an affectionate son with his dear mother, as he calls her, after long years of separation!

But is it the Prophet's own mother? No, it could

HOLY ANECDOTES

not be she. The Prophet's lot denied him the tender cares of his father as well as the fond caresses of his mother. His father's shelter was withdrawn even before his birth, and in his mother's loving lap too he was not destined long to repose. While yet a child of six, she was snatched away by the hands of death.

It was the custom among the higher classes of Arabs to send out their children to nurse among some neighbouring tribes. This gave them a good grounding in the Arabic language, which existed in its purest form among these Bedouin tribes. This also helped in cultivating in them, at this tender and pliant age, the characteristics of pure Arab blood. The nobility of Arabia long conserved this custom, till down to the régime of the Banu-Umayya dynasty when the capital was shifted to Damascus. In their pomp and glory, these kings vied with the mighty emperors like the Kaiser and the Chorusus; still their children were brought up in the Bedouin huts in the wilds of Arabia. Only one of these, Walid-bin-Abdul-Malik, could not be sent thither for certain reasons, and was brought up in the royal palace. Consequently he was the only person among the Bani-Umayya that lacked in eloquence of language.

In accordance with this custom, Bedouin women would visit the town twice a year, offering themselves as nurses. Just a few days after the Prophet's birth, some women of the tribe of Bani-Hawazin arrived at Mecca. They were soon provided with children, with the exception of one, named Halima. Amina, the Prophet's mother, wished to engage her for her child, but she was loath to accept an orphan child; for it was to the father chiefly that the nurses looked for remuneration. At last, however, she was prevailed upon, and she took the child with her. Halima's young daughter, Shima, was very fond of the child, and would lovingly look after him. After

ISLAMIC REVIEW

two years she brought the child back to the mother, but Mecca being stricken with some epidemic at the time, she was asked to take him back. So the child was taken back and tended by Halima till he was six.

Scores of years have gone by and it is she, Halima, the Prophet's foster-mother, that has come to visit her foster-child. At her sight, tender emotions swell the Prophet's breast and he treats her with reverence, hardly approached even where the tie is of blood-sonship.

The battle of Hunain is over. The enemy have been routed. A large number of prisoners have fallen into the hands of the Muslims. And lo! among the captives is a woman who claims to be the Prophet's foster-sister. She is brought before him, and when enquired how she could prove her identity, she touches the tenderest chord in the Prophet's heart when she replies, "Thou gavest me this bite upon my back, once upon a time, when I carried thee on my hip." Recognizing the mark, the Prophet spreads out his own mantle and seats her thereon with all respect. Then he offers her the choice of staying with him at Medina, but she prefers to return to her own people. So handsome presents are made to her and she departs in all honour.

This encourages the Bani-Hawazin, Halima's tribe, who forthwith send a deputation to wait upon the Prophet, concerning their kinsmen taken prisoners. Their spokesman thus addresses him: "Here among the captives in these huts are thy foster-aunts and foster-sisters. We have known thee a suckling, a weaned child, a youth generous and noble, and now that thou hast risen to this dignity. Be gracious, therefore, unto us, even as the Lord hath been gracious unto thee!" Surely, the Prophet cannot refuse anything to the kinsmen of his foster-mother. "Whatever prisoners fall to the share of my family,

CHRISTIANITY IN HER OWN LAND

I give them up to you. As to the rest, I will speak to the congregation concerning them, at afternoon prayers. Come at that time to make a public request." Accordingly this is done. The Muslims, both the Helpers and the Refugees, who consider it a privilege to sacrifice anything for the Prophet, cannot reject his intercession on behalf of his foster-mother's tribe. All the prisoners, numbering six thousand, are instantaneously released, out of regard for the memory of his foster-mother. Such was the tender heart that gave vent to the noble sentiment : "Paradise lies at the feet of mothers."

BABAR.

CHRISTIANITY IN HER OWN LAND

DO WE WANT A NEW CREED?

CANON ALEXANDER continued at St. Paul's Cathedral yesterday afternoon his course of sermons on "The Modern Outlook in Religion," and took as his subject "The Church of To-day." He said it was being urged that the Church ought to draw up a revised formula of belief, which, in its scope and phraseology and style, might be congenial to the thoughts and aspirations of the present time. If the Church were a living organization, directed to put the new wine of life into new bottles, we could not rule out the possibility of a new creed, and it was certainly of the first importance that a Church's formularies should not be allowed to fall so far out of correspondence with general contemporary standards of knowledge and belief as to acquire an air of unreality ; but, remembering that living creeds were born only of the vitality of spiritual insight and enthusiasm, we might still ask whether we were quite the men best fitted to produce such things, and whether a time of acute controversy and intellectual restlessness was the best time for attempting such tasks.

Perhaps we should even feel the need of greater caution on this road, because the acceptance and interpretation of creeds were, to some extent, and at any rate in the Church of England, a matter rather of individual conscience than of Church authority. The Church allowed even to its ministers a certain latitude—as was shown, for example, by the change made in the form of subscription in 1865—and expected them to use and apply and interpret the creeds in a living and progressive way.—*The Daily Telegraph*, February 18th.

In the last of his above-mentioned series, Canon Alexander

ISLAMIC REVIEW

said that the last century had thrown up in high and wonderful relief, through such works as *Ecce Homo*, the perfect humanity of the Founder of the Christian Church. To the constructive thought of to-day it was becoming apparent that some conception of Deity was required to make Him an intelligible figure at all. There were many forms and degrees of what it was now the fashion to call Modernism, but none of them had succeeded in dispelling the mystery of the Gospel. Two facts which emerged from the very structure of the original story—the recognized power to forgive sins and the failure to exhibit any sense of personal shortcoming—could not be brought within the limits of a normal human life. Nor could we escape, even in the most primitive records, phrases which, belonging to the earliest tradition and in no way coloured by the after-thoughts of theology, revealed in Jesus the consciousness of a unique Sonship.

But the earliest of Christian documents were the letters of St. Paul. We found him habitually using in his correspondence thoughts and language about the Son of God which he could not have invented, and which were simply and naturally accepted by those to whom he wrote. The teaching of the Apostle, and, indeed, the very existence of a Christian society, proved an early acceptance of the Divine claims of Christ as interwoven with the innermost fibre of primitive belief; and those who urged that these claims went no farther, and had no greater validity, than those of any supreme prophet or teacher had failed hitherto to give us any adequate explanation either of the origins of the Christian faith or of its practical efficacy in satisfying the tests of experience.—*The Times*, February 27th.

CHURCH DOCTRINE.

SUGGESTION FOR UNITY.

PRIMATE AND A COMMISSION.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has sent a reply to a memorial signed by representative members of the Church of England, including nine Diocesan Bishops, and sent to him on December 1, 1921. The memorial suggests the appointment of a commission, to be composed of representatives of all tendencies of the Church of England, to endeavour to find a basis of doctrinal agreement which would unite all parties in the Church and be accepted as its doctrinal standpoint. The signatories point out that the controversies on doctrine tend to weaken the Church and to render ineffective endeavours towards Christian unity, and state that while the basis finally found might cause a few secessions, the present state of controversy renders possible a graver disruption.

In his reply the Archbishop of Canterbury expresses his full sympathy with the spirit which had induced the memorialists to write their letter. He says, however, that he cannot accept

CHRISTIANITY IN HER OWN LAND

the plan advocated as it stands, doubting the possibility of assembling a commission which would have the necessary authority. While admitting the gravity of the present position, he asks, in the interest of the unity of the Church, for a further elucidation of the proposal. In it he sees serious dangers, but he believes it could be so developed as to prove of great assistance and utility.—*The Daily Telegraph*, February 21st.

BIBLICAL FORGERIES.

Dean Inge, writing in the *Evening Standard* on "Hoaxes on the Public," says:—

The most successful literary frauds have unfortunately been connected with ecclesiastical history. After the first pioneers of Christianity had passed away, there came a time when a writer could hardly hope to gain the ear of the public except by passing off his book as the work of an apostle. A whole crop of forgeries appeared—or should we follow the delicacy of scholars, who call them not forgeries, but "pseudepigraphic writings"? We shall never know for certain how many of these pseudoapostolic treatises have found their way into the New Testament Canon. The Church was honest, but uncritical. It rejected many documents, like the "Acts of Paul and Thekla," a rather pleasing romance which was brought home to its author, who pleaded that he wrote it "to do honour to Paul." The Second Epistle of Peter has been given up by all except a few conservative Die-hards; and some other books of the New Testament are of doubtful authenticity.

A HERESY HUNT.

Heresy Hunting has just received a check! Truth itself is coming into its own, through the courage of its exponents, and the fact that public intelligence has outgrown its primitive capacity for being gulled and hoodwinked about things "sacred." The Rev. Dr. Henry Dewsbury Alves Major, Principal of Ripon Hall (a Theological College), Oxford, declared some months ago in the *Church Times* that the Resurrection was a *spiritual and not a physical happening*. A common informer reported his heretical offence to the Bishop of Oxford, and an inquisitorial prosecution was demanded. The Bishop has, however, acquitted the offender! He can now say, "I do *not* believe in the Resurrection of the Body," as he pleases. Ordinary Church people, however, must still go on asserting their belief in the words of the Creed. For the letter is still tremendously important, the spirit does not so much matter—as in old days.—*Psychic Gazette*, February, 1912.

THE NATIVITY OF CHRIST.

The story of the Virgin Birth of Jesus is fiction, pure and simple, cribbed without acknowledgment from heathen myth-

ISLAMIC REVIEW

ologies and unwarrantably embodied in the Christian Scriptures and Church Creed. Professor A. S. Pringle-Pattison, one of the greatest minds of to-day, in addressing the Edinburgh Theological Society (consisting of divinity students) on October 21, 1920, said :

“The crucial cases of miracles for the Christian Church, you will probably think, are the Virgin Birth and the Physical Resurrection of Jesus—partly because the belief in them is asserted in the words of her most ancient Creed. And yet how gratuitous and irrelevant is the first of these beliefs ! It is supposed in some way to guarantee the divine origin of the Christ. But how is that impaired if his birth is supposed to take place in the ordinary way of physical generation ? *By the irony of circumstances it happens that the words were inserted in the Creed not to support the divinity of Christ, but as an assertion of his REAL MANHOOD, ‘born of a woman,’ as against the Docetic heresy that the earthly Jesus was a mere phantom or appearance.* The birth-story does not belong to the oldest stratum of tradition.”

We gladly add further the straightforward utterance of that brave, enlightened, and truly spiritual pastor of his people, the Rev. G. Vale Owen, some of whose famous automatic scripts were published in the *Gazette* long before they were heard of by the general public. Writing in the *Weekly Dispatch* of December 18, 1921, the Vicar said : “Then there is that much discussed question of the Divinity of Christ. Here also Orthodoxy has cut and dried the subject, and parcelled it out in dogmas to be received or rejected at our peril. *Was He divine or not divine ?* In the later gleams of light which have percolated through the Veil the question seems to me somewhat meaningless. *I do not see how He could be anything else. You and I, my readers, are divine, or we are nothing. Inasmuch as we are the offspring of God we must be divine. And if the Divinity of Christ is of another kind than our own then He is different from us, and we can never be ‘one with Him,’ as He told us we ought to be. . . .* I find that my spirit-friends are not nearly so enamoured of Orthodoxy as our earthly theologians are.”—*Psychic Gazette*, January, 1922.

NOTES FROM FRIDAY SERMONS

CAN THEY BUILD A NEW CREED ?

THIS question often arises in a Muslim's mind as he looks, with some doubt, at the many modernizing tendencies at work in Christendom to-day ; and yet the Churchman would seem to experience no difficulty in giving a cordial welcome to a new revision or recasting of his beliefs with undisturbed equanimity.

NOTES FROM FRIDAY SERMONS

Perhaps he is used to it. Modernization, or keeping abreast of the times, has been the exclusive boast of the Western Church from the beginning. If Paul could so modernize it to suit it to the Pagan requirements of his time, and yet be accepted as the sole authority in the Church, it will not perhaps greatly perturb the present-day religious instinct if some new interpretation is devised with the object of bringing the Christian faith more or less into line with the demands of Rationalism.

But if religion is a divine institution, receiving its inspiration directly from God, are not all these attempts of the modern Church mind not only futile in themselves, but also an insult to the Divine Dispensation? Nay, by these very attempts these Christians give the lie to their faith. If they believe that God has been speaking to man from time to time to express His will to man for his guidance, and that He has always been pleased to choose one man to be His mouthpiece, they can scarcely disbelieve in this Divine Economy; otherwise the whole fabric of Christianity falls to the ground. But how can they frame religion for themselves? God is unchangeable in His ways, His laws are immutable. Study any ancient religion in the world (including that revealed to the Israelites) and you will observe the same Divine Economy. The message from God comes always through one man at a time; and that when the old message became corrupt through human handling; Jesus came for the same ministry. The present intellectual unrest concerning current creeds is not a new development of its kind. Every third or fourth century since the birth of the Church, religion has seen its recurrence, and it was a natural recurrence enough. Man-made things cannot satisfy the human mind if it is to be a progressive mind. Do not all these attempts at the modernization of the Christian faith prove its creed to be only a human fabrication? If from God, it should have remained

ISLAMIC REVIEW.

the same in all the evolutionary stages of man's mind and at the same time capable of satisfying each new demand as it arose. Does not the whole of Nature itself bear testimony to this truth? Everything in the universe is as old as the world itself, and yet ever new and fresh, with ever the same capacity for satisfying the human mind, though it is always in process of a development that never ceases. Every new need can be and is satisfied by what is discovered in the original authority. For this reason the Qur-án gives the attribute of *Rahman* to Allah—the Beneficent Lord who created things to satisfy human needs long before those needs came into existence. The Providence of the all-knowing God must precede the appearance of need. Similarly religion, if from God, should be comprehensive enough to be grasped by the progressive mind. Christianity certainly could not stand this test; and from a Muslim point of view a religion is hardly worth the name if it is not proof against the vicissitudes of time. We claim that the religion revealed in the Qur-án possesses this adamant, unshakable character, leaving aside all question of its merits or demerits. No desire for change in its doctrinal beliefs has ever been felt by its adherents, no matter how developed their culture or how advanced their thought. Islam can boast of achievements in culture and science far greater than those of Christianity. It has always encouraged liberal education, yet the most cultured people within its pale have been the foremost in the support of its teaching. It was with much astonishment that one of the English dailies in India was forced to admit that while Western liberal education caused bankruptcy of religious belief and encouraged scepticism and materialism, it only served to strengthen the belief of the Muslim in Islam.

There is yet another aspect of the case worth consideration by modern thought and Church theology.

NOTES FROM FRIDAY SERMONS

The present intellectual struggle proves at least this, that the religion taught by Jesus has not reached us in its entirety, that the Divine Dispensation has failed. That the teaching of the Master saw corruption in the very beginning is an admitted fact. Every subsequent effort to restore it to its pristine purity, though seemingly successful for the time, has, nevertheless, always failed to receive support from the coming generation.

You cannot rebuild a ruined house with the materials of decay. You cannot, from the crumbling bricks and rotting timber that may remain to you, reconstruct that house in any form approximating to its original. You can, at best, produce a pathetically ineffectual imitation, or a grotesque parody, good neither to look at nor to live in.

And if it be so with man's efforts to restore the work of his own hands when it has become ruinous, how shall it be with those things that are the work of God's hand?

The fruits of the earth that ripen, summer by summer and fall into decay and are gone, leaving only rottenness behind them—can man, from that rottenness, bring back the fruit again in its beauty and its sweetness? The elements, the constituent atoms that go to the making of the fruit, are from God—everlasting, undiminishing, indestructible. They exist—have existed from the birth of Time—in all-surrounding space, a vast, confused, heterogeneous mass, the secret of whose compounding is known to God alone. And as the earthly fruit decays with the decaying year into rottenness and nothing, the constituent atoms that composed it pass back into the mass from which they came, to be absorbed into it again, thence to be again sent forth by God at the appointed time to be blended anew in the buds of spring and the ripe fruits of summer. It is God's work to renew and restore them when need arises. It is not for man to interfere.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

And if it be so with the works of God, will it be otherwise with the Word of God, the Message that He has been sending through all the ages by the mouth of His chosen Prophets ?

The Last Word of God, while explaining the necessity of the Revelation of the Holy Qur-án, because the previous revelations had become tempered with human handling, thus refers to this very natural phenomenon to elucidate the truth I am speaking of :—

By Allah, most certainly We sent (apostles) to nations before *you*, but the devil made their deeds fair-seeming to them, so he is their guardian to-day, and they shall have a painful chastisement.

And We have not revealed to *you* the Book except that *you may* make clear to them that about which they differ, and (as) a guidance and a mercy for a people who believe.

And of the fruits of the palms and the grapes—you obtain from *them* intoxication and goodly provision ; most surely there is a sign in this for a people who ponder. —The Holy Qur-án, xvi. 63, 64 and 67.

If the house be decayed, man cannot, out of that decay, build it anew.

If the fruit be decayed and rotten, man cannot out of that rottenness bring forth fresh.

If the Word of God become decayed and corrupted by the taint of human error, loss, denial, interpolation, suppression, misconstruction, its vitality sapped, its usefulness destroyed, man cannot out of that corruption, out of the wreck of the remnant of the revealed Word, build for himself that Word anew.

As with the material decay of flowers and fruit, so with the spiritual decay of religion and faith. It is God's work, and His alone, to restore and renew.

So it is with the teaching of Jesus. Shall we look to human effort to aid us in discovering it, in restoring, in building it up again, when the result of such effort is sure to be baffled by a new development of thought within a century ; or should we look to God to renew the revelation of His will as

THE DEAN OF CARLISLE

man everywhere was wont to do before the advent of Jesus? If the latter is the safest course, then the need for it appeared only a few centuries after Jesus; and if the Qur-án and the Prophet Muhammad came to meet that need in the sixth century of the Christian era, when the corruption of the religion of God reached its climax in the four corners of the world (even in Christendom itself), does not our belief in the Divine origin of Islam and in its claim to receive universal adherence become justified?

THE DEAN OF CARLISLE AND THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST

WE publish this month a brief correspondence which has passed between the Editor and Dr. Hastings Rashdall, Dean of Carlisle, with respect to the latter's now famous pronouncement concerning the Divinity of Christ. It will be remembered that Dr. Rashdall expressly repudiated the denial, attributed to him, of that Divinity, and that a well-known daily newspaper saw fit to apologize for having represented him as taking that view. We should regret most sincerely if we have, in all innocence, misrepresented Dr. Rashdall in any way; but, inasmuch as his precise attitude on this all-important point seemed a little difficult to define—and for that reason likely to be a cause of confusion—the Editor thought it best to approach the Dean directly, with a view to finding out where and how the misconception had arisen. We append the correspondence.

February 10, 1922.

DEAR SIR,—May I so far trespass on your courtesy as to ask you for a further statement as to the precise sense in which you desire your pronouncement (which aroused so much discussion) at Cambridge last summer, with reference to the Divinity of Christ, to be understood.

The enclosed letter—with cutting—expresses the difficulty felt by one of our readers in Ceylon as to what you actually said, and the purport of it, and though by this time the matter may

ISLAMIC REVIEW

well be ancient history to you, Sir, yet in far-off parts of the world it is still fresh; and, as Editor of the *Islamic Review*, I wish to be able to answer the enquiries which reach me from time to time, as to the attitude taken up by the more advanced leaders of Modern Christianity.

If the construction (for which apology was given) placed on your words by the *Daily Graphic*, be absolutely false, the misconception must be a serious one; and I am anxious to make the matter clear—on your authority—to my readers, who, though scattered over the world, yet follow Christian developments in England with an interest which many Christians at home might advantageously emulate.

Is it your contention, perhaps, that Christ's Divinity is—after all—only a supreme development of the Divinity which is potentially latent in every man; an internal Divinity, shared by all human creatures alike potentially, rather than an external Divinity superior to and quite apart from the potentiality of all human creatures?

With apologies for troubling you.

I am, Dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN,

Imam of the Mosque, Woking.

The Very Rev. the Dean of Carlisle,

The Deanery, Carlisle.

THE DEANERY, CARLISLE,

February 11, 1922.

SIR,—I cannot accept your interpretation of my view as to the Divinity of Christ, and I do not think I can advantageously attempt in a small space to supply an interpretation of what I said. My article is now published just as it was delivered, and I have written upon the subject in many books, the latest being *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*.

I am shortly publishing three sermons in a little volume to be called *Jesus Human and Divine*, and I am writing a series of articles in reply to Bishop Gore, in the *Modern Churchman*, the first of which has already appeared. I would rather that your friends should get their impressions of what I mean from a study of my published writings than supply them with private explanations which, taken apart from the rest of what I have written, might only lead to fresh misunderstanding.

Faithfully yours,

H. RASHDALL.

P.S.—I enclose a copy of the *Graphic's* apology and of their next number.

February 20, 1922.

DEAR SIR,—I thank you for your letter, and the extracts from the *Daily Graphic*. If you will permit me to say so, I

THE DEAN OF CARLISLE

confess that I have failed to discover an essential discrepancy between the principle of the view propounded in my letter and that enunciated at the conclusion of the approved report of your address, which you were kind enough to send me.

As I have promised Mr. Boutwood¹ to deal with the matter in the *Islamic Review*, I feel it only right, in fairness to the contributor to whom Mr. Boutwood refers, and indeed to all parties, that I should publish the correspondence as well.

I should be grateful, therefore, if you would return to me the letter and cutting which I sent you.

Thanking you for your courtesy.

Yours faithfully,

KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN.

The Very Rev. the Dean of Carlisle.

¹ The following came from Mr. Boutwood in connection with the above:—

CHARITY COMMISSION,
RYDER STREET,
ST. JAMES'S, S.W. 1.

February 15, 1922.

DEAR SIR,—A Christian theologian, I appeal, on behalf of a friend, to the courtesy and fairness of Islam.

In your January number Zain-ul-Abidin Bin Ahmad speaks of the recent momentous pronouncements of the Dean of Carlisle and others against the popular Church doctrine of Jesus Christ's Divinity as Son of God, and, in perfect good faith, he adduces "an extract from *The Graphic* of August 20, 1921."

I have known the Dean of Carlisle—Dr. Rashdall—for five and twenty years, and the theological matter is one on which I can speak with some authority. It is entirely untrue to say that Dr. Rashdall denies the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ. The widespread belief that he does so arises out of a failure to understand his attempts to express that doctrine in a modern form. The words of your Malayan contributor suggest that Dr. Rashdall is unmindful of the obvious proprieties and obligations of his office—in fact, an unfaithful priest. I therefore venture to express a hope that, in your next issue, you will dissociate him from Zain-ul-Abidin Bin Ahmad's article.

Dr. Rashdall asks me to say that, in his opinion, much harm has been done by the failure of Christians to emphasize the great primary doctrine which they all profess to believe—the doctrine of the Unity of God. For us, as for you, there is One God, and He is One.

Yours very truly,

ARTHUR BOUTWOOD,
(Hakluyt Egerton).

The Editor,
The Islamic Review.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

THE DEANERY, CARLISLE,
February 22, 1922.

DEAR SIR,—I am sorry that I cannot return your letter or cutting. As you did not ask me to return them, I have not kept them.

The passage I sent you as reported in the *Daily Graphic* was, of course, only a part of the Essay, the whole of which is, as you are no doubt aware, published in the *Modern Churchman*.

Faithfully yours,

H. RASHDALL.

It will be observed that Dr. Rashdall "cannot accept" the interpretation of his view suggested by the Editor; but he encloses a copy of the *Daily Graphic's* apology and of "their next number" (August 22, 1921)—the latter containing a "report of the address" approved by Dr. Rashdall as "quite honest and sincere," which runs thus:

There was [he said] a growing demand that liberal theologians should say in quite definite terms what they really meant when they used the traditional language about the Divinity of Christ. Dealing first with the negative side of the proposition, Dr. Rashdall said Jesus did not claim Divinity for Himself.

He may have called Himself, or more probably allowed Himself to be called, the Messiah or Son of God, but never in any critically, well-attested sayings was there anything suggesting that His conscious relation to God was other than that of a man toward God—the attitude which He wished that all men should adopt.

It obviously followed from that admission that Jesus was in the fullest sense a man; that He had not merely a human body, but a human soul, intellect and will.

That was not always recognized by the Church. Many of the early Greek fathers—Irenæus, for instance, and Athanasius—obviously thought of Him simply as the Logos of God residing in a human body. Later councils condemned this position in the person of Apollinarius.

From the point of view of later theology it could not be too strongly asserted that Athanasius was an Apollinarian.

And [added the Dean] I fear a great many people now, who think themselves particularly orthodox, are really Apollinarians, too. I have known quite advanced Catholics who simply did not know that the Church teaches that Christ had a human soul. Much so-called orthodoxy is really Apollinarianism, and some defenders of the Catholic faith, who are too well informed to become downright Apollinarians, are really under the influence

THE DEAN OF CARLISLE

of that heresy in the later reduced form of it, which denied that Christ had a human will.

It was equally unorthodox to suppose [continued Dr. Rashdall] that the human soul of Jesus pre-existed. There was simply no basis for such a doctrine; and from the time when the Logos Christology was accepted by the Church, it had been held that what pre-existed was the Divine Logos—not the human Jesus.

The Divinity of Christ did not necessarily imply the virgin birth or any other miracle. The virgin birth, if it could be historically proved, would be no demonstration of Christ's Divinity, nor would the disproof of it throw any doubt upon that doctrine, nor did the Divinity of Christ imply omniscience.

Since the appearance of Bishop Gore's Bampton lectures it had been unnecessary to labour that point, though the doctrine of a limitation of Christ's knowledge had not yet sunk into the popular mind. Modern eschatological theories had still further increased the necessity of admitting that that limitation must be pushed much farther than Bishop Gore and his school would admit.

Even if they reduced, as he personally was disposed to do, the genuine eschatological sayings to a minimum, it was difficult to deny that Christ entertained some expectations about the future which history had not verified.

What, then, was the modern view of the relation between God and man? That man is not merely the creation and plaything of God, that there is a certain community of nature between God and man, that all human minds are reproductions "in limited modes" of the Divine mind, that in all true human thinking there is a reproduction of the Divine thought, and, above all, that in the highest ideals which the human conscience recognizes there is a revelation of the ideal eternally present in the Divine mind; those were the pre-suppositions under which alone any real meaning could be given to the doctrine.

Philosophers have not been slow to see in the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation a recognition of the truth that our knowledge of God is derived from the revelation which He has made of Himself in humanity; but to say simply "Humanity is Divine" leads straight to the Hindoo theology or the modern "Absolutism," which treats God as revealed equally in all men—in the worse men as much as in the best, and so makes God "super-moral," "beyond good and evil."

There was much in human nature that was not Divine at all. It was just because it so emphatically negated such a non-moral doctrine of Divine immanence that the Christian doctrine of a supreme incarnation in an historic person became so valuable.

If we believe that every human soul reveals, produces, incarnates God to some extent, if we believe that in the great ethical teachers of mankind, the great religious personalities, the founders, the reformers of all religions, God is more fully revealed than

ISLAMIC REVIEW

in other men, then it became possible to believe that in one man the self-relation of God had been signal, supreme, unique, that we are justified in thinking of God as like Christ, that the character and teaching of Christ contains the fullest disclosure both of the character of God Himself and of His will for man.

That was (so far as so momentous a truth could be summed up in a few words) the true meaning for us of the doctrine of Christ's Divinity."

This view would seem to us to differ in no essential from that put forward in the Editor's suggestion; but, however that may be, it expresses a principle very familiar to Islam—to wit, that man *can* attain to perfection by working out the Divine element that is in him; but that if and when man has accomplished this, and if, as Dr. Rashdall seems to imply, Christ is to be regarded as the perfect example of this working out of the Divine element in man, wrought to its sublimest pitch, even then the result is not Divinity, but Perfected Humanity—a height, that is to say, to which all men may aspire with a reasonable hope of attaining thereto, such attainment depending on the individual man's own use of the powers and opportunities which God has given him.

Perfection of this kind we cannot regard as Divinity (nor, be it noted, does it in any way satisfy the age-long claims of the Church); but that Dr. Rashdall appears so to regard it we must perforce (bearing in mind the *Daily Graphic's* apology) deduce from his statement that "the Divinity of Christ did not necessarily imply the virgin birth or any other miracle . . . nor did 'it' imply omniscience." Indeed none of the supernatural attributes commonly ascribed to the Godhead need, it would seem, be implied, according to Dr. Rashdall's view, and so we are driven back upon the theory of a "supreme incarnation in a historic person" of the Divine elements in human nature, as the sole basis of Christ's claim to Divinity.

If Christ became this "supreme incarnation" of

THE DEAN OF CARLISLE

the Divine in man by the perfect development within himself of faculties and capacities vouchsafed to all mankind, so also, says Islam, was it with God's other great prophets and messengers—Abraham, Moses, and last of all, Muhammad—that they might, in their lives and conduct, be living examples to humanity of the heights to which humanity may attain—but that is not Divinity.

If, on the other hand, Christ became this “supreme incarnation” by virtue of the possession of faculties and capacities greater than and above those vouchsafed to mankind; then is he, says Islam, no more an example (for what man will set out to attempt to imitate what is admittedly and utterly beyond his power?), and the reason for his ministry on earth is yet to seek.

What, then, is the position? “The paper,” says Dr. Rashdall, in his letter to the *Daily Graphic* (August 21, 1921), “was an attempt to indicate, and at the same time explain in a way intelligible to modern minds, the Catholic doctrine that Christ is both human and Divine.” The attempt succeeds only, at the most, in indicating him as a supertype of Perfected Humanity—a conclusion to which Muslims will not object, but which is surely repugnant to the devout Christian.

If, as he seems to imply, Dr. Rashdall wished to do no more than re-state a strictly orthodox conception in terms acceptable to what Matthew Arnold describes as “liberals of every shade of opinion,” he has, in an honest attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable, laid himself open to an almost inevitable misconstruction, alike far-reaching and fraught with grave consequences for the weaker brethren.

If, we repeat, we have been led into misrepresenting him, we apologize in all sincerity; the report of his address, as approved by himself, is our excuse, and, we fear, our justification.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

TABLE TALK

The Problem for a Freethought Socialist.

THE equal distribution of a nation's wealth among its various units is an ideal proposition; but to work it out is nothing short of an impossibility. All State measures to achieve it would discredit the machinery of the Government, encourage laziness and kill individual exertion without which there can be no increase of wealth. On the other hand, there is a large proportion of mankind that cannot be saved from the iron grip of poverty unless some effort is made to make wealth accessible in some degree to every person.

God is impartial in the dispensation of His bounties; His blessings fall equally on every creature; His ministers of nature serve every unit of His creation; He makes no distinction between man and man. In short, there is absolutely equal distribution of His wealth among all the members of mankind. If Communism on the one hand is the only salvation from poverty, it cannot be achieved by the killing of Individualism, seeing that Individualism is in itself the best means and the most efficacious incentive for the production of wealth. These two ends, set poles apart, can only meet if man elects to follow the broad, Divine Law alluded to above.

God's gifts come to us without our deserving them. We cannot live for a minute if an atom in the universe becomes eliminated; and the blessings of life are in no sense the reward of any action on our part. Follow this one attribute of God which the Qur-án discloses to us in its very beginning: "Rahman"—the compassionate God whose beneficence reaches everyone without any merit or desert—and the whole problem of human misery is solved. Let those people who know how to utilize God's gifts to their best advantage give the proceeds of their labour as a gift to others. If riches and wealth

THE SUFI'S DIARY

in all their forms are simply the conversion of various things in nature to some purpose profitable to mankind, and if those who know the way of doing so become richer than others, are they not the most indebted to God? All their skill would be of no avail if no material created by the hand of God was already existing to be worked upon. A man needs simply to compare his own labour with Divine labour that has supplied him with the raw material to realize actually where he stands.

Truly speaking, human labour plays an infinitesimal part in comparison with the Divine labour by which that same human labour was brought into being. How shall recompense be made to the Great Benefactor for all the riches which the wealthiest man in the world possesses? The last message from Allah suggests an answer:—

Righteousness is this, that one should believe in Allah . . . and give away wealth out of love for Him to the near of kin and the orphans and the needy and the wayfarers and the beggars and for the emancipation of the captives.—The Qur-án, ii. 177.

I invite the attention of the Socialist and the Atheist to these lines. Can he suggest to us a better method of working out the noble objects and aims which he sums up in the word Socialism? Try what other course he will, he will see only failure. To kill Individualism is to kill the Ego—a suicidal step to destroy human activities and put an end to all exertions which lead to true civilization.

THE SUFI'S DIARY

(Continued from page 104.)

SINCE my last record I have had two further dream-experiences, which persuade me to dismiss the idea of "thought-transference" in the matter as throwing any real light on the question of dreams.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

The first is as follows : Mr. W—— appeared to me in a dream, beseeching me for urgent pecuniary help. The said gentleman I know quite well to be above financial troubles. He has, however, the misfortune to possess certain physical defects. On the following afternoon another gentleman, suffering from physical defects precisely similar to those of Mr. W——, came to me, and to my great surprise asked for help, almost in the same terms as those used by the apparition of the previous night. The only thing in common between the apparition of Mr. W—— and the gentleman who called to see me is this same physical disability.

The other experience is, I think, more conclusive. I had a serious complaint last month, and a doctor friend wanted to help me. One Sunday he brought me some pills, which I accepted, as in courtesy bound, but without, as I frankly confess, any intention of taking them, or any particular desire to put them to the test. A few days passed, and the complaint became more troublesome. I prayed to God incessantly for a full week for the cure. And one day, in a vision like a dream, a stage, such as that we see in a theatre, came before me, and I saw an English child, of an age apparently between nine and ten, frolicking about on it, reciting the while some English verses with the chorus, "Mirror Pills, my name, so and so." The dream left me with all the effects of a true vision in my mind. The phrase "Mirror pills" did not sound to me like particularly good or intelligible English. Besides, it conveyed no meaning whatever. I consulted my *Webster*, and found the following as one of the meanings of the word Mirror : "Any polished, or smooth substance, as water, that forms images by the reflection of rays of light."

Here was another puzzle. But the postman's knock brought me that morning a letter from this same doctor friend, who urged me to give a trial

THE SUFI'S DIARY

to his pills. I looked for those pills, and I was surprised to find them brilliant and glossy enough to reflect rays of light. I used them as directed, and they brought me the cure. Here is a typical example, which admits of no explanation from spiritualistic or materialistic quarters. Probably, I may say, surely, the doctor of whom I have spoken must have been thinking of me, and if transfer of thought had anything to do with it the apparition should have been in the person of the doctor. Neither do the theories of subconsciousness, imagination, or association help at all to explain it. Even after the dream I did not think of, or remember, the pills given to me by the doctor. In any case I could never have given them the name of "Mirror pills," even if I had properly examined them before. The message in the dream had been put in the mouth of a child, and the description was a child's description, so was the designation. We describe things according to our conception of them, or in the terms of such logic as we possess. If we desire to describe a thing with precision, then our knowledge, such as it is, of the properties and attributes of that thing will suggest to us some outstanding quality by which we may distinguish it. Every one is more apt than not to describe a thing by that one of its features which strikes him most. If the dream in question was the outcome of my imagination and the association of my ideas, I should have named it, either after the doctor, or the complaint from which I was suffering. But if a child had to name the pills, the gloss and brilliancy of them would be the first thing to appeal to his mind, more especially as he would be incapable of conceiving of any of their other attributes. That the message conveyed through the child in response to my longing, or prayer, for some efficacious remedy, revealed to me the true remedy, and was no hallucination, appears from the results achieved by using the pills. Here

ISLAMIC REVIEW

was neither thought-transference nor the play of my imagination or subconsciousness.

Muslims do believe in the power of thought and its transference, but not on the lines suggested by certain of the Spiritualists. We know of ways by which communications may be made from one mind to another without the use of normal means. But that has nothing to do with such phantasmal experiences as I have related. Possibly I may write on the subject later on ; but I wonder what a Spiritualist friend would say about these dreams of mine. Possibly, he would account for them as messages from spirits in the ghostland, who are interested in me. But why not attribute them to the Supreme Spirit, Whom I have addressed in my prayers ? With us Muslims, such dreams indicate the initial stage of spiritual growth, when the mind of man begins to receive messages from Allah, the Source of all knowledge. Mankind is invested with wonderful capacities and senses beyond the materialistic ken. Besides our five senses, we have other interior senses. The inner sense of hearing and seeing when cultivated enables their owner to see and hear things quite outside the range of normal conditions. They have nothing to do with what are commonly called clairvoyance and clairaudience. They represent something of a very sacred nature—a power within the scope of human acquisition, but demanding strong discipline of character. The cultivation of this power was not unknown to the people in the East, but the course they pursued was long and cumbersome, and full of rigid austerity. Islam came to simplify it and render it not inconsistent with our necessary attendance to the other calls of mundane life. Briefly, we have to control the physical side of our nature and weaken its hold on the mind. There are very few people in the whole world who have never had the experience of a true dream. Almost every one can remember at least one incident

THE SUFI'S DIARY

of the kind in his life. Our occult powers begin to develop the more, in proportion as our physical nature tends to assert itself less. While we are asleep all our external senses become dormant, and thus we are brought nearer to that state of the mind wherein its latent faculties become awakened. But if we are under the thralldom of the flesh and the lusts of the flesh, unconscious though we may be of their domination while asleep, subconsciously the mind is still under their control; and, hence, less capable of spiritual progression. It is a common experience that the last hours of the night are the more favourable for true dreams. The reason is obvious. The mind has been freed for many hours from external cares, agitations, and impulses, and has thereby become more qualified to have its inner eyes opened. If a person would be capable of exercising the secret power of which I speak, this is the state of the mind to which he must attain, even in his waking moments. His control of the carnal side of his nature enables him to ignore the animal element that is in him, even while he is conscious and acting under normal conditions. I wonder if the many mediums in the West are not the victims of delusion. Their life and their environment do not indicate the development of occult power. We need not doubt their veracity. They may be quite genuine in the statement of their experiences. It must then be a gift (and not an advanced spirituality) which the Divine economy has granted to some in order to strengthen their belief in the life after death. It must be confessed, however, that the messages we have received through such mediumship have hardly added to the treasure of our knowledge. I will deal with this subject in my next article.

(To be continued.)

ISLAMIC REVIEW

THE SECRET OF EXISTENCE

By KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN.

(Continued from p. 119.)

II

“Whatever (a soul) has earned is for its own benefit and (the evil of) whatever it has wrought is upon it.”—THE HOLY QUR-ÁN, ii. 286.

My gain and my loss are the direct outcome of my own deeds. I am the author of my own pleasure and my own pain. My rise, my fall are my own handiwork. My honour, my dishonour, my luck, my ill-luck, my might, my humiliation, my glory, my degradation, are each one and all the fruits of my own actions. I am the paddler of my own canoe, the architect of the edifice of my own life. The various capabilities embedded in my nature are meant to be subservient to me, the forces of nature exist to minister to my good. But it is my own capacity and competence properly to handle them, that make them useful or harmful, helpful or baneful to me. Turn my steps whither I may, towards acclivity or declivity, all these things keep pace with me. All around me, above me or beneath me, there is nothing, whether an insignificant blade of grass or a passing gust of wind, which is not the repository of some blessing or other to me. But the blessings latent in all these things await my own hands to bring them out. A wrong manipulation of them may turn the same blessings into instruments of ruin and destruction. Water and fire, those great gifts of God, may become veritable heaven or hell for me; it depends on my own actions. In brief, pleasure and pain, joy and sorrow, brightness and gloom, in this life as in the hereafter, are but the shadows and reflections of my own doings.

The Qur-ánic verse quoted above, though small to look at, is in fact the sacred gospel, which, if lived up to, will bring down all idols of worldly

THE SECRET OF EXISTENCE

grandeur to an equal footing with man, or even make them subservient to him. This gospel, the GOSPEL OF ACTIONS, is the very essence of self-realization and the secret of self-respect. Man has ever been bowing his head before another, for the achievement of his own good or the avoidance of his own evil. There was a time when he looked upon the various forces of nature as the controllers of his good and evil. Hence arose fantastic forms of pagan adoration—tree-worship, stone-worship, star-worship and element-worship. Sometimes he attributed his good and evil fortune to the influence of certain imperceptible beings from whom sprang all sorts of superstitious beliefs in invisible controlling agencies such as genii, spirits, ghosts and fairies. With the lapse of time, he came to look up to his fellow human beings for the realization of his ends. This killed within him all sense of self-respect, making him meanly servile to others, and, as the natural consequence, destroyed self-reliance. He never worried himself to work out his own salvation, through the exercise of his own innate capabilities. These, therefore, were never brought into play, and got atrophied, in the course of time. His brain got overclouded. He could not see his own way. His bridle was handed over to others, his fellow-men, with exactly the same flesh and blood. In a word, he lost his manhood and was chased helplessly hither and thither like dumb, driven cattle, at the beck and call of his self-made masters.

It was as a safeguard against such ignominy that the Holy Qur-án had invited the Muslims' attention, in the garb of a parable, to a great moral truth. But as ill-luck would have it, the Muslims, losing sight of the underlying lesson, contented themselves with empty parrot-like repetition of the words. They, unfortunately, missed the spirit inculcated therein, which alone, and no amount of lip-repetition of the sacred script, could elevate them to human dignity. "What! Is he who goes prone upon his face better

ISLAMIC REVIEW

guided or he who walks upright upon a straight path ? ” (The Holy Qur-án, lxvii. 22). These Divine words allude to two distinct classes of creation—the quadrupeds whose necks and heads are bending towards the ground, and man, the lord of creation, who holds his head upright on his shoulders. Let man try to appreciate what the Qur-án means. Let him look at the structure of his neck, the respective positions of the eyes and the ears, and compare these to those of lower animals, and then ponder over the Divine purpose which has ordained that such differences should be. An animal cannot look far ahead, while man’s horizon is unbounded. The former’s neck does not permit of its seeing right or left to a great distance, but the flexibility of that of the latter enables him to survey all sides. This is the reason why, to keep the horse on the straight path, its reins must needs be held by man. But woe unto the poor wretch who, notwithstanding all the Divine capabilities with which he is endowed, has handed over his leading-strings to others, and is driven by them like lower animals. In morals, in actions, in character, in short, in every phase of their life, the Muslims have lost their own peculiarities. Discarding *Sibghat-Ullah*, i.e. the colouring of Allah, they took a fancy to the glimmer and glitter of the base and tawdry hues of others, and imbued themselves with the same. Call it civilization or whatever you will, in our estimation, this relegates you to the category of those of whom the Qur-án speaks as “going with their heads bent.” You will not be entitled to the dignified epithet of MAN until you hold your reins in your own hands, until your necks have resumed their natural upright posture, until you make your way with your own eyes, until you use your own ears to form an opinion on world-affairs ; not reposing blind faith in another’s word as Gospel truth.

The very next verse invites attention to this very

THE SECRET OF EXISTENCE

truth : " Say : He it is who brought you into being and made for you ears, eyes and hearts, but little it is that you give thanks." Thanksgiving does not consist in the repetition of the words *Alhamd-o-Lillah*, i.e. all praise to Allah. Real gratitude lies in the right use of every Divine endowment. Lip-gratitude counts for little. You may do it a million times a day, for the Divine gifts of eyes, ears and heart, but you will still be of the most ungrateful ones, should you fail to make a right use of these organs, for yourself, and be guided by others' eyes, ears and hearts, leaving your own to rot in inactivity. It is noteworthy how beautifully the Holy Qur-án makes mention of man's ears, eyes and heart, directly after referring to his neck. As a matter of fact, these two, of all the five sense-organs of man, play the major part in the acquisition of knowledge. Sight and hearing bring together fact and figures from surrounding nature, and submit them to the heart for judgment and transformation into knowledge for the guidance of human steps in future.

In brief, the man who does not know how to make use of his ears and eyes, head and heart for himself, falls, according to the Divine decree, under the category of the lower species of animals. He must be driven by others, inevitably keep plodding under others' yoke, and carry others' burdens. Day and night, he will exert himself tooth and nail, but the fruits of his labours will be for others to enjoy. He will get just as much of it as may suffice to keep his soul and body together. The whole lot will go to enrich the pocket of his driving master.

To-day, the Muslims all over the world mourn their wretched plight. They have lost their kingdoms, their might and majesty, and are now bewailing the gruesome loss. But they seldom for a moment ponder over the fact that their deterioration has in no way been wrought by alien hands. It is not the enemy that can be held responsible for the collapse

ISLAMIC REVIEW

of the Muslim's house. Nay, the edifice was already tottering. Of course those on the look-out for his fall eagerly seized upon the opportunity which only served as a last straw to break the camel's back. The Muslims have for long abandoned thinking for themselves. For long has the power of action disappeared from among them. Having fallen a prey to their baser passions, they have lost their faculties of seeing and hearing. Why, then, should they lament that in the course of the natural order of cause and effect, their leading strings should rest in other hands. In fact, we have no pretext for grumbling. We have wrought our degradation with our own hands. The immutable law of nature as expounded in the Holy Qur-án—"Whatever (a soul) has earned is for its own benefit and (the evil of) whatever it has wrought is upon it"—knows no distinction between man and man. It must apply equally to all, and to-day we find ourselves as we do in just conformity with this law. The Divine decree announced over thirteen centuries ago—"Verily Allah does not alter the condition of a people unless they alter their own ways"—has this day been enforced against us. Divine judgment has found us guilty, and has accordingly visited us with the punishment which is our just due.

Thus the Qur-ánic verse brings to mankind what may be termed the GOSPEL OF ACTION. Whatever we acquire or whatever befalls us, that, the Divine Word assures us, is the direct outcome of our own actions. Could there be a more blissful message to mankind? It is the Magna Charta, so to speak, of human freedom. It liberates man from the shackles of innumerable superstitions and breathes into him a spirit of self-reliance and independence. It gives an impetus to his dormant energies, bringing them, one and all, into play. His heart is purged of every form of false hope and fear and attains complete and genuine satisfaction. He is enabled to set his

THE SECRET OF EXISTENCE

hand to his work, with a sense of thorough confidence in himself. So long as a man looks upon his good and evil as dependent upon others, he loses what is the indispensable essential of all success—self-reliance. He cannot trust to his own capabilities. He loses pluck, and the goal of all his efforts is to win the good graces of his imaginary masters. He thinks that effort on his own part will avail him little; for his good and evil wait upon the sweet will of another. Do whatever he may, all his exertions will come to nought unless he succeeds in winning the pleasure of one whom he regards as the controller of his destiny. Thus, quite naturally, he turns away from self-exertion and addresses himself soul and heart to what may win him his pleasure. And what is the logical corollary of such a frame of mind? Annihilation of all power of action and devotion to superstitious and mean practices such as offerings, sacrifices, atonement, intercessions and so forth. He must submit to loathsome humiliations before his supposed lords. Even then, however, he has no assurance as to whether his offerings and sacrifices have succeeded in pleasing them and whether they will at all be able to save him from any trouble or grant him any blessing.

Is not this the true picture of a mind which, lacking in self-reliance, looks up to another for its loss and gain? What, then, can be a happier message than the one communicated through the Qur-án to mankind, by the Almighty in whose hands lie true felicity and good, and which may be summed up thus :

Your pain and pleasure, loss and gain are not bound up with some element or phenomena of nature, the sun, the moon, the star, the tree, nor do they rest with any human being, be he a hermit or a saint, a *rishi*, *autar* or a Prophet, a citizen or a ruler. It is entirely in your own hands

ISLAMIC REVIEW

whether you make or mar your fortune ; We have only prescribed certain limits to everything, which are immutable. A particular measure of something must lead to a good result, while another proportion of the same thing will be prolific of evil. This, and no more than this, is the philosophy of the problem of *Taqdir* or fate in Islam, which has been so commonly misunderstood. The specific measures leading to good or evil, are either made known to you through Revelation from Us, or you acquire their knowledge on your own account by scientific processes. In the light of the knowledge gained in either way, you must work out your own destiny. As you work out the means at your disposal, rightly or wrongly, so the consequences, good or evil, must inevitably follow, as certainly as the night follows the day. Whatever you will sow, the same will you reap. Good must beget good and evil, evil. Should you sow the dragon's teeth, you must expect a similar crop. *No amount of ransom, no atonement, no intercession, will avail in averting the inevitable.* There are, no doubt, some other sets of means whereby you may expiate your mistakes and avert their bitter consequences, but these too require doing on your own part.

You must bear in mind as well, that there is nothing in this vast universe but what is pregnant with immense good for you, and nothing happens but it is intended for your welfare. It is your own wrong way of reacting upon things that converts them into evil for you. But even in laying down this law of actions and their fruits, We have been gracious to you. The wrong on your part

WHAT THEY THINK OF US !

is visited with no more than just the same measure of punishment, but a virtue is rewarded tenfold. In a word, your own deeds are all in all. Good or evil follows your actions in the same ratio of ten and one, even as an object is followed by its shadow. This is the GOSPEL OF ACTION, which We give to you.

Have faith in your own capacities for work. No human power would then be able to hurt you. You are not born to be servile to others. The rulers and the ruled saw the light of the day, in a state of equal helplessness and exactly in the same manner both leave this earthly abode. Rule and subjection are but the passing shadows of their own deeds. Every atom in the universe has been designed to be subservient to your good. But you must yourself take the first step in order to be the recipient of the blessings in store for you, to say nothing of others; even We with all our might have been pleased to refrain from interfering with the chain of causation between actions and their fruits ; as We have said in the Book : “ Verily, Allah does not alter the condition of a people until they bring about a change in their own ways.”

(To be continued.)

WHAT THEY THINK OF US !

SIR HUGH BARNES writes to the Editor of *The Times* :—

Your outspoken article in your issue of the 15th on the Indian debate will gladden the hearts of many Indian officers, like myself, who have watched with dismay the easy-going attitude of the Government of India towards the outbreaks of lawlessness in that country.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

I have read with great interest Lord Northcliffe's warning of the ugly Muhammadan situation in India and the resentment felt by Indian Muhammadans at our policy towards Turkey. I spent the greater part of my service in India among the Muhammadan tribes of Baluchistan and the North-West Frontier, and I have no hesitation in supporting the views of Lord Northcliffe and Mr. Aubrey Herbert that the first thing necessary to allay the grave unrest throughout the East is the conclusion of a fair and reasonable peace with Turkey, and that no peace with Turkey can be satisfactory or stable which admits Greek sovereignty in any part of Asia Minor. I do not think Sir Valentine Chirol will find many Indian officers to agree with him that the views of the 60,000,000 Indian Muhammadans may be set aside as the views of a small and negligible minority in the Empire.

Great Britain still fails to understand intelligent Muslim opinion. At the root of strong indignation is the belief that the Indian Muslims were exploited during the war, only to see Turkey despoiled for the benefit of Greece when the war was won. They regard the cession of Smyrna and Thrace as a direct breach of the Prime Minister's pledge. Much of the Hindu sympathy with the Muslims springs from this feeling of a breach of faith, because the Hindus as a class recognize the danger of association with 70,000,000 militant Indian nationals with a wholly extraneous religious issue. Peace with and within Turkey, and Great Britain friendly to an effective Turkish Government, would rob the Indian situation of half its menace.—*The Times*, February 14th.

Mr. Graham Bower, in the *Near East*, February 9th, writes :—

But loyalty is not killed in a day ; although we had swapped horses, the Indian Muslim soldiers remained true to their salt. Turkey was willing to accept something equivalent to a British Protectorate. India sent a million and a half of soldiers to help us in the late war ; thousands of Muslim soldiers have died for the British Raj, trusting to the loyalty and justice of England. The Turks surrendered to the English, inspired by the same trust. The British Prime Minister pledged himself to preserve to the Khalif Constantinople, the rich and renowned lands of Thrace and Asia Minor and the home-lands of the Turkish people.

That promise has not been kept. The Greeks, who are the most cruel, the most intolerant and the most barbarous of all the Balkan peoples, were let loose in Thrace and Asia Minor. It would not be possible to compile a full record of the massacres and outrages committed by the Greek Army in this war of extermination.

Now I do not stop to enquire whether in shifting our sub-

WHAT THEY THINK OF US !

sidies from the Russians to the Greeks we have or have not been backing the wrong horse. I trust that the language, the methods and the morals of the betting ring may be eliminated from British foreign policy. I do not stop to consider what the Muslim and the whole Asiatic world may think of our support of these methods of barbarism, but I do appeal on behalf of British loyalty, British good faith, British justice, and British honour. I ask that the promise made to our fellow-subjects and accepted by them in good faith be observed. I ask that the British name for truth, loyalty and justice be vindicated and maintained without fear of the fanaticism of intolerant clerics—without favour to the ambition or Imperialism of Balkan politicians, and without affection for the influence of foreign capitalists. I believe in the honesty and justice of the British people, and in that belief I appeal to them.

The Times, in its leader of February 15th, while commenting on Mr. Montagu's speech, says :—

Again, Mr. Montagu says that " nothing could give a greater immediate contribution to peace with India " than a settlement with Turkey, and the termination of the war between Greece and Turkey. Again we agree with him ; but since the breakdown of the London Conference what steps have the British Government ever taken to settle the Turkish problem ? Their one definite act has been an attempt to provide Greece with funds to continue the war against the Turks. We have the testimony of Lord Northcliffe that the permission given by the Government to Greece to raise a loan of £15,000,000 in this country has been deeply resented by Indian Muslims. The Government's blunder has been accentuated by the more recent proposal to permit Greece to obtain credits under the Trade Facilities Act with a British guarantee. When a country is at war any form of financial help it may receive is in effect help in the waging of war. The plea that the loans are to be spent in this country is a mere subterfuge. All forms of financial aid to Greece from Great Britain should be rigorously eschewed until peace has been concluded between Greece and Turkey. When we proffer money to Greece can we wonder that Muslim sentiment in India, already deeply roused by the plight of Turkey, becomes more inflamed than ever ?

In the same issue *The Times* says :—

In determining our Egyptian policy, we must consider its possible effects on that far-spread Muslim world which has become such an important factor in our Imperial affairs. No rights or interests of ours in Egypt are permanently secure without Egyptian consent. It is the height of folly to hope to govern there by mere force. It cannot be done. If the Egyptian problem thrusts itself

ISLAMIC REVIEW

urgently upon us at a critical moment in domestic politics, it cannot be evaded for that reason. Great Imperial issues must be kept independent of party squabbles. It will be the ruin of the Empire if questions like that of Egypt are made mere pawns in a party game. The moment has come for a clear, wise, and generous decision that will make it once more possible to deal rationally and progressively with the Egyptian problem.

MUSLIM UNREST.

FRENCH CHIEFS' CONFERENCE LAST NIGHT.

World unrest among Muhammadans, and the possibility that the postponement of the Near Eastern Conference in Paris will have a bad effect throughout Islam, was considered at an important military, financial, and diplomatic conference held at the French Foreign Office by M. Poincaré, the Premier and Foreign Minister, late to-night.

The unrest in the Muslim world caused by the delay in settling the future of Turkey has been emphasized to the French Government during the last few days by all her eminent military chiefs who have been called back from all parts of the French Muhammadan Colonies. Marshal Lyautey, the Governor-General of Morocco, who was recently summoned home, has had discussions on the matter with M. Poincaré, during which he also supported this view.

The necessity of speedily taking measures to settle affairs with the Turks with the aim of quieting the spirit of unrest was again urged at the meeting to-night. Among those present were Marshal Foch, Marshal Pétain, General Gouraud (French High Commissioner in Syria), General Pellé (French High Commissioner in Constantinople), prominent Foreign Office officials, and several financiers and bank directors with important interests in the Near East.

It is understood that the special object of this conference was to examine the British attitude towards the French proposals on the Near East submitted to Lord Curzon last week. In French diplomatic circles it is stated that the main differences between the French and British points of view consist in the fact that the British Government wishes to insert a clause by which the Turkish Nationalists, the Kemalists, should, if they prove recalcitrant, be forced to accept the terms of the proposed revised Sèvres Treaty. I understand that all the French military experts in touch with the Muhammadan world in Africa and elsewhere urge that this might cause much trouble throughout Islam.

It is generally thought here that the postponement of the Paris Conference between the Foreign Ministers of Britain, France and Italy from to-day till February 9th or later will mean a postponement of the Genoa Economic and Financial Conference fixed to begin on March 8th.—*The Evening News*.

WHAT THEY THINK OF US !

TURKS WANT THRACE.

The principal obstacle to a Turkish settlement, apart from Mr. Lloyd George's inveterate devotion to Greek interests, is that the Turks constantly increase their demands, and now want a bit of Europe back. They seek to recover what the Prime Minister once called "the rich and renowned lands of Thrace." The Greeks are very unwilling to leave Asia Minor, and they will not give up Thrace without a struggle.—*Sunday Pictorial*, February 12th.

EGYPT'S DESTINY.

ACCORDING TO HOLY WRIT.

To the Editor of the *Daily Express*.

SIR,—In view of recent developments in Egypt, it cannot but be interesting and profitable to examine the ancient prophecies concerning this land, for, after all, the Lord Almighty is the Supreme Ruler of His universe, and His authority cannot be ignored with advantage to all concerned.

To the Bible student it would appear to be extremely foolish for Britain to contemplate relinquishing her control, because the Eternal has decreed that "The sceptre of Egypt shall depart away" (see Zech. x. 11), also "There shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt" (Ezek. xxx. 13).

What does history teach in regard to the fulfilment of these prophecies? We learn that Egypt has not had a native prince to govern it for over 2,000 years, but has been successively governed by Babylonians, Persians, Macedonians, Romans, Saracens, and Mamelukes, the independence of the State having ceased to exist from the year 525 B.C.

In recent times we have seen Britain take the reins from the Turks, and is it too much to say that her rule has been so beneficent and of such advantage to the whole community that it would be nothing short of an irreparable calamity if she left the country to become a prey to any chance adventurer?

The sure word of prophecy stands, and therefore, as there can be no native ruler over Egypt, what nation is so fitted and so entitled to govern as Britain?

SCRIPTUS.

Newport.

—*Daily Express*, February 12th.

Rev. Mr. Macleod, lecturing on Islam before the Invergordon Literary and Debating Society, said :—

Its creed may be summed up as an unquestioning submission to the one God and belief in Muhammad as His prophet, the regular practice of prayer and attendance on special services on

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Friday, the Muhammadan Sabbath, the giving of alms, fasting in the sacred month of Ramadan, and the pilgrimage to Mecca—all detailed in the Qur-ân, the Muhammadan Bible. . . .

In the later part of his discourse, he spoke about the Muslim Rulers, and said :—

Gradually all their states with the exception of Turkey came under the sway of European nations, but a reaction has set in during the last hundred years. The idea of a Muslim Renaissance has of late gained ground, and through missionary work in Africa and Asia Islam has captured and is capturing the hearts and lives of many. To return to the purity of the faith as delivered by Mohammed, and to make actual and real the solidarity of fellow-believers are the aim and object of their wonderful religious fraternities and propaganda. No one who realizes the bearing of such influences on the rise of Mahdism in the nineteenth century and the recent disturbances in the East will fail to see that the outlook is a serious one for Western civilization. Thus Islam, laying stress on religion as the tie that should bind men, and making light of political and geographical disturbances, so characteristic of European nationalism, is a vital power in the world to-day.

Viscount Northcliffe, in an interview with a representative of the *Sunday Pictorial*, made the following observation :—

He (Lord Northcliffe) passed to the Muhammadan question, commenting upon the “extraordinary ignorance” in Britain of what the word “Muhammadan” means. “By this time,” he remarked, “we realize that it is a dangerous thing to insult the Pope. Whatever our personal views may be, we have found that the supporters of the Pope have an unpleasant way of hitting back, whether it be in Ireland or elsewhere. It is true that among Muhammadans there is no one holding the precise position of the Pope, but a great many Muhammadans regard the Sultan of Turkey as their Caliph. The Muhammadans number between 250,000,000, which is the British estimate, and 400,000,000, which is the Muhammadan estimate. Why, there are even millions of Muhammadans in China. *All the Muhammadans are united by ties of religion.* When you give money to the Greeks to shoot Muslims in Asia Minor, Muslims everywhere snipe you or fight you, rather like the Irish Republican Army. And the Muslim has a wide fighting range. Ireland is by comparison a mere football field. If the British Empire helps the Greeks to kill Muslims somewhere beyond Smyrna in Asia Minor, the Muslim will scupper you on the Indian frontier, snipe you in Bombay and bomb you in Cairo

WHAT THEY THINK OF US !

or Alexandria. *I do not suggest that we should be in any way intimidated by Muslims or anybody else*, but I do urge the makers of our policy to remember that these 250,000,000 people whose faith is in the sword have a horrible opportunity for hitting back."

* * * * *

"Look at Palestine," exclaimed Lord Northcliffe. "Do you know that we are on the verge of starting a war in Palestine ? There is a population of about 700,000 in Palestine, mostly Arab Muslims, with a comparatively small proportion of Christians and Jews. In former times they all got along very well together, and the Muslims protected the Holy Places of Christ. During the war the Palestine Muslims assisted us. When I visited Palestine years ago I neither saw nor heard of any friction between Muhammadans, Jews and Christians. When I returned there last month I was met, to my great astonishment, by an armoured car and an escorting party, while overhead flew an aeroplane. I wondered whether I was in Ireland or on the Indian frontier. The reason of the need for these military measures is the mistake of the British Government in declaring that Palestine is to be 'a National Home' for the Jews. The Muslims simply say: 'This is *our* home. We have been here for centuries. We do not want Bolshevik Jews or anybody else in our home.' There is bound to be an upheaval soon in Palestine. *I expect there would be a considerable upheaval in London if some distant Government suddenly announced that London was to become the 'National Home' of the Muslims or the Chinese.* I imagine that the police force would have to be considerably increased when the immigrants arrived !"

* * * * *

"The Muhammadans," he proceeded, "belong to many races, but it is probable that collectively their instincts are more warlike than ours. From Java, in the Dutch East Indies, right across the world to Morocco, on the Atlantic, Muhammadans resent what they consider to be the ill-treatment of their brethren in Palestine. Remember that apart from their many newspapers and other forms of propaganda, *their missionaries outnumber those of all other denominations.* Then about a hundred thousand of them meet every year in their sacred city of Mecca in Arabia. The immediate purpose of the Mecca pilgrimage is religious, but this immense assembly of Muhammadans from all parts of Asia and Africa talks much of temporal things. They talk about India and Egypt and Palestine, and about Gandhi and other specially British topics, on which they are much better informed than we are at home. Don't imagine that because a man wears a turban or a *tarboosh* (fez) he is a fool or slow or unable to combine. We are gradually learning that *these people are not so much unlike ourselves as*

ISLAMIC REVIEW

we thought they were. They look different, but when they take to golf, lawn tennis, or cricket, they can compete with us on equal terms; and many of them are politicians as acute as the Irish. I release these few opinions in order simply to suggest quite delicately that *we ought to be very, very careful in our relations with the great world of Islam.*"—*The Sunday Pictorial*, March 5th.

CORRESPONDENCE

WHILE welcoming our new English Muslim brother, Mr. Hamiy-ud-Din Harris, to the Universal Brotherhood of Islam, we give below extracts from two of his recent letters. These will give the reader an idea how far the enlightened English mind has grown sick of the sham farce of Church life and is hankering after a spark of genuine light, which Islam alone can give in the fullest measure :—

Now, I have given myself a certain period of time in which to thoroughly probe my conscience and inmost feelings concerning the real meaning of "religion" and as to how it appeals to me. I can say that I am convinced upon one supreme point—the utter hypocrisy of the whole Christian Faith as at present existing throughout the world.

In the first place there is absolutely no spirit of unity at all.

The many sects are almost too numerous to count, and they seem to be increasing every year. At the present time the whole Christian Faith is a sham, and the Church truly has no hold upon the vast majority of people.

In this country a respectable person is expected to attend a church once a week for two hours, donned in the best of clothes, and for what reason? From the view of religion and its true meaning? *No*, surely *not* . . . but in order to keep up an appearance from the point of view of *good Society*!

Society—Social Position—*this* is the religion of England, and in order to attain and *keep* Social Position one goes to church!

If one desires to worship the great God privately at home, in quietness and peace, one is termed *wicked* and lacking in respect. This, to my mind, proves the utter hypocrisy of the Christian Faith and the whole system of worship conducted throughout the Church.

The wonderful and beautiful religion of Islam has opened my mind in a manner that I am unable to express in words.

It seems to be the ideal Faith—the natural Faith—and the only *real* Faith.

REVIEWS

I feel that it is hardly necessary to say that it is *my* Faith absolutely, and it is with very great and deep pleasure that I ask to be admitted into the all-wonderful Brotherhood of Islam.

In uttering these words, I fully realize how very serious and solemn are the true interpretations, and in asking for admittance to the Brotherhood of Islam, I promise from the depths of my soul to try my *best* to be a real and devout believer and to follow to the utmost of my ability the meaning of the Great Belief.

* * * * *

In his second letter he writes:—

It is quite impossible for me to express my thoughts and feelings regarding the article "The Philosophy of Islam," by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din.

I have read this beautiful piece of literature many times during the last week or so, and the more I read and think about it, the more I feel that it is a "true inspiration from a Divine Source." In reading this article I have but one feeling, a feeling that I am in the presence of a great soul, a great mind, a great and noble character—one who realizes and fully understands the intensity of existence and the depth and true meaning of human nature. It is the gift of *understanding* that seems lacking in so many human beings in these days of sordid materialism, and it is only when one is able to read and appreciate thoughts such as those that inspired the writing of "The Philosophy of Islam" that one can, as it were, enter into actual communion with a Spirit Divine, and can realize the meaning and power of this Spirit.

REVIEWS

Prof. T. L. Vaswani's fresh production, *The Spirit and Struggle of Islam* (pp. 179, Rs. 1/8/-. Ganesh & Co., Madras), displays a wonderful grasp of the true spirit of the cult of Islam. It was, we must say with gratitude, a spiritual treat to us to go through the book, page after page. It is one impassioned appeal to all that is high, good and noble, in India and the East. It mirrors a soul gasping for the honour and glory of Mother India—a free and united India. It attempts to unmask the dark designs of Western imperialism and capitalism to exploit and enthrall the golden East. It portrays,

ISLAMIC REVIEW

in moving terms, the present revolt of the Indian and Muslim sense of manhood against the emasculating repressive attitude of the foreign rule. Above all, the work conveys to the sons and daughters of India a message of unity, of sacrifice and of hope.

The Turks and Europe, by M. Gaston Gaillard, translated from the French, presents before the English-speaking world a sketch of the Near Eastern Question. It is devoted to a vigorous advocacy of the Turkish cause, throwing light on the various designs to secure the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire, frankly revealing the true nature of the alleged Armenian and Greek massacres, and above all placing the Frenchman's estimate of the British attitude towards the Turk. In dealing with the delicate subject at a great length, the work supports its details by interesting authentic quotations from the numerous agreements, correspondence, interviews, declaration of policies and so forth, bearing upon the Turkish problem. It covers 408 pages, octavo size, published by Messrs. Thomas Murby & Co., 1, Fleet Lane, Ludgate Circus, E.C. 4 ; price 12s. 6d. net.

THE SPIRIT OF ISLAM. By the Rt. Hon. SYED AMEER ALI. New Edition. Amply enlarged by the Author. 30s. net.

THE LITERARY YEAR BOOK. 10s. 6d.

TEACHINGS OF ISLAM. 2s. 6d.

JESUS A MUSLIM. Recent work of KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN. 3s. [In Press.]

MODERN EGYPT. By the EARL OF CROMER. 2 vols. 20s.