

ISLAMIC REVIEW

the RAHMAN and the RAHIM." For this very reason have we been enjoined to recite the same every time we set our hand to something. It is intended to impress on man, thereby, that whatever his requirements, RAHMAN has already created them out of His grace. These, however, can only be turned to account after he has brought his own powers into play. Grain, for instance, is a necessity of our life, for the production of which we stand in need of the co-operation of every atom in the universe. The earth, the sun, the moon, air, water, clouds—in brief, every element of Nature—must be subservient to us, or we cannot grow a single grain. The RAHMAN has, in His infinite grace, provided us with all these servants for nothing, but these God-given labourers refuse to render us any service until and unless we have taken the first step and brought one of our own faculties into operation. After we have ploughed the soil and sown the seed do all these agencies of Nature set to discharge their assigned functions. The initiatory step must be our own, in order to set this Divine machinery into motion. This is the significance of the report from the Prophet which says that God advances ten steps towards the man who takes but one step towards Him. In other words, Divine blessings are impatient to meet us more than half-way, should we take but one step to receive them. Thus the RAHMAN has given us the necessary material and capacity wherewith to deserve and attract His blessings as RAHIM.

M. Y. KHAN.

CHRISTIANITY IN HER OWN LAND

WHAT THINK YE OF GOD ?

Few people deny the existence of God. Some doubt it, as a matter on which they cannot make up their minds ; but we seldom find anybody who will openly declare that there is no God. There is a general belief in God. But when we come to ask the question, Who and What is God ? we are met with different

CHRISTIANITY IN HER OWN LAND

answers. Few people have clear opinions. This is not surprising when we consider that the Christian Churches, which are concerned with preaching doctrines about God, and ought to be able to teach with knowledge and understanding, are themselves divided in opinion. Different doctrines cause what should be one united Christian Church to be divided into many Christian Churches, all of which profess to have something distinct to preach, something which each claims to be better and truer than what the rest possess. Many of these distinctions are exceedingly trivial. But there is one great difference of opinion which, so far as their teaching is concerned, places the Christian Churches into two distinct camps. This difference is the difference between the "Trinitarian" and the "Unitarian." Most of the Christian Churches are Trinitarian; that is to say, they profess and teach the doctrine of the Trinity which declares (1) that there is one God, but (2) that His Godhead includes Three Persons (the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost), and (3) that the Three Persons, who are equal, are each uncreated, incomprehensible, eternal, Almighty, God, Lord, yet (4) that there is only one uncreated, incomprehensible, eternal Almighty Lord God. This doctrine is held by many to be necessary for salvation; in other words, it is said that those who do not hold it are doomed to eternal damnation.

The Unitarian does not believe this doctrine; he does not even profess to understand it. But understanding the simple teaching of his Master, Jesus Christ, who never taught that God is Three Persons in One, he believes that there is one God who is Father of all men, of all ages and nations, and who is to be worshipped in spirit and in truth; not in beliefs, but in true and spiritual lives. He does not believe that God will punish any of his children with eternal damnation and torment, but that He will judge them with justice, remembering also mercy and love. He believes that at some time in God's eternity all souls will be saved, that not one will perish everlastingly. And he believes this because he believes that God our Heavenly Father is a God of love.—*Unitarian Monthly*, July 1922.

"REUNION" AND THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

Dr. Hensley Henson, Bishop of Durham, has been preaching again at Westminster Abbey. He dealt with the much discussed subject of reunion, and suggested that, before asking other religious bodies to unite with it, the Church of England might well try to bring about religious unity in its own ranks. Whatever may be his own doctrinal laxity the Bishop has a way of facing realities when he deals with the existing position of affairs, and he candidly admits that there are serious rifts in the unity of the Established Church. But the way to unity that he proposes is rather hopeless. He is better at diagnosing the malady than finding the remedy. His proposed remedy for

ISLAMIC REVIEW

disunion is "a recasting of the Thirty-Nine Articles." The *Guardian's* frank criticism is that "to whatever extent that document might be edited it would not of itself produce unanimity of opinion." The very words of the criticism express the root difficulty of all these schemes of reunion, directed as they are to finding some formula that will satisfy men of varying "opinions." "Unanimity of opinion" is surely something utterly different from that united belief in the teachings of the Church guided by the Spirit of God, which is the basis of Catholic unity. One of these very Thirty-Nine Articles practically lays it down that all Churches, including the Church of England, are liable to error. The Articles themselves were originally a compromise between discordant teachings, and as Protestant commentators themselves say, and as Newman demonstrated in the famous Tract Ninety, there is a remarkable elasticity in their exposition of doctrine, and they are capable of many interpretations. With the existing variety of "opinions" in the Anglican Church, any new Articles intended to secure "unanimity of opinion" must be still more elastic or "comprehensive." One wonders what kind of unity can possibly be the result, and indeed what relation there can be between Divine Faith and the acceptance of a formulary devised to cover divergences of "opinion."—*Catholic Times*.

NEW GOSPEL.

Though we deplore the decay of church-going among the working classes, we do not, says a cynic, deplore their absence from the churches of the rich. "For social classes will inevitably settle into separate places of worship, and the poor cannot feel at home in a congregation of richer folk. Each rich church should be accompanied by its own auxiliary mission-chapels for the poor. The worshippers of the mother-church must themselves make frequent visits to these chapels, as well as to the benevolent activities that may circle around them. This, and this alone, can avert an un-Christian severance between two groups of fellow-Christians." This is the new Gospel.—*The Christian Life*.

"SOUL-DECEIVING, IDOLATROUS ORTHODOXY."

The Rev. Principal H. D. A. Major, of Ripon Hall, Oxford, preached a memorable sermon in Westminster Abbey on Sunday morning, June 7th. Our readers will remember his having been recently accused of heresy for saying "I do not believe in the resurrection of the body."

In the course of his sermon, Mr. Major alluded to the Creed of St. Athanasius as giving to many the impression that Christian orthodoxy was not only a very complicated and indeed almost incomprehensible affair, but that it was mainly concerned with the exercise of the intellect—a series of propositions put forward for intellectual assent—and that those who could not assent were guilty of heresy and in peril of damnation. Such, he said, was the conception of orthodoxy and the test

CHRISTIANITY IN HER OWN LAND

of orthodoxy in the golden age of orthodoxy, and it still survived in the great Christian Churches of to-day. Yet it had no support at all in the authenticated teaching of Jesus Christ. It was a test which gave those who held it the impression that there was salvation in professing assent to propositions, whereas salvation was only to be found in possessing the spirit of the Lord and in striving to obey His principles. The worship of the idol of a false orthodoxy cast the stigma of heresy on the Christian scholar who uttered some novel literary, historical or scientific judgment which conflicted with Christian tradition, while it had no hesitation in holding as orthodox Christians those who were cowardly, mean, dishonest, grasping, slothful, selfish, unsociable, providing their verbal professions were orthodox. "Let us have done with such soul-deceiving, idolatrous orthodoxy," exclaimed the preacher in closing; "Christ's orthodoxy was the orthodoxy of action. St John's test of orthodoxy was the Christian practice."—*The International Psychic Gazette*.

ANGLICAN INDIFFERENCE.

He spoke of the harm done by uncertain and contradictory teaching within the Anglican Church. It needed St. Paul's spirit. "But," he went on, "we have lost it. It is not only that the Gospel of the Cross and the Resurrection have lost their old prominent place, that varying views of the Atonement have to a large extent silenced our pulpits, and divergent views on the Eucharist have dulled men's spiritual perceptions, but that the absence of these fundamental truths from much of the preaching of to-day causes no great concern, and it does not greatly matter whether an ethical or a sacramental Gospel is preached, whether Christ or His death is presented, whether He comes before men as the great Teacher or the Redeemer. The great Apostle would have been astonished at our easy-going tolerance."

The very pulpit from which Dr. Walpole preached is a monument of this easy-going tolerance. Varying doctrine is heard from it on successive Sundays, and the Dean of St. Paul's and the Bishop of London, whose Cathedral it is, teach widely divergent and even contradictory doctrines on vital points.—*Catholic Times*.

FOUNDED ON A LIE OR TRUTH?

The Rev. R. H. Shepherd thinks it impossible the Church should have progressed had it been founded on a lie. It all depends upon what one means by a lie. No one is absurd enough to believe that every follower of the Christian Church *knew* that his religion was based upon either a lie or a myth. That would be an absurdity. The chief thing for a Church such as Christianity to persist is, not that it should be based upon a conscious lie, but that the vast majority of those who follow it should believe it to be based on truth. And all history proves that there is no absurdity and no falsehood that cannot command the allegiance of

vast numbers of people. When, only a few years ago, Horatio Bottomley and the Bishop of London told the people of England the lie about the angel of Mons, there were not wanting numbers who were prepared to believe it. Belief is one thing, verification is another. And a glance through the records of any lunatic asylum will not fail to prove that the most sincere conviction is not incompatible with the most foolish and the most false of teachings.—F. T.

DEMOCRACY IN ISLAM

King a Commoner in the House of Allah.

IN 91 Hegira Caliph Walid, after performing the pilgrimage ceremonies at Mecca, intended to go to Medina to pay a visit to the "Mosque of the Prophet." The Governor of the town, Amr bin Abdul Aziz, gave instructions for turning out all those in the mosque for the time the Caliph stayed in the mosque. There was one, Said b. Musaib, who in spite of listening to the orders did not leave the mosque. When pressed hard, he refused, saying, "What! Can the Caliph not suffer one's presence in the mosque—a house dedicated to Allah's worship?" The Caliph arrived, and was entering the gates of the mosque when again he was ordered to get away. The man kept to his seat. The Caliph just came towards him. The couriers instructed him to get up as a mark of respect for the Caliph. The man was stung to the quick, and said, in a true Islamic spirit: "I can't serve two masters at a time. I won't rise. The Caliph ought to have come into the mosque not as a king, but as a commoner. Every distinction sinks into oblivion the time one steps into the House of Allah."

Amr bin Abdul Aziz, a Caliph, and Bitam, a rebel.

On his ascending the throne of Caliphate, Amr bin Abdul Aziz had to face a standard of rebellion raised by Bitam, a Kharijite, due to some differences of opinion. The Caliph wrote a short note to him, which ran as follows:—

DEMOCRACY IN ISLAM

We learn that your sole aim is to regenerate the faith of Islam. We also, let it be known to you, are bending our energies to the same end. Won't you, then, appreciate the idea of holding a debate between both the rival parties? If we can advance convincing arguments, you will have to give allegiance to our authority. But if you get the better of us, we would consider over the matter.

Upon this Bitam commissioned two proxies to the Court of the Caliph. The debate was convened, and the following words passed between the Caliph and the representatives :—

CALIPH: Well, what reasons have you to justify yourself to disturb the peace of the country?

REPRESENTATIVES: You have ridden roughshod the desires and wishes of the people in general and your relatives in particular. You have confiscated their landed properties. If they did a wrong thing, is it not quite justified, according to Islamic jurisprudence, to curse them?

CALIPH: You do not seem to catch the point. I have taken back only what they had received either through unlawful means or because they did not deserve it. I don't see any necessity of upbraiding the unbelievers and wrongdoers, nor is it supported by any verse or authority either of the Qur-án or the Traditions. Did you ever curse Pharaoh Rameses II? Do you believe honestly that it is incumbent upon you to do so?

REPRESENTATIVES: We never curse the Pharaoh, nor is this an article of faith with us.

CALIPH: The matter stands quite clear then. We leave it to you to decide. You don't curse the Pharaoh, an out-and-out enemy of God. Do you think it is in any way lawful to curse those who keep up prayers and observe the month of the Ramzan and give alms? Surely we can punish the transgressors, but can never curse.

REPRESENTATIVES: Well and good. But better for you and us both if you cut off your connections with them.

CALIPH: You have a very beautiful precedent in Hazrat Umar, who released some of the apostates on condition they paid the ransom money. Did you ever segregate yourselves from him?

REPRESENTATIVES: No, surely not.

CALIPH: To quote one more. The Kufites and Basrites once led an army against your ancestors, the Nahrvanites. They put to death many of your ancestors. Did you forsake those people?

REPRESENTATIVES: No.

CALIPH: If that is so, we don't understand why you compel us to do what you did not yourself. One who professes to believe in the oneness of Allah and the prophethood of Muhammad Allah and his Apostle are ready to take one under protection. And

ISLAMIC REVIEW

is it not a pity to find this, that it is only you who refuse to extend your sympathies to believers. Is it, then, the regeneration of Islam you are driving at ?

The proxies could make no reply. They acknowledged in express words their satisfaction, and said : “ We beg to be excused for our outspokenness. We are very much thankful to you for your lending a patient ear to so lengthy a talk.”

A Widow Accusing the Crown Prince in Open Court.

Mamun was once holding the Durbar when there appeared a beautiful woman of an exquisitely fine stature. A child was clinging to her breasts. She cared not for the formal ceremonious etiquette of the Durbar, and at once burst out into tears and cried aloud, saying :—

“ Oh, Caliph, the house of a widow has been seized for no other fault but that she was not ready to sacrifice her chastity at the altar of lust. Do justice to my complaint and keep in view the Day of Judgment where I shall stand up and raise my voice amidst the crowd against you if you don't make good the wrong done to me.”

The courtiers were quite astonished to hear the woman speaking so boldly in the presence of the Caliph.

The Caliph on hearing this complaint was startled, as if taken aback by some unexpected calamity.

“ Well, who has done such a glaring injury to you ? Tell us his name.”

The woman smiled blushing and said, “ Prince Abbas, your son.”

The Caliph had earned a good name for justice. The story told by the woman, by name Mughira, set the blood of Mamun boiling ; his face glowed with anger. He at once ordered Abbas to stand by the side of the plaintiff, so that every distinction be wiped out. Abbas, being guilty, could not clear his position. When he spoke he stammered—a guilty mind makes a failing hand. But Mughira was so

HOLY ANECDOTES

eloquent in giving vent to her wounded feelings that her very face was an evidence of her innocence ; that her very eyes, sparkling with passionate anger, seemed to speak for the wrath in her bosom. So much so, she uttered, addressing the Prince, the following :—

Prince Abbas, I realize full well that you are a Heir-apparent to the throne, but all the same, let it be known to you, that had you ever ventured to lay your hands upon me or even to touch me the day you were out a-hunting just near the stream flowing by my house, these two hands of mine you would have found too prompt to strangle you there and then. Ah ! don't you know I come of the Baramakites ? Don't you think for a moment that, although the Abbasids have succeeded in stamping out the glory of the Baramakites, their women have got so depraved as to surrender their chastity and purity of character for pelf. They prize it so highly that they are ready to sacrifice the whole of the Abassid Empire.

The nobles could not reconcile the audacity of the woman with the forbearance of the Caliph. One of them could not help saying, " Oh, woman ! Such language, such conduct does not become the presence of the Caliph. You are so rude." The Caliph interrupted the nobleman, and said : " Let her say whatever she likes. She has every right, for all this is an outcome of truth." In fine, when, at the request of the Caliph, Mughira gave an unconditional pardon to the Prince, who otherwise would have been punished, the Caliph restored to her the confiscated house, presented to her five big bags full of money and one palace to live in.

ABDUL MAJID.

HOLY ANECDOTES

GOD—THE MAINSTAY OF MAN.

" Say : Surely my prayer, my sacrifice, my life and my death are all for Allah, the Lord of the worlds."—*The Holy Qur-án.*

PERSECUTIONS failed ; persuasions failed. The Prophet could not be weaned off from his mission. Truth had dawned upon him. Could he shake it

ISLAMIC REVIEW

off? The love of the Lord had filled his very soul; what did he care for aught besides? Threats fell as flat on him as lures. There he stood for the cause of Truth, the storm of opposition raging around him. As usual he called his people to the path of virtue, as usual he denounced their debased forms of worship. He was unsparing; he was uncompromising.

How to deal with him—that was now the problem. How to nip the evil in the bud. The point of the sword was the only alternative left, and the Meccans were nothing loath to try it. A body of choice swordsmen was drawn up; the Prophet's house was besieged. It was against the Arab code of chivalry to assault a female quarter. Strict was the watch and ward kept, lest their victim should escape.

Man, they say, proposes, but God disposes. The Meccans proposed one way but Providence disposed otherwise. As the dark hours slowly glided by, drowsiness overtook the besiegers. In the stillness of night the Prophet made good his escape. Under the very nose of the slumbering watchmen, and through their drawn swords, he managed to slip out.

Arrangements for a secret flight had already been made with his bosom friend, Abu Bakr. Straightway he made thither to meet him, and both set out for Medina. In the small hours of the morning they arrived at a cave called Thaur, at a distance of three miles from Mecca. There they concealed themselves to avoid detection.

It was dawn, and the besiegers awoke to find, to their utter dismay, that the bird had flown. Scout parties were dispatched in hot haste in all directions to hunt out the refugee. Following his track, one party got right up to the mouth of the cave. Just a peep inside and the Prophet together with his Message would be no more. Critical as the situation was, his companion of the cave felt alarmed on his master's account. He could not conceal his fears. But as to the Prophet himself, the word fear was

HOLY ANECDOTES

unknown to him. Had he not the Lord for his sole prop? What else could cow him down? His mind was as serene as serene could be. Death was staring him in the face; yet these were the words that came out of the tranquil depths of his soul to console his friend:

GRIEVE YE NOT; FOR SURELY, THE LORD IS WITH US.

Watch him at the field of battle and you notice the same reliance in the Lord. While swords and spears clashed, and volleys of arrows showered, what would the Prophet do? With his forehead on the dust, he would humbly beseech the Lord. Such was his sense of utter dependence on His grace. The soldiers would strut and slaughter, but the General's strength lay elsewhere. He would rub his forehead on the ground or lift his hands up in prayer to the Almighty—the Source of all strength.

At Badr, for instance, where a handful of his followers—three hundred and thirteen in all, and these, too, ill-equipped—were opposed to one thousand strong, he did the same. Ali says that thrice he went round, in the clash and clatter of arms, to see him and each time he found him with his forehead on the ground. He would lift his hands of prayer to Heaven and thus implore the Lord:

LORD! MAKE GOOD THIS DAY YOUR PROMISE TO ME!

LORD! SHOULD THIS HANDFUL OF MUSLIMS PERISH,

YOU WILL NEVER BE WORSHIPPED TILL THE DAY OF RESURRECTION.

Come to his next battle, Uhad, and you find him as usual addressing the Lord with his entreaties, while others were dealing death on all sides. He was assaulted in person, wounded in the cheek and knocked down. His companions, shielding him with their own lives, fell one by one around him. But he knew no other occupation than knock at the door of his Lord.

LORD! FORGIVE MY PEOPLE; FOR SURELY THEY KNOW NOT.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

And when the Meccans, flushed with a momentary upper hand, shouted : " Glory to Hubal ! " he bade the companions shout in reply :

ALLAH IS HIGH AND GLORIOUS.

And when Abu Sufiyan, the leader of the Meccan hosts, cried : " Uzza is ours ! Uzza is not yours ! ", the Prophet told Umar to cry aloud :

THE LORD IS OUR MASTER ; HE IS NOT YOUR MASTER.

At the battle of Ahzab, when a ditch was being excavated around Medina to fortify it against the teeming hosts of the enemy, the Prophet worked as a common labourer, and thus chanted aloud with others :

LORD ! THERE IS NO FELICITY BUT THE FELICITY OF HEREAFTER.
LORD ! BLESS THE HELPERS AND THE REFUGEES !

The same single-minded devotion to and dependence upon the Lord was displayed at the battle of Hunain. His men lost their foothold. Consternation seized the rank and file, who were scattered in utter confusion. At such a juncture the Prophet might be seen recklessly holding to his post, all by himself, with the enemy fast advancing upon him. Jumping off his animal, he called at the top of his voice :

I AM THE MESSENGER OF THE LORD ; IT IS NOT A LIE ;
I AM THE SON OF ABDUL MUTTALIB.

Once it so happened that the Prophet, while on his way to Medina, stopped at noon-time to rest a while under a shady tree. Weary, as he was, he fell asleep. In the meantime, a Beduin, who was on the look-out for an opportunity to take his life, happened to come that way. Finding the Prophet was an easy prey, he caught hold of his sword, which was hanging by the tree. The Prophet awoke, and on opening his eyes he found the man standing at his head, with a drawn sword. " Who can now rescue thee, O Muhammad ? " thundered the would-be assassin. " ALLAH ! " came forth the reply.

WHAT THEY THINK OF US

Once again, and for the last time, we find, as usual, his heart going out to Allah, his Lord. While on his death-bed and in the agonies of death, these were the words on his lips :

“ALLAH ! ALLAH ! THE COMPANION ON HIGH.”

BABAR.

WHAT THEY THINK OF US!

DWELLING in its leader of June 19th on the need of close co-operation between England and France, *The Times* is at pains to point to an imminent common danger—the awakening of the world of Islam :—

We and France are indissolubly joined, for better or for worse, in all the vicissitudes that the new future may bring. In Europe and far beyond there are great questions that can only be successfully faced, if they are faced in common. There must be ways of reconciling the temporary predilections and desires of each country with the fundamental impulse that unites them both. The reconstruction of Europe is a vain dream unless France and England can agree upon the method. *The world of Islam, whose vivid awakening is so largely due to forces reverberating from Western Europe, must drift into chaos unless France and England can unite in a determination to assert the primacy of their civilizing influence.* Issues of world-wide importance were implied in that victory, so hardly won on the battlefield. It was really a matter of securing the keystone of civilization. For France and England to drift apart would be to imperil the whole achievement. Victory has still to be pursued with valour.

Islam and Britain.

It is time to examine the British position in the Middle East. One still meets the Englishman who believes that the Arab, the Turk, the Persian, and other Orientals, “if only they were left to themselves,” really like us, and long for our administration. But this Englishman is proof against atmosphere, and does not know the realities of to-day.

But what is it that we have done ? Why is Islam in particular so sore with us ?

No good is likely to come of this inquiry unless we are prepared to examine the record honestly. If we set out to whitewash ourselves and to prove that the East has in part misunderstood us, and in part been misled by hostile propaganda, we waste ink and convince none.

Let us rather examine our own declarations and our own actions. Above all, let the public learn something of the policy

ISLAMIC REVIEW

that has been carried out in the name of Britain. In this wise we may understand why Britain is disliked and distrusted, even where we still hold that we have not earned that dislike. We may also come to understand that we have made many mistakes, some fraught with great danger to us and to our peace at the present time. By these means we may yet rebuild our ancient reputation and recover the hearts that we have lost.

The Coalition Government formed during a crisis in the war rendered an immense service to mankind. At the same time it committed even during the war a grave blunder, for which Britain has been paying ever since.

RECKLESS PROMISES.

It did not bank enough on victory. Had it lived up to its high professions and believed in victory through fair weather and foul, it would not have compromised with principles in search of support. Promises were flung broadcast to every possible or impossible ally, though these promises were in some cases contradictory and could not be kept. Thus in the Arab world alone we had the Sykes-Picot agreement, the "National Home" declaration to the Jews, and the agreement with King Hussein and our arrangements with his son Feisal. The Venizelist Greeks and the Armenians were given high hopes in regard to Anatolia.

Meantime we shook the enemy by a lofty moral propaganda based on respect for nationality and enthusiasm for humanity. It is now admitted that propaganda immensely contributed to the military success in all theatres of war in 1918. Simultaneously President Wilson came on the scene with his fourteen points. Mankind, like matter, is infinitely divisible. From self-determination for Czecho-Slovaks and Yugo Slavs the descent is easy to the self-determination for Kurds and Chaldeans, or for Tosks, Ghegs, and Kutzo-Vlachs.

What has the British Cabinet, fettered by its own contradictory agreements, done to satisfy the longings it roused in the East by its inspiring propaganda?

Let us put ourselves in the position of some Central Asian Musulman and see how he regards it. I have talked with many, and I shall not overdraw the picture.

After the Armistice we poured troops into the Caucasus, which is largely Musulman. Far across the Caspian we had troops even in famous Merv. At first these had a stabilizing influence, and we announced that we had come to keep the Bolsheviks away. But as soon as the Bolshevik menace began to materialize, it was we who faded away. Why, then, did we go there at all? Islam has its own answer. We went to try to get hold of the Baku oilfields, but we were not prepared to fight for them.

Our northerly front was now in Persia. We persuaded an Anglophil Government of our own creation that we would defend

WHAT THEY THINK OF US

its northern frontier, and with the help of a personal bribe of £180,000, stolen from the British taxpayer, "to popularize the Anglo-Persian Agreement" (Englishmen do not know about this sum which the Foreign Office paid over in 1919, but Islam does), the Anglo-Persian Agreement was signed.

But here again our bluff was called. When the Agreement was being negotiated Denikin was threatening Moscow, and British troops held the Caucasus. Nine months after its signature the Bolsheviks were on the Persian frontier and were cutting Denikin's fleet out of the Persian port where it had taken refuge.

The British troops, after offering vain opposition to a Bolshevik landing at Enzeli, were withdrawn to Kasvin. British troops were also withdrawn from Meshed lest they might come in contact with the Bolsheviks. It was now given out that British troops were in Persia to lend moral support but not to fight. Persian troops under Russian officers were put in front of the British troops and fought the Bolsheviks with varying fortune.

To the Persians it seemed that we continued to keep troops in Persia solely in order to bring pressure upon Persia to ratify the Anglo-Persian Agreement and to enable the "political officers" whom we had sprinkled over the north to interfere in local and tribal affairs with authority and prestige. For nearly three years after the Armistice the Persian Prime Minister was invariably nominated by the British Legation and chose his colleagues to suit the British Minister's wishes!

WITHDRAWAL FROM TEHERAN.

The Bolsheviks meanwhile announced that as soon as the British troops evacuated Northern Persia they would quit Enzeli and Resht. Though we made it plain that in no circumstances would we oppose the Bolsheviks, we yet professed to believe that in some way we were keeping them out of Teheran, and when at last, in the spring of 1921, financial considerations forced us to withdraw from Northern Persia, we first got up a panic, and ordered British businesses to close down and British women and children to quit Teheran.

The actual result of our withdrawal was that the Bolsheviks followed suit, and that for the first time for nearly fifty years the Persian capital is now protected by a purely Persian force with Persian officers. It is also certain that never in the course of its history has the Persian Cossack Division been so efficient as it is to-day.

Though the differences in Islam are deep, there is a unity withal. And even in the Sunni world, above all in India, the ancient fame of Persia gives it a lustre which wins it sympathy to-day. But the fate of Turkey stirs Islam far more deeply. How little the situation is apprehended was shown in the House of Commons not long ago. There was a question of appointing a Commission to inquire into the alleged atrocities committed upon Turkish Christians of Greek race in Asia Minor.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

The late Sir J. Rees suggested that an Indian Musulman should be added to the Commission, believing, doubtless, that if the Commission found the atrocities true the presence of an Indian member would assist India to accept its findings, however unpalatable. No sooner had he made this suggestion than another member urged that in such case a Greek should also be nominated to the Commission. This member utterly failed to understand the deep feeling which exists in Islam that an Allied Commission is a body of Christians animated by a secret inevitable prejudice against Islam, and more particularly against their late enemy, the Turk.

To add a Greek is to add one more Christian, whereas to add an Indian Musulman is to introduce a new element altogether. I trust that my attempt to make this point clear will not be interpreted as an attempt to discredit reports of eye-witnesses as to the sufferings of Greeks in Asia Minor. The American evidence and my own experience of what subject races in Turkey sometimes endure leave me with little doubt that these have been terrible.

But most serious of all is the Caliphate question. Let us make great allowances for wilful misrepresentation, for insincere advocacy by political agitators in India, for the surprising patronage of Hindus, and for the curious compact between the Ali brothers and Gandhi. From these causes we have suffered unjustly. But actually where do we stand?

Before the war we had happily no responsibility for the protection of the Holy Places. During the war, by our patronage of the Sherifian family of Mecca, we came to be regarded as the opponents of the Sultan's Caliphate. To-day the Government of India openly advocates recognition of the Sultan as Caliph, and on March 30th, Lord Curzon in the House of Lords went so far as to describe the Sultan as Caliph.

But what the West fails to see is that Islam now holds us responsible *de facto* for the protection of the Holy Places. We are regarded as the heirs who have succeeded to the Kaiser's well-known hopes of becoming the Christian overlord of the Holy Places of Islam. The Sherifian family, unfavourably known from Samarcand to Mogador to successive generations of pilgrims is regarded as our instrument. It is we who have enthroned its members in Mecca, Baghdad, and Transjordan. And, in the last resort, the protection of Mecca and Medina falls, in the eyes of Islam, on us—a fact which it resents.

Now what risk do Mecca and Medina run?

A very grave risk. It is the fact that since the British Cabinet set up Abdulla beyond the Jordan and Feisal in Irak, nothing much stands between the ravaging of Mecca and Medina by Ibn Saud's Wahabite followers except the £60,000 per annum which the British tax-payer pays Ibn Saud to avert this calamity. That the charm will work permanently is improbable. That

WHAT THEY THINK OF US

when it fails Islam will hold us responsible and that all our enemies will sound a drum throughout Asia is certain.

Before the war it lay with the Sultan to keep the Wahabites from Mecca. And by some miracle of prestige, though the Turkish writ had little actual power in Arabia, he did it. He could never have done it if he had surrounded Ibn Saud by his bitter enemies as we have done. And had he failed it would have been no concern of ours. There are many Musulmans who would bear with more than equanimity to see the Puritan purge of the Wahabites applied to the sinful pilgrim cities of Sunnis and Shias alike. That would be Islam's affair, and would cause such a spiritual ferment as would give the Musulman world an occupation of its own for long.

At present it is our affair. It is a liability of which we must somehow rid ourselves. It is for the British people to realize the perilous adventure in which the Colonial Office has engaged it in Irak, Arabia, and Palestine, and to insist on breaking free. We have given the Arabs and the Jews their chance, and we have reduced Turkey to small dimensions.

Now let us leave them to it, before we have fresh Arab and Kurdish insurrections on our hands, and before we have to ask the General Staff to think out a scheme for defending Holy Places.—*The Times*, July 10, 1922.

League of Nations Union.

LIVELY DEBATE IN LETCHWORTH ON THE PALESTINE MANDATE.

As mentioned in our news notes of last week, an event of exceptional interest took place at the Museum Buildings on Wednesday, June 14th, in the form of a debate between supporters of Zionism and the Palestine Arabs. Mr. Barry Parker, J.P., presided, and called upon the speaker for the Arab side to open the discussion.

Mr. KAMAL-UD-DIN, a gentleman both tall and stout, with bronzed complexion, pitch-black hair, expressive gestures and voluble speech, and wearing the turban of his race and religion, rose to speak. He said at once that he was not a native of Palestine or of Arabia, but came from Kashmir, in the north of India. He was a member of the League of Nations Union, and came at the invitation of the local branch to offer objections to the proposal to re-settle the Jews in Palestine.

First, he recognized that the Arabs and the Jews were of one kin, in that they were alike descended from "father Abraham." But they were nevertheless two nations now, with different religions, traditions, customs and ideas, and the proposal of Zionism was to put a stranger in the land of Palestine (or father Philistina) inhabited for centuries by the Arabs. The Jews are said to want a "National Home"; but why should one be found for them at the expense of another nation?

ISLAMIC REVIEW

The Zionists say, said the speaker, that their return to Palestine has been foretold, and is in accord with Divine commands. He would show, however, from Scripture and history, that the Arabs, and not the Jews, had had the longest and firmest tenure of the country. Beginning with Abraham, the father of both races, a native of Chaldea, he remarked that the Hebrew descendants of this patriarch—Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph—moved westwards, and settled and multiplied in Egypt. After hundreds of years, Moses liberated “the sons of the bondage” and led them for forty years’ wanderings to the view of the Promised Land; but neither he nor any of the generation of the Exodus set a foot in Palestine. Joshua did a little better, and took a few towns, and David later on managed to establish the throne for himself and his son Solomon; but the national career of the Jews in Palestine ended with the Babylonian conquest, and did not last at the most more than three hundred years.

The claim of Zionism was to restore the Jews to their former dignity and pomp, but it was necessary to consider this idea from the Christian as well as the Jewish point of view. Biblical history showed that the Jews were punished and expelled from Palestine because of their persistent disobedience to God, persecution and disregard of His prophets, and rejection of His Messiah. When Jesus came, the Jews misunderstood him, and some even desired him to become their King and leader on the old lines. For this rejection they were further and finally punished and dispersed, as was made clear in the Gospel: “The Kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof” (Matt. xxi. 43). “Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord” (xxiii. 39).

The Muslims, unlike the Jews, treated all prophets with equal respect; the Qur-án, as was shown by a citation, made no distinctions. “And this was Our argument which We gave to Abraham against his people; We exalt in dignity whom We please; We gave to him Isaac and Jacob; each did We guide, and Noah, David and Solomon and Job and Joseph and Moses and Aaron; and Zacharias and John and Jesus and Elias; every one was of the good” (chap. vi. sec. 10). The Jews rejected Jesus and Mohammed; the Muslims accepted both, and the Christians only one. Neither of the two latter could restore the Jews to Palestine and at the same time be true to their faith.

The idea that Palestine was the proper “National Home” of the Jews was not, said the speaker, an original part of Zionism. Zionism was a spiritual concept, and the leader and founder of the movement even held it consistent with its principle to settle the Jews in Uganda. It was a poetical, not a geographical aspiration, and there was no reason why the Jews should not

WHAT THEY THINK OF US

be settled anywhere that was suitable to them ; Palestine, however, was already inhabited by 600,000 of the Arab race, with whom the Jews were incompatible. The Jews, as already said, were established in Palestine for three hundred years ; but if previous residence gave a title, the Arabs might claim Spain, which they had ruled for nine hundred years. The Jewish occupation of Palestine was a mere sojourn ; the Arabs lived there for thirteen hundred years. So much for the idea of the National Home.

The claim of the Jews to Palestine was not only based on tradition, but on an alleged promise or bargain made during the war by Lord Balfour. It was true this announcement had been made, but it was a violation of previous promises made to the Arabs that the " Holy Places " of their faith—Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem—should not fall into alien hands. Moreover, the settlements made since the war insured a degree of independence to Arabia, Mesopotamia, and Syria, but the contemplated settlement of Palestine by Jews would deny it to the Palestine Arabs.

The present population of Palestine was computed at 600,000 Mohammedan Arabs, 85,000 Christian Arabs, and 70,000 Jews. It was agricultural, not commercial or industrial. The Jews were notoriously not agricultural, but financial, and the fear was that the small farmers of Palestine would soon lose their titles by sale to the new-comers. It would be like yoking the weak with the strong, and trouble would ensue.

If it was a question of " sacred memories," they all had them—there were tombs of patriarchs and prophets revered by three religions ; but while the Jews were the least tolerant, the Mohammedans were the most so ; at the Holy Sepulchre they alone could be trusted to keep the keys. Why, then, should a new element be forced in, to bring the Palestine Arabs under subjection ?

Dr. SALAMAN, when called upon to reply, stated it was difficult to deal with so discursive a speech as they had heard, but as he had been a Zionist for about five years and had served as Medical Officer to the Jewish Regiment in Palestine, he claimed a closer knowledge of the conditions than his opponent appeared to have. He was obliged to contradict with emphasis several statements of an archæological nature that they had heard with regard to the Temple site, the Ark of the Covenant, and the Tomb of Abraham. Also, according to his experience, the Mohammedans were nothing like so tolerant as the Arab speaker had claimed, notwithstanding the doctrine of the Qur-án in that respect. It was absurd of the Arabs to base their claim to Palestine on their respect for the prophet Jesus and then to call his followers " dogs "—as they did.

The speaker dismissed as a pure invention the story put forward as to a financial " deal " between Lord Rothschild and Mr. Balfour. Moreover, he claimed a " sojourn " of the Jews

ISLAMIC REVIEW

in Palestine of at least 1,300 years, instead of the 300 allowed them by his opponent. As to Zionism, it was not the "purely religious ideal" it had been stated to be, but an attempt to re-establish Jewish national life in an atmosphere free from all hostility. This the Jews for two thousand years had not enjoyed in any country in the world.

The Arab speaker had said his race were agricultural; but only 10 per cent. of the land of Palestine, after all their tenure, was cultivated. He had said they were poor and humble, and would be exploited by rich Jews; but even now the best lands, like the plains of Esdraelon and Jezreel, were owned by great Arab landlords and worked by the poor. It was the former who were raising objection to Jewish penetration; not the latter, who worked harmoniously with all the existing Jewish colonists. Arab agriculture was utterly primitive, the people were almost entirely illiterate, unhealthy, and ill-clad and ill-fed; indeed, the only bright spots in Palestine were the sixty Jewish colonies, where food was abundant, industry advancing, and the so-called "incompatibility" of the races not so marked.

The speaker denied that the British word had been given to the Arabs and broken. On the contrary, promises had been made that the latter would help in removing the Turkish power, but no Palestine Arab helped in the war, except so far as they helped themselves to whatever they liked in the British camp. The Jews did rise, however, and formed the regiment with which he had the honour to serve.

Dealing with the figures of population advanced by the other side, Dr. Salaman affirmed that the inhabitants in question were not Arabs, but only a mixed people of Arabic speech; there was no trustworthy census return, but the Jewish colonies were known to contain 80,000 persons. They did not come as conquerors or as propagandists, but as settlers, reclaimers and civilizers, and everything they did for the country would benefit the inhabitants already there. The Jews, dispersed as they were, had benefited the world, and produced many men of genius, notably in the present generation—Bergson, Freud, and Einstein. They could do even more if those of them who wished to go were settled in Palestine.

At the conclusion of the statement of the Jewish case, the hour being late, there was only time for a few questions, and these were answered in admirable manner by Mr. Leonard Stein. He said there would be no seizure of land or dispossession; purchase in the open market would be, as it had been, the only means of acquisition, and for this every one would have an equal opportunity. No injury could accrue to the Arabs; first, because Palestine was virtually empty, and there could be no need to displace anyone. Secondly, there was no desire to do so, all rights had been fairly purchased; and thirdly, there was no power, for the Mandate secured the supremacy of British power and the protection of the existing people of the country.

FATHER DEGAN ON ISLAMIC MORALS

After a brief reply had been given by Mr. Kamal-ud-Din, a vote of thanks to the speakers terminated the meeting.—
The Citizen, June 23, 1922.

FATHER DEGAN ON ISLAMIC MORALS

COPY of Mr. Waheed-ud-Din Green's letter to the Rev. Father Dagan in connection with the latter's reflection on Islamic morals in the course of his address at Coalville :—

DEAR SIR,

According to the *Sunday Chronicle*, you are reported to have made the following statement during an address :—

"To men I say : Spend your money on your wives. Harpies levy blackmail. God knows and sees all. Remember that you are citizens of Christian England and not of Mohammedan Turkey."

If your words are as stated above, I can only regard them as a slur upon the character of Mohammedans, and therefore as an English Muslim I should like to reply to you.

In Christian England, and in all countries under Christian rule, you will find that prostitution is rampant, and your churches with all their teachings have utterly failed to stop it. A prostitute is unknown in a Muslim country under entire Muslim rule, and this statement is supported by the fact that "Constantinople" is partly under Christian rule and partly under Muslim rule. In the Christian portion, prostitutes are found in the streets at all times ; in the Muslim portion they are not found or allowed.

A few days ago when talking to a Church of England minister, who is well versed in Oriental religions, he somewhat surprised me by making the following remark : "There are two things in Islam that I greatly admire, first its strictly moral code, and secondly its respect for women."

It is unusual for a Christian minister to admit the truths of Islam, and I can only say, "Thanks be to Allah" that at least one can admit the truth.

Unfortunately many ministers speak without any knowledge of Islam or its teachings, and although we regret this want of honesty in this direction, we do not retaliate by casting slurs upon *their* teachings.

Christianity has much to learn from Islam, and might with advantage copy the Muslims in their purity of mind and action.

In conclusion, I would ask you (if within your power to do so) to read this letter in the same church or building in which your statement was made, and thus show to us the same consideration which we would show to you.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

I am sending a copy of the *Sunday Chronicle* and also of this letter to the Imam of the Mosque at Woking.

Should you care to make me a personal reply, I shall respect it, and any point you might like to raise I will do my utmost to reply to.

I have the honour to remain,

Yours respectfully,

H. WAHEED-UD-DIN GREEN.

“INDIA IN THE BALANCE” CORRESPONDENCE

MR. B. GIBSON writes from Jonsered, Sweden :—

The book is a highly interesting one. Very well-written and full of fresh facts. It was very refreshing to read the books on Islam. We Christians, even if we are, as I am, free from Christianity, have so many prejudices—inherited from the schoolbooks—against Islam that I was gladly astonished to see the rich soul of Islam. It is a fine religion, and most probably the best way to the international brotherhood, as Islam is more international than the other Semitic world religion to which I nominally belong. (We in Sweden are so little advanced that we must be a member of a church, even if we, as I and my family, have a real dislike for the Churches.) If the League of Nations should have a religion, then this religion must be Islam. But Islam will never be strong and reformed so long as the Islamic Powers and peoples are politically unfree.

We may for this reason hope that you will regain your old freedom from Morocco to India, and in India produce many wonderful men, new Akbars in the free Hindu-Islamic India. Is there, from a religious point of view, a richer country than India? No country on earth can compete with India, and thirty to fifty years hence will India be the leading Power. We Europeans will now sink to an abyss, since there will be a new war or new wars. And this sinking of Europe and her causes will give India one lesson: the necessity of the Hindu-Moslem unity.

Forgive me to have written such a long letter.

Mr. R. A. Bush writes :—

I have now finished reading your book *India in the Balance*. It seems to me to be an exceedingly able and a very powerful presentation of the position from a Muslim point of view. It is, of course, an *ex parte* statement of the case, but it is not any the less valuable because of that. Only by considering dispassionately all *ex parte* statements can one arrive at truth and justice in any cause and in any subject. I think that it is most important that the English people should get to know of your book, so clearly and concisely written, and also that our people

“INDIA IN THE BALANCE”

should be induced, if possible, to take a greater interest in Indian affairs.

Mr. Leland Buxton writes :—

Please accept my best thanks for the copy of your excellent book which you have so kindly sent me, and which I have read with great interest.

I think it is a most valuable contribution to the subject, and I shall do my utmost to make it known.

It seems to me that the vital question at present in our relations with Turkey is that of Adrianople. If the British Government would cease to support the Greek claims to that city, there would be some chance of peace in the Near East ; and I am glad that your book will help to enlighten the British public—so easily misled by the mendacious Greek propaganda—on the extremely important question of Thrace.

The Rt. Hon. Lord Raglan, G.B.E., C.B., writes :—

I am much obliged to you for your book, which, having lived for many years in close acquaintance with Arab Muslims, I have read with great interest.

I am in general sympathy with your attitude towards the Turkish and Caliphate questions, but regret that you thought fit to bring in the question of Gandhi and the Amritsar “ massacre,” etc., in regard to which I, as well as many other well-wishers of Islam, cannot be expected to share your views.

On the whole I may say that I regard those questions of your book as very valuable, and the remainder as, shall I say, somewhat unnecessary.

It is a temptation to review it at greater length, but I will refrain.

Lt.-Col. Hon. Cuthbert James, O.B.E., M.P., writes :—

I thank you for your courtesy in sending me your work *India in the Balance* for perusal.

As you justly remark, a great deal of apathy and much misunderstanding prevails in England on the subject of the Indian situation, generally, and the Caliphate question in particular ; much of the misunderstanding in my opinion being due to wilful misrepresentations of facts and seditious propaganda. The Treaty of Sévres gave the propagandists an easy excuse, with the results already known.

Having spent some years of my life in a Moslem country, and appreciating as I do the depth of Moslem religious beliefs, I welcome your contribution as coming from one whom I have always understood to be broad-minded, literate and temperate in the expression of his views.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Dr. E. H. Griffin, M.D., D.S.O., M.C., writes :—

I am much indebted to you for sending me a copy of your interesting book, *India in the Balance*, which I am particularly glad to have.

Unfortunately we all know only too well that the question of the Caliphate, with all it implies for millions of citizens of the British Empire, is misunderstood and often misrepresented in this country. Therefore the clear and authoritative exposition of the subject which you are able to give is undeniably of great value and importance. For this reason I trust your book, which I have read with very great interest, will have the wide circulation it deserves, and most certainly I will do anything within my power to call attention to it.

Brig.-Gen. A. C. Bailward writes :—

Having read your book, I find myself quite in agreement with you as regards the bad faith shown by our present Government towards Turkey, and the evil effects which their policy is likely to have on the position of this country in the East.

Colonel Algernon Durand, C.B., C.I.E., writes :—

I am much obliged to you for the copy of your book, *India in the Balance*, which I have read with much interest.

I had so many Mohammedan friends in India that it has been a great source of regret to me to think that any cloud should arise between us as the result of the War and the subsequent treaties.

One can only hope that in the end sane counsels will prevail.

Colonel Sir Charles E. Yates, Bt., C.S.I., C.M.G., M.P., writes :—

I have to thank you for your letter of the 20th, and for so kindly sending me a copy of your book, *India in the Balance*.

I have read it with much interest, as I have always been a strong advocate for the return of Smyrna and Eastern Thrace to Turkey and for the Bulgarians to be given their exit to the Ægean Sea at Dedeagatch.

I am one of those who desire to see the old friendly relations with Turkey restored that have existed since the time of the Crimean War, and I hope you will kindly write and tell me how you think this can best be done.

Captain E. N. Bennett, J.P., writes :—

Please accept my sincere thanks for your kind present of *India in the Balance*.

The moderation, sincerity and reasonableness of what you write will, I feel sure, appeal to any fair-minded reader, and I shall certainly recommend the book to my acquaintances. As you probably know, I have personally been in full sympathy

“INDIA IN THE BALANCE”

with your views for many years. With renewed thanks and best wishes.

Sir E. Denison Ross, K.C.I.E., PH.D., writes :—

Thank you very much for so kindly sending me the copy of *India in the Balance*, which is an admirable piece of work, and if widely read should do much to enlighten the public here.

With regard to the Caliphate question, in my view the main consideration is not the right possessed by the Sultan to be regarded as the Caliph of Islam, but the fact that the Sultan of Turkey has been regarded by many millions of Muhammadans as the *de facto* Caliph; and no amount of historical data can either strengthen or remove that belief.

If you are publishing a revised edition of your book, I should like to send you one or two notes of a purely historical nature. I cannot refrain from complimenting you on your command of the English language.

Sir Graham Bower, K.C.M.G., writes :—

I have read, somewhat hastily, your book, *India in the Balance*, and am keeping it to read more carefully and attentively on a sea voyage which I propose taking in July. I consider that in explaining Islam to the British people you are rendering a great service not only to the Empire, but to humanity and to the peace of the world. More than that : you are rendering a great service to Christianity. For both Christianity and Islam are religions of peace, and the basis of all peace is mutual understanding and mutual sympathy. Religion or racial antagonisms are the negation of Christianity.

It is highly important that each race and each religion should be free to work out its own salvation in its own way—without dictation from outside. For instance, the intrusion of Christian speakers and writers into the question of the Caliphate is as presumptuous and as foolish as would be the intrusion of Moslem writers into the question of the papal supremacy. The Moslems are the only judges of the succession to the Caliphate.

I need hardly inform you that I deplore the Greek invasion of Thrace and Asia Minor, and the attempt to convert Palestine into a national home for the Jews. To attempt the restoration of conditions that existed 2,000 years ago is to attempt the impossible. If it was universally adopted as a policy it would require the restoration of England to the Ancient Britons and America to the Red Indians. There can be no peace that is not based on justice; and wars of conquest and of religion or racial domination are unjust. To impose Greek or Jewish domination in Thrace or Asia Minor or Syria or Palestine is to provoke future wars of liberation and of revenge for the outrages committed by the invaders.

This is not the road to peace. It is the negation both of the Christian and the Moslem peace, and if there be any truth

ISLAMIC REVIEW

in religion it involves the judgment of God on the nations guilty of such a defiance of the principles of justice and morality.

It has been your aim to free England from such a reproach, and I wish every success to your efforts in the cause of truth, justice and patriotism.

Mr. Arthur Boutwood, M.A., writes :—

This book, by the learned and courteous Imam of the Mosque at Woking, is a temperate and illuminating exposition of the Muslim case against the British Government. It is convincing, and it leaves one wondering. In the name of all that is reasonable, *why* has the British Government acted as though it were the enemy of Islam ?

Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din is not a politician. He is a teacher of religion who has been compelled, by his religious duty, to take part in political affairs. This latest book of his is at once a religious exposition of Muslim politics, and a political expression of the Muslim conscience. In each aspect it is admirable. It should be read by everyone—by all who have to take part in the government of India, and by every man in England who has influence on public policy or a voice in the shaping of public policy.

This trouble is, in England people do not *think*, and do not want to *know*. They mean well, but they are ignorant, and they will not take trouble. They have not yet learned the lesson—though events have taught it emphatically—that the great equities of “the Imperial idea” cannot be established and maintained except by vigilance and effort on their part. Yet only by those equities can one justify the existence of the Empire.

Recent British policy in the East has been a failure—a failure dangerous and humiliating. It is high time that the British Government “cut its losses.” Especially should it satisfy the conscience of Muslim India, for where the conscience is affronted there cannot be unity.

I, for one, find it hard to disagree with Kamal-ud-Din when he contends that the Muslims would make the best guardians of the Holy Places in Palestine. It is much to be regretted that the Christian Churches in England have become polemical for mediæval policies.

Among the appendices to the book are a paper, “The Penalty of Apostacy in Islam,” and the written statement which was read by Mahatma Gandhi when on trial. In the body of the book there is the notable “appeal” published by Mr. S. Srinavasa Iyengar after the trial. That appeal should be studied carefully and candidly by every public man in Great Britain. Only one thing more will I say. It is impossible to believe that the atheistic politics of Christendom are the “last word” of political wisdom. For our salvation in this world and the next, we Westerners must rebaptize ourselves in that Eastern spirit which

“INDIA IN THE BALANCE”

is a miracle still vivid in the New Testament. Is there no one in England big enough to make England's Christianity scriptural and England's policy *English*?

The book is published by the *Islamic Review*, at the Mosque, Woking. The price of the book (including postage) is 4s.

Sir M. Abbas Ali Baig, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., LL.D., writes :—

Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din's new book, *India in the Balance*, conveys a warning to the people of Great Britain against the danger of debasing the value of British pledges given in their name and in the hour of their need to their Muslim fellow-subjects. The author's authoritative elucidation of the doctrines and principles of Islam in their bearing upon international and inter-racial relations, and especially upon the attitude of Muslim India is in complete accord with the most exacting standards of loyalty to a Christian Sovereign when his temporal authority rests on the twin pillars of justice and equality between his subjects of diverse creeds. There may be differences of opinion in regard to some of the facts mentioned in the book and their implications, but the writer's sincerity of purpose in deprecating the disastrous consequences of religious or political bigotry and blind prejudice is not open to any challenge. He analyses with singular vigour and candour, springing from the strength of his convictions, the causes which have unhappily changed the firm and confiding reliance of the Muslims of India on British righteousness and sense of fair dealing into a resentful and deepening feeling of mistrust.

In view of the successful appeal to Muslim loyalty which, with enthusiastic alacrity, rallied around the British Throne and ranged itself against the Sultani Caliph, on the strength of British assurances as to the inviolability of the cherished ideals of Islam, the disclosure of the abortive pact with Tsarist Russia for handing over the seat of the Khilafat to the arch enemy of Islam, and the covert understandings which have culminated in the unratified Treaty of Sèvres, have raised the apprehension whether Machiavelian perfidy without “the master's finesse” would be allowed to stain the record of British statesmanship. A ray of light and hope, however, illumines the author's gloomy survey of recent events. He trusts that wise and conciliatory statesmanship may yet readjust and harmonize the conflicting interests which are now disturbing the peace of the world; that modern religious thought may yet bridge “the great gulf between Christianity and Islam”; and that Christian and Muslim may yet dwell together in peace, and recognize “the faith of the other” as a branch of the same “Tree of Life.” In his view “things are not hopeless if the British Government will only change its course.”

The author's plea for the promotion of mutual goodwill not

ISLAMIC REVIEW

only between the Arab and the Turk, but also between the Muslim and the non-Muslim is characteristic of the higher Catholicity which Islam inculcates and which is also in accord with the teachings of Jesus.

At a time when the conscience of the British public is showing signs of uneasiness at the sinister development of political Zionism in an aggressive form, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din's observations, based on his personal experience of the conditions in Palestine, may serve a useful purpose in exposing the sophistries which seek to mask the virtual repudiation of the War pledge given in 1915 to the indigenous Arab population of that unhappy land *prior* to the Balfour Declaration of 1917. It is obvious from the author's searching examination of the problem that the consideration which is held to justify the exclusion of His Majesty's Indian subjects from the Dominions, namely, the right of the majority to determine the character and composition of the population of their homeland, is *reversed* in the case of the unfortunate Arabs, who are being forced, under the authority of a still unsanctioned "mandate" to submit to an increasing influx of a foreign and uncongenial element, which threatens to destroy the cherished traditions of the children of the soil.

The author points out that as the Jews do not venerate Christian shrines, and the Christians attach no sanctity to the sacred places of Islam, the claim of the Muslims, whose all-embracing creed enjoins equal veneration for the holy places of the three religions founded on the faith of Abraham, to the protection of all the sanctuaries in Palestine, rests on unassailable moral grounds. To the Muslim, every place "of importance in Jerusalem is holy," whether it be the Temple of Solomon, the Holy Sepulchre, or the Mosque of Omar.

The author's vindication of the Ottoman Khilafat is supported by ample historical evidence. The idea that the right to the Khilafat should be confined exclusively to a single Arab tribe is shown to be obviously inconsistent with the fundamental principle of equality, which constitutes the democratic basis of Islam. The author points out that the simple but comprehensive words of the Qur-án "who believe and do good" sum up the main qualification for the most exalted position in the Muslim world.

SOME PRESS REVIEWS

THIS work is noteworthy as the first detailed study published in this country from the pen of an Islamic divine on the vexed problem of a settlement with Turkey. The author, always a devout Moslem, gave up practice at the Indian Bar some ten years ago on selection to be the leader of the Moslem religious organization centred round the Mosque at Woking. Since the war he has travelled extensively in India and other Eastern lands, and one of his first undertakings on returning to his Imamship at Woking is to write this exposition of his views.

“INDIA IN THE BALANCE”

Unlike such fiery spirits as the Ali Brothers, the Moulvie is no irreconcilable. It says something for the broad “live and let live” spirit of the home-staying Englishman that one who came here not only to rally the sojourning Faithful to religious observance but also to proselytize (his converts including a peer of the realm) should frankly admit that life in England has greatly changed his impression of the English people. The effect of atmosphere, especially with non-cooperation rife in India, is shown in the further observation that this impression is almost “fundamentally different from what it used to be—and what it is still apt to be, I am afraid, when I am in India. . . .”

The claims made on behalf of the Turkish Caliphate are far-reaching. They comprise not only the fulfilment of the oft-quoted pledge of Mr. Lloyd George in January, 1918, but also a real suzerainty over the Holy Places—Jerusalem as well as Mecca and Medina. The Moulvie is manifestly anxious to promote good will, and he does well to emphasize the points of contact between Christian and Moslem. Though his interpretations of the Islamic law are rigid, he even looks to the Modernist movement here to provide a way of what Lord Ronaldshay would term synthesis between the two religions—the coming of a day “when Christian and Moslem will dwell together as brothers, each gladly recognizing in the Faith of the other a veritable branch of the Tree of Life that was in the midst of the Garden.”—*The Times*, June 19, 1922.

The present state of India and recent controversy on British policy with regard to the future of Turkey invest a volume on British rule and the Caliphate with special interest just now. *India in the Balance* is from the pen of Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, B.A., LL.B., Imam of the Mosque, Woking, and is issued from the office of the *Islamic Review*. The author takes a comprehensive view of the subject, and makes an appeal to the innate sense of justice, honesty and fair play of the English people to study Indian questions in view of problems which urgently call for solution. He does not hesitate to say that his Majesty's Government do not know one-hundredth part of what is actually going on in India, and he deals at length with British policy with regard to Turkey and the Caliphate. He is at a loss to understand how the weakening of Turkish rule can be expected to contribute to the solidarity of the British Empire, and reminds the Government that the Moslems are in a majority under them, and are more sensitive in religious matters than any other people in the world. He does not fail to emphasize the argument that the separate peace procured by France and Italy with Turkey created a new position, and, after referring to the attitude of M. Poincaré, asks: “Who, then, is at war with Turkey; and who is it that is constantly and conscientiously opposing the Moslem demands?” adding that the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

answer is obvious. The author passes lightly over the Turkish atrocities in Armenia, and, when quoting an article in which Mr. S. Srinavasa Iyengar eulogizes Mahatma Gandhi and his "radiant gospel of truth and work," says: "This is not unrest in the commonly accepted political significance of the word. You cannot deal with a man like this as you would deal with a street-corner agitator or a bomb-throwing lunatic. It signifies, on the other hand, a vast unmistakably national movement—coherent and ordered," etc. It is obvious that the author's sympathies are with the views of Lord Reading and Mr. Montagu rather than with the policy of the Home Government, and he reiterates his belief that the latter is not fully alive to the real urgency of things in India. There is much in the volume which will not commend itself to all readers, but on the principle of "hearing both sides," *India in the Balance* will repay perusal.—*Bristol Evening News*, June 20, 1922.

Khawaja Kamal-ud-Din, B.A., LL.B., Imam of the Mosque, Woking, in his new book, asks who or what is to blame for the unrest in India?

Khawaja Kamal-ud-Din, lawyer, philosopher and divine, a leader in the intellectual life of modern India, gives an answer to the question. Approaching the subject from a point of view, consistent alike with that of the devout Muslim, the patriotic Indian, and a true well-wisher of the British Empire, he propounds his reason and remedy, and throws light on causes, many of them unsuspected or undreamed of by the average Briton, which, he says, have led to the recent crisis.

He contrasts the Eastern conception of religion with that of the West, and points out the mischief arising from the latter's confusion of religion with politics, and its effect to-day upon the Muslims of India.

The book treats of Muslim loyalty, prior to, and in spite of, Lord Curzon's Bengal partition scheme, and shows how that loyalty still survived the incessant strain imposed by misguided statesmanship.

With the outbreak of the Great War, this same loyalty to the British Crown induced Indian Muslims to take up arms against the temporal Head of their religion. The leaking out of the secret pact with Russia concerning the fate of Constantinople caused unrest, and the implied bargain by which it was allayed produced a sequel.

Disillusionment followed on the terms dictated to Turkey, as did the militant Christianity of English politicians with regard to Adrianople, Smyrna and the "Minorities."

The Caliphate—or Headship of the Sultan of Turkey over the Muslims of the world—has very real significance in Muslim eyes. The writer argues that Jerusalem is a holy place with Muslims no less than with Christians, and that Muslim and Christian susceptibilities are at one in resisting the scheme of

“INDIA IN THE BALANCE”

Zionism embodied in the Balfour declaration.—*Birmingham Weekly Post*, June 24, 1922.

A useful, very temperate book, *India in the Balance*, by the Imam of the Mosque, Woking (published by the *Islamic Review*, Woking), explains the condition of Moslem feeling in India, and why it is gravely disturbed by the anti-Turk and pro-Greek policy of the Government. All who care to understand the causes of the unrest in India, evidenced by the Gandhi movement and other startling symptoms, will obtain here considerable enlightenment.—*The Star*, June 23, 1922.

The spiritual chief of the Muslims in London seeks to enlighten English public opinion on Indian problems, as seen from the native point of view, and his well-written book ought to be read with respectful attention by lovers of the British Empire. The author is a scholar and barrister, a philosopher and divine, who though “one of the foremost figures in the intellectual life of modern India, whose name carries weight and authority in every part of the Muslim world,” has not previously touched politics. He does so now in the loyal hope of bringing about a better understanding between Britain and the Indian Empire, “when Christian and Muslim will dwell together as brothers, each gladly recognizing in the Faith of the other a veritable branch of that Tree of Life that was in the midst of the Garden.”—*International Psychic Gazette*, July, 1922.

Any attempt to unravel the tangled skein of Indian politics and to enlighten European opinion thereon is peculiarly welcome just now. In *India in the Balance*, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, the Imam (priest) of the Woking Mosque, sets out to clear away the doubts that assail and to correct the perspectives that distort the European view. The grave misconceptions as to the Islamic faith and what it stands for are, he says, still prevalent in England, and he alleges the indifference of the British people to Moslem susceptibilities—an indifference largely due to inaccurate and meagre information—as the root cause of the trouble.

The writer himself sees no insurmountable barrier to the ideal of a united India, obvious as are the practical difficulties; such an aspiration, indeed, is cherished by educated Indians, Moslem and Hindu alike—but there is always the Treaty of Sévres and the “real and desperate anxiety” arising from its provisions as affecting the Caliphate and the integrity of Turkey. What he does see is the urgency of a problem to which the home Government is not, he declares, fully alive—the ever-increasing peril of delay which may prompt a step that can scarcely fail to result in an outlook new and sinister for British rule in India.

If the British Government is to continue in its present position, he concludes, British statesmen must always keep in

ISLAMIC REVIEW

view the fact that the Moslems are in a majority under them, and are more sensitive in religious matters than any other people in the world. Steps should be taken forthwith to allay differences and disputes between Christians and Moslems in everyday civil life at least, and if there are Moslem rulers who do not adhere to the law of Islam in practice, it would surely be better to compel them under the commands of their religion to improve their ways than to devise plans of the kind suggested by the Paris Peace Conference, which can only serve as a perennial apple of discord, keeping the Moslem and the Christian communities at daggers drawn for all time.—*South Wales News*, June 29, 1922.

The Muslim side of the great problem of Indian discontent is presented, on the whole, with studied moderation in *India in the Balance*, by Khwaja Kamal-ud-din, LL.B. (3s. 6d. net). The writer practised for several years as a barrister in India, but for ten years has devoted himself entirely to religion as Imam of the Mosque at Woking. Whilst defending Gandhi and his fellow-agitators in India, he professes ardent loyalty to the British Crown. But he appeals to the Government, and to Englishmen in general, to consider the Muslim position with insight and sympathy, particularly in regard to Turkey and the future of the holy places in the East. His case is that the pledge of the British Government that no people in India should be placed at any disadvantage after the war on account of their religion has been broken. To Muslims it appears that the Treaty of Sèvres is a victory for Christianity to the detriment of Islam. This is his central point:—

“If Greeks and Armenians are the co-religionists of the smaller community under British rule, the Turks are co-religionists of the greater. . . . If the plea of Christian interests being in danger has from time to time justified British interference in the government of other countries, then the question of the Caliphate surely justifies the Muslims of India in requesting their Government (which is the British Government) to interfere in the matter on their behalf. . . . But what an irony of fate and faith! The very body to which the Muslim in India looks for help turns out to be his adversary.”

Muslims, we are reminded, are as anxious for the preservation of the holy places, including Jerusalem, as Christians, and the plea made here is that the Turkish Caliphate shall be strictly maintained. His contention as a Muslim is put into the form of a question: In what way can the weakening of Turkish rule be expected to contribute to the solidarity of the British Empire?—*The Yorkshire Post*, July 5, 1922.

The *Islamic Review* publishes from the pen of Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, B.A., LL.B., Imam of the Mosque at Woking, England, *India in the Balance: British Rule and the Caliphate*, which discusses the vital problems with which the British Empire is

“INDIA IN THE BALANCE”

faced at the present time, including the spirit of unrest and ever-growing dissatisfaction with things as they are, and as they seem likely to be, everywhere active among the Muslim subjects of the King-Emperor, and more especially among the Mohammedans of India.

In this book Khwaja Kamal-ud-din approaches the subject from a strictly impartial point of view. He shows very convincingly both the reason and the remedy, and throws a flood of light on the causes, many of them unsuspected or undreamed of by the average Englishman, which have led to the present crisis. The author has an intimate and first-hand knowledge of present-day conditions and feeling among all classes in India, and his book is one that should be studied carefully by every man and every woman whose mental purview is not bounded by the cricket field or the cinema.

In the foreword is contrasted the Eastern conception of religion with that of the West, and it points out the mischief arising from the latter's confusion of religion with politics, and its effect to-day upon the Muslims of India; while in Chapter I is described, from Qur-anic teaching and the history of Islam, the essential principles of Muslim civilization, its conception of duty on the part of the ruler as well as of the ruled, and illustrates the practical application of those principles, touching also on the Muslim attitude towards foreign rulers and the conditions which make such rule irksome.

The book should remove the cloud of deliberate misrepresentation that has of late years made a byword of Turkish government; and shows that in actual practice and the handling of problems of racial and religious complexity, “Turkish misrule” is no unworthy model for more “up-to-date” administrations. In conclusion the author sums the situation, as it is to-day, both in its political and religious aspects, and shows how impending disaster, brought about by ignorance and misunderstanding, may yet be removed.—*Dublin Herald*, June 24, 1922.

This is the title of a useful and timely contribution to the controversy aroused in Moslem India by the treatment of Turkey under the Treaty of Sèvres. It is the work of Mr. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, Imam of the Mosque, Woking, and one of the foremost figures in the intellectual life of India. In a spirit of sweet reasonableness, he presents the Moslem case from the point of view of a well-wisher of the British Empire. The author sums up the situation in its religious and political aspects and discloses the increasing peril of the present position in India, as he sees it. Apart from the immediate purpose which the book is intended to serve, it gives a large amount of interesting information about the Caliphate and the Moslem conception of Government. *India in the Balance* is published by *The Islamic Review*, The Mosque, Woking, at 3s. 6d.—*Edinburgh Evening News*, June 28, 1922.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

The trouble in India is attributed in this book to Britain's treatment of Turkey, and the author quotes with approval the words of Sir Henry Wilson that "friendly relations with the Turks are essential to the peace of India." He argues that the tension among the Indian Muslims would be greatly allayed by creating a better understanding between the Arabs and the Turks, and he claims that the latter have not ill-used their non-Muslim subjects. The book is a strong ex-parte statement, but deserves to be read as one side of a very serious problem.—*Glasgow Herald*, July 13, 1922.

The author claims to state dispassionately and without bias the condition of Muslim feeling in India as it is, and its possible bearings on the future, neither justifying nor condemning. This little book is well written. The quiet, controlled and fair way in which the author expounds his arguments lend them considerable force and authority.—*Lloyd George Liberal Magazine*, July, 1922.

In dealing with the question of creed, the author of *India in the Balance* ignores the fact that India's grievance is largely economic. To him the fact that the British Government treacherously promised the Czar Constantinople seems of infinitely greater importance than the fact that the people of India are dominated and robbed by a foreign power. Indeed, unless he libels it, the Muslim religion enforces unquestioning obedience and submission to the Government, however bad, and whether it be foreign or not; and he even seems proud of having, like most of the priests of the Christian churches, preached to the people that it was their duty to fight the Government's wars for it. He naïvely adds that "if anyone went to the platform in these days with such a lecture he would be hooted down"—which is something to be thankful for at any rate. And he traces all the change of heart—or alleged change of heart—in India to the fact that the British Prime Minister has broken his sacred pledge about Turkey. As though he had kept all his other sacred pledges.

However, with regard to his fear that the British Government is now prejudiced in favour of Christian communities because they are Christian, he may rest assured that there never was a more impartial Government. It fights on the side of the big purses without regard to colour, class, or creed.

Probably it is true, as the author points out, that recent events—the Treaty of Sèvres, the arrest of Gandhi, the dismissal of Montagu, and so forth—have aggravated the unrest in India; but he ignores the fact that no people ever has rested, or ever will really rest content, under foreign oppression, whatever their religious teachers may tell them. Really the finest part of the book is the appendix giving Mahatma Gandhi's statement, in which he preaches the duty of disobedience. Inci-

“INDIA IN THE BALANCE”

dentally he points out that “the cottage industry, so vital for India’s existence, has been ruined by incredibly heartless and inhuman processes.” That is more important to India than any question of the Caliphate.—*Labour Leader*, June 29, 1922.

Of the many vital problems with which the British Empire is faced at the present time, undoubtedly the gravest is the spirit of unrest and dissatisfaction with things as they are, which is active among the Muslim subjects of his Majesty the King-Emperor, and more especially among the Muslims of India. Such is the opinion of Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, Imam of the Mosque, Woking, who in his book, *India in the Balance*, which has the sub-title of *British Rule and the Caliphate*, and is published by the *Islamic Review*, Woking (3s. 6d), discusses why India may soon be but a name, so far as the British Empire is concerned; who or what is to blame for that, and how the danger may be averted. That the danger is a real one is patent to anybody who knows anything about India or Muslims, and those who do not possess that knowledge will be impressed by the grave warning of the Aga Khan, the head of the Ismaili Mohammedans, whose services rendered during the war were recognised by his being elevated to the highest status of chieftainship.

To his credit, be it said, the Imam handles this difficult question with the utmost delicacy, tact, and impartiality. As a devout Muslim, a patriotic Indian, and a true well-wisher of the Empire, he places the facts before the reader in a most lucid manner, which cannot be misapprehended by even the densest Briton whose knowledge of Eastern affairs is of the flimsiest order. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din deplores the ignorance of Indian Civil servants as to the social and religious conditions prevailing in India, and regrets their *penchant* for making their own “colonies” wherever they go, and keeping themselves aloof from the Indians.

The question of the Caliphate, that is, the headship of the Sultan of Turkey over the Muslims of the world, has become grossly intermixed with international politics, and the Imam has striven to explain the position of the “Viceroy of God upon earth,” from its origin in the *Qur-án*—commonly known as the *Koran*—and points out its precise and very real significance in Muslim eyes. It must not be confused with the Papacy in Christendom, for it means an independent empire, with Arabia as its dependency, with power enough to maintain safety and security in Arabia, and keep the religious seat of Islam immune from internal and external dangers.

The Imam, as a holy man, has availed himself of the opportunity, which the subject opened up for him, to show the close affinity between Islam and Christianity, and in this he has done a good service to the adherents of both beliefs. Every prophet that was raised up in Jerusalem and in its vicinity is the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Muslim's own prophet, and the Imam quotes from the Qur-án verses relating to eighteen prophets, including Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Noah, David, Solomon, Job, Joseph, Moses, Aaron, Zacharias, John, Jesus and Elias, Ishmail, Elishah and Jonas, and Lot. "These are they whom God guided, therefore follow their guidance," is the injunction of the Qur-án, and "make no difference between prophet and prophet." Muslims pay the same respect to Jesus as to Muhammad, and another verse from the Qur-án showing the close relationship between Muslims and Christians is the one which says, "And you will certainly find the nearest in friendship to the believers those who say We are Christian." The Imam is of opinion that, in the not far future, it may well be that the dividing line between Islam and Christianity will become academic rather than actual.

The Imam contends that Muslims are better qualified than the Jews are to guard the interests of the three great religions which have their roots in Palestine—Judaism, Christianity, and Muhammadanism—for they have to regard the prophets of the other religions as their own prophets and to venerate the holy places.

There is much interesting matter in the book, not the least being a written statement by Mahatma Gandhi in an appendix. This statement was read by Gandhi this year in the Court of the district and Sessions Judge of Ahmedabad, and in it he mentions that his public life began in South Africa in 1893 in troubled weather. He discovered that as a man and an Indian he had no rights, having no rights as a man because he was an Indian. In 1899 when the Empire went to war with the Boers, Gandhi raised a volunteer ambulance corps and served in several actions which were fought in the neighbourhood of Ladysmith. Similarly in 1906 during the Zulu Rebellion he raised a stretcher bearer party and served until the conclusion of hostilities. He was mentioned in despatches and received medals including the Kaiser-i-Hind gold medal. When war broke out in 1914 he raised a volunteer ambulance corps in London consisting of the then resident Indians in London, chiefly students, and again in 1917, in India, when a special appeal was made for more recruits, he raised a corps in Kheda. In all these efforts he was actuated by the belief that it was possible for such services to gain a status of full equality in the Empire for his countrymen.

The Rowlatt Act, which Gandhi characterizes as "a law designed to rob the people of all real freedom," came to him as a shock, and from that time he embarked upon those agitations which his friends can only regret. Gandhi may really be regarded as a patriot in the true meaning of the word. In the country districts semi-starved masses of Indians are slowly sinking to lifelessness, and in order to help them Gandhi has endeavoured to re-establish cottage industries as they were many years ago. But Indian officialdom has not been helpful,

“INDIA IN THE BALANCE”

and matters have not progressed so quickly or satisfactorily as he wanted.

The writer of this article knew Gandhi well when he lived in South Africa, and during the period of strife in Natal and Transvaal, when the Indian question loomed large on the political horizon, he had many interviews with the recognized leader of the Indians in the sub-continent. He found Gandhi ever a courteous gentleman, loyal to the Crown, but resenting the manner in which British Indians were treated in British territory outside India and the British Isles. He pointed out on more than one occasion that British Indians had fought in the battles of the Empire, whereas the Boers had fought against England and English rule for a period of seventy years, yet the Boers were granted all the rights which were rigidly denied to Indians, and had even the right, which they exercised, of excluding British Indians from British territory.

“Why is it?” asked Gandhi. “Our culture is higher than that of the Boers, and our loyalty has been proved not once or twice, but on every occasion when danger has threatened. Is it because we are Asiatics? But many of these Indians who want to enter Transvaal, and are not permitted to do so, were born in Natal; they are South Africans just as much as are the children of Europeans born in Cape Town or Pretoria. If they are not to be admitted because of their Asiatic origin, why do you allow Jews to enter the land, and to own the gold mines? They are Asiatics just like the Arabs, and their literature, architecture and culture is not so high as that of the Indians, nor have they ever fought for the Empire like the Indians.” It was a problem to which Gandhi was unable to find a solution, and although he had the sympathy of the best portion of British opinion in Transvaal, the opposition from the British traders in Natal and the Boers in the old republics was too strong for him. He left the country deeply resentful of the treatment meted out to Indians.

The problem has not been shorn of its difficulties, and although Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din has demonstrated the danger he has not suggested a solution. He has done well to have placed the facts before the people of England. It is not the British way to play off one religion against another, but to secure conditions which will do justice as far as possible to all parties, and in regard to Indians in the Dominions it is a matter for congratulation to all parties that the well-known Indian statesman, Sastri, is engaged in consultations with the Dominions, excepting South Africa, with reference to immigration regulations. It has been decided, South Africa excepted, that Indians legally domiciled in the Empire shall enjoy the citizenship of the Dominions, and it is only a matter of time for this commendable recognition to be general throughout the British Commonwealth.—*Nottingham Guardian*, July 15, 1922.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

REVIEW

STUDIES IN ISLAMIC POETRY.¹

IN the first part of his book Dr. Nicholson, who dedicates his studies to Professor E. G. Browne, condenses and translates extracts from 'Awfî's *Lubâbu 'l-Albâb*, an ancient work of which Professor Browne produced a very valuable edition.

The *Lubâbu 'l-Albâb*, by Muhammed 'Awfî, is the oldest extant work on poetry in Persian. 'Awfî was born and bred in Bukhârâ in the latter half of the twelfth century (of the Christian era), and his book gives biographies and extracts of bards from C.E. 867 to 1220. His work therefore covers the period from the spring of Persian poetry up to its rich maturity amid the Mongol invasion. When Transoxania and Khurâsân were threatened by the Mongols, 'Awfî travelled to India, where he served under Sultan Nâsiru'ddîn Qubâcha (of Sind), and afterwards under his conquerer, Sultan Iltatmish.

Among the matter in his work, not always of the highest quality, is an absolutely priceless disquisition on the forms of Persian poetry and very valuable examples of its main forms. Those whose acquaintance with Persian poetry consists wholly or chiefly in a reading of FitzGerald's translation of Omar Khayyâm's *Rubâ'iyat* will do well to read this book, learn of their limitations, and begin their education. A *rubâ'î*, or quatrain, is a *short* epigram, if we can use the word epigram and exclude its implications of sententiousness and sophistication. Collections of *rubâ'îs* are often to be found, but each one is independent and complete. It may be easy yet to discover "more quatrains by Omar," but it will be wrong to join them up to the existing and apparently connected poem, strung together equally wrongly by the gifted translator and poet FitzGerald.

¹ *Studies in Islamic Poetry*, by Professor R. A. Nicholson. Cambridge University Press. (Second notice.)

REVIEW

We will examine some of the different forms of verse, among which the *rubâ'i* has its honoured place.

(1) The *qasida* is a poem with a purpose, satirical, philosophical or religious. An attempt has been made to define it as properly a panegyric of some sort or other; but many a *qasida* is not a panegyric. The plainly panegyric seeks to praise some great person who has something to give—a prince for money or other favours, an exalted lady for her love. Instead of coming straight to the point, the poet commences his ode by some irrelevant topic of great beauty and arresting interest. He glides from the exordium (*nasīb*) into the encomium (*madīh*), not always very consistently.

(2) The *ghazal* usually deals with love, human or divine. It is a shorter poem than the *qasida*.

(3) The *qit'a*, or fragment; this is either a verse detached from a *qasida* (and therefore a genuine fragment) or a complete idea in a small setting.

(4) The *rubâ'i*, or quatrain, has been briefly described above.

(5) *Mathnawî* includes poems of a lengthier character, such as epics, romances or expositions of moral or mystical philosophy.

THE "QASIDA."

The introduction to the *qasida* (the exordium, *nasīb*, of the poem) is the object of great care and contrivance. There is a characteristic example of the rhyme-system of a *nasīb*. The *radif*, or terminal (refrain) syllables, do not form a rhyme; the rhyme is formed (where the line is a rhyming line) by the syllable immediately preceding the *radif*.

O heart, bring the good news! She I love *best* is coming.

O eye, prepare the lodging, for thy *guest* is coming.

O body, though love hath brought thee to thy latest breath
Yet forward send thy soul! She of thy *quest* is coming.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Now once again make merry with new glee : the end
Of absence long that burns the aching *breast* is coming.
The days of grief and woe and anguish—all are past ;
The hour of peace and joy and balmful *rest* is coming.

In another introduction or exordium the translator is compelled to abandon the attempt to imitate the system of rhyme, but in compensation he indicates a characteristic form of construction :

Behold the rich tiara	of gems on the jasmine-bough !
See how the queenly roses	unfold their broideries !
Roses like cheeks of houris	laden with spicy curls ;
Jasmines like lawns of Eden	fragrant and beautiful.

As 'twere a bride the rosebush	arrays herself ; the cloud
Tirewoman-like is laving	the dust and grime away,
Now round her neck arranging	a string of pearly tears,
Now drawing o'er her blushes	a veil of gauzy mist.
	'AM'AQ OF BUKHÂRÂ.

Not all of the love imagery is trite or "finnikin."
Here is an example of the extremely intelligent :

I am not seeking diversion and I am not desiring pleasure,
I am not keeping patience and I am not getting sleep.
My tears, white as quicksilver and as glistening,
Turn to pure gold as they traverse my yellow cheeks.
By the tears of mine eye, by the yellow hue of my cheek,
Alchemists decide that quicksilver can turn into gold !
ABU 'L MA'ÂLÎ.

THE "GHAZAL."

The mono-rhyme runs through all the types of Persian verse, except the *mathnawî*. (The opening verse of a *qasida* is frequently a double rhyme.) It is not generally possible to reproduce the *rhyme* in translation. In the following *ghazal*, however, the *metre* is imitated :

That idol fair, whose kisses	are balm to the broken-hearted,
Alas, she still denies me	the balm that heals my sorrow.
Now I, for love's sake weeping,	an April cloud resemble.

REVIEW

'Tis well, the cloud of April conceals a beauteous morrow.
At dawn across the garden it passed, and in a moment
The pink and opening roses the rose of Heaven borrowed.
JÛYBARI OF BUKHÂRÂ.

THE "QIT'A."

Abû Shu'ayb of Herât wrote the following verses
on a Christian boy :

Can it be doomed to Hell, that face of Heaven ?
With fawn eyes, curly tresses, tulip cheeks,—
A lip as when the Chinese painter's brush
O'er vermeil traces the long silver line.
Could he that beauty to the negro give
The Ethiop would be envied by the Turk.

Persian poets are famed for their devotion to the
rose. There are few lines so charming as these by
Kisâ'î :

Roses are a gift of price
Sent to us from Paradise;
More divine our nature grows
In the Eden of the rose.

Roses why for silver sell ?
O rose-merchant, fairly tell
What you buy instead of those
That is worth more than the rose.

It is not right to satirize Persian poetry as "all
love and rose-leaves." The following *qit'a* by Rûhi
shows a light satire which had apparently already
involved its possessor in trouble :

To-day, when like a donkey from his meal
Driv'n off, I know what Fortune's outcasts feel,
Some evil-minded and suspicious men
Call satire every eulogy I pen.
If I but breathe a prayer to God on high,
"This fellow is reviling us," they cry.

Adîb-i Sâbir wrote an elegy on his mistress. The
Persian mono-rhyme is here rendered in English

ISLAMIC REVIEW

without any typographical device, leaving it to the reader to detect it, as he should :

My sweetheart went to yonder world to see among the houris
there

If she might find for loveliness her parallel in yonder world.

Rizwân unbarred the gate for her, because her hair's dark violet

And bosom's jessamine adorned no damozel in yonder world.

How all the pains and agonies of earth and heaven do load
my heart

Since I am lingering here, but she is gone to dwell in yonder
world.

THE "RUBÂ'Î."

Examples of this form of poem can be found on all the planes : (1) The physical ; (2) the intellectual or mental ; (3) the mystical or spiritual. The following will illustrate each sort :

(1)

Oh well of honey ! Yestereve thy sight

Gladdened this heart that cries for thee to-night.

'Tis a thing unimaginable, the tale

Of to-night's anguish, yestereve's delight.

TÂJU'DDÎN ISMÂ'ÎL AL-BÂKHARZÎ.

(2)

When from her house the soul sets forth to climb

And hastens back to her eternal prime,

The four strings Nature fitted on Life's lute

Disorder'd break at the rude touch of Time.¹

BADÎ'U'DDÎN TURKÎ AL-SANJARÎ.

(3)

Soul of the World, to thee I turn again

With bleeding heart, and bring Thee all my pain.

Myself behind, before me need and woe,

And love still waxing—never may it wane.²

RAFF' OF MERV.

The limits of this article do not admit of any example of the *mathnawî*.

ARTHUR FIELD.

¹ The "four elements" of old science, from which all the compounds—mineral, vegetable and animal—are produced.

² The love here referred to is certainly the mystic "love" of religion.

THE PROPHET IN WAR-TIME

THE PROPHET IN WAR-TIME

By MAULVI MUSTAFAKHAN, B.A.

FIGHTING WITH HAWAZIN AND SAQIF.

THE victory of Mecca completed the triumph of Islam, and the truth of the Holy Prophet was established. The power of the Quraish was broken, and the wild children of the desert, who closely watched the struggle of the new faith with dubious feelings of success and failure, now realizing the strength of Islam, readily embraced the new religion of their own free will. Yet the fire of jealousy, which was long smouldering in the hearts of Hawazin and Saqif, the two famous tribes of the Arabs, celebrated for their martial spirit and military strength, was now fanned into a big flame, which once more threatened the destruction of the Muslim Commonwealth. These two tribes were making rapid and formidable preparations for an onslaught on the Muslim World, even before the victory of Mecca; because they clearly saw that the progress of Islam was undermining their aristocratic position. The victory of Mecca all the more aggravated their fury, and they were determined to lose no time in making an attack on Muslims. They had already enlisted the sympathies of some of the Arab tribes, who joined with them. Thus a huge army consisting of the various regiments of the Arab tribes was formed and led against the Muslims. The wives and the children of the soldiers were also taken to the battlefield in order to rouse their heroic passions.

When the Holy Prophet heard of this, he was much upset. The Muslims were quite unprepared. They had no money, no provisions, and no arms. But the defence was indispensable. Therefore the Prophet at once made preparations for it. A loan of 30,000 dirhams was taken from Abdulla bin

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Rabia, a wealthy man of Mecca, in order to purchase provisions for the Muslim soldiers; while Safwan bin Ummayya, another gentleman who had not yet embraced Islam, was good enough to lend the arms to the Prophet. Thus an ill-fed and ill-equipped army of twelve thousand men had to face the well-equipped and adequately rationed forces of Hawazin and Saqif. Both the armies met at Hunain, a deep narrow defile about ten miles to the north-east of Mecca. The result was that the Muslims were routed in the first onset and the Holy Prophet was left alone. The enemy was showering a rain of arrows on the Prophet, who even in that critical moment said aloud:—"I am the Prophet; it is not a lie."

These words infused the Muslims with confidence and hope. The routed army turned back and fell upon the enemy with unabated fury. A pitched battle was fought, and the idolatrous were eventually defeated with heavy losses. The Holy Qur-án thus describes the victory:—

Certainly Allah helped you in many battlefields and on the day of Hunain, when your great numbers made you vain, but they availed you nothing and the earth became strait to you notwithstanding its spaciousness, then you turned back retreating.

Then Allah sent tranquility upon His Apostle and upon the believers, and sent down hosts which you did not see, and chastised those who disbelieved, and that is the reward of the unbelievers (Chap. ix. 25-27).

The retreated enemy sought refuge in Autas and Taif. Fears of a fresh attack on the Muslims were generally entertained, and the Holy Prophet, in order to ensure the safety of his people, had to lay siege to Taif, which now had become the stronghold of the enemy. The siege lasted for twenty days, after which it was raised, because it was discovered that the enemy had no intention to renew the offensive.

The Woking Mission Letter

THE MOSQUE,
WOKING.
July 17, 1922.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER IN ISLAM,

Assalam-o-Alaikum !

Our Sunday lectures and Friday sermons attract large, intelligent and inquisitive audiences. Sundays at our London Prayer House are particularly crowded. Seekers after truth representing diverse schools and shades of thought come with their doubts and queries, and in most cases find solace in the teachings of Islam. Lectures are followed by a long series of interesting questions and answers, and then comes general exchange of ideas. Thus we spend each Sunday afternoon—some three busy and enlightening hours.

Our Imam, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, is on a tour on the Continent. The first-hand information thus gained as to the state of things obtaining there will enable him to form an opinion whether we can with advantage extend our activities beyond these shores. He has already visited France and is by now in Germany, where he is expected to address the English-speaking German public on Islam. From there he proceeds to Austria, which brings his programme to a close. He will be back with us before the Eid-uz-Zuha festival, which falls this year on August 4th.

The German Consul in London was approached for the necessary passport to our missionary in connection with the proposed German Mission, which, we regret, he could not allow. Attempts are now

ISLAMIC REVIEW

made to approach the authorities in Berlin, and we hope work will start there before long. Besides our branch in Germany, we contemplate setting up another in U.S.A. Our missionary for that country sails next month.

Churchman is a churchman wherever he may be. Even in this land of freedom of thought and conviction he makes you feel the sting of his narrow-minded prejudice. So far as our activities are concerned, he has ever viewed them with alarm, and has at times gone out of his way to place difficulties in our way. As an instance we reproduce the letter of a local tradesman to us—one whom we have been patronizing for years. This is what he writes :

“ DEAR SIR,

Complaints having been received from a member of the Church of England in the neighbourhood, on whom I depend for the greater portion of my work. I regret that I cannot undertake any further orders for you. In enclosing the account to date, I take the opportunity of thanking you for past favours.

Yours faithfully

G—E. F. D—L.”

Truth, however, is truth, and must have its way, notwithstanding obstacles and opposition. Religious thought in England is feeling the influence of Islam. Longstanding misconceptions are giving way to respect for the sound teachings of our Faith, and the person of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (Peace on him). Actual conversions secured are : Messrs. G. Rutland Clapham (Abdul Hafiz), P. J. Gaffney (Abdul Ghaffar), E. Fost (Faqir Ullah).

Our appeal for Free Circulation of Literature Fund has so far met with generous response. Our thanks are due, and with us the thanks of the cause for which the free circulation is intended, to all the brethren who have contributed their mite. We trust our Muslim brethren will do their utmost to strengthen this fund. We acknowledge with thanks the contributions received since our last issue :

THE WOKING MISSION LETTER

				£	s.	d.
Mr. A. S. Wali Mahammad, London	0	10	0
Mr. I. H. Hoosain, Pietersberg, S.A.	0	5	0
Through Young Muslim Union, Penang :—						
Mr. Shamsuddin M. Joonoos	0	10	0
Mr. Shamsuddin M. Osman	0	10	0
Mr. M. N. Merican	0	10	0
Mr. S. M. Yusoff	0	5	0
Mr. M. Y. Merican	0	5	0
Mr. S. M. Zainulabidin	0	5	0
Mr. S. A. Aljunid	0	5	0
Mr. M. Mohamed Nur	0	5	0
Mr. S. M. Haniff	0	5	0
Mr. Hamid Khan	0	5	0
Mr. A. Mohamed Noor	0	3	0
Mr. O. Mohamed Yusoff	0	2	6
Mr. Mohamed Zain	0	2	6
Mr. Shaik Mohamed Tamby	0	2	6
Mr. Basha Merican	0	2	6
Mr. Shaik Ibrahim	0	2	4
Mr. Mohamed Sawai	0	2	4
Mr. A. M. Eusoffizzidin	0	2	4
Mr. C. M. Che Din	0	2	4
Mr. R. Omar	0	2	4
Mr. S. Alwee Alhady	0	2	4
Mr. S. Hassan	0	2	4
Mr. H. O. Murshid	0	2	0
Mr. M. H. Merican	0	1	0
Mr. S. Choonoomeah	0	1	0
Mr. Mohamed Daroos	0	1	0
Mr. K. Mohamed Noor	0	1	0
Mr. M. N. Mydin	0	1	0
Mr. A. M. Sheriff	0	1	0
Mr. B. Rahmat	0	1	0
Mr. K. H. Merican	0	1	0
Mr. C. D. Che Teh	0	1	0
Mr. S. Mohamed Hussain	0	1	0
Mr. A. Pawan	0	1	0
Mr. I. Shaik Ji	0	1	0
Mr. Mohamed Ariff	0	1	0
Mr. A. Din	0	1	0
Mr. Ibrahim	0	1	0
Mr. Aboo Kassim	0	1	0
Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din	2	0	0
Mr. R. U. Qurashi, London	0	5	0
Mr. S. Ghulam Nabi	1	0	0
Mr. Ismail Ahmad Mia, Johannesburg, S.A.	0	10	0
Mr. A. Sadeeq M. Kajee, Natal	1	10	0
Mr. Mohd. Ismail Kolia, Natal	0	10	0

ISLAMIC REVIEW

	£	s.	d.
Mr. A. H. Khan, Strand, S.A.	0	10	0
Mr. S. Muhammad Baksh, Dun, Br. Guiana	1	0	0
Mr. S. Mohd. Ashraf, Simla	3	0	0
Moulvi Ghulam Hassan, Peshawar	3	2	9
Mr. Sh. Hidyat Ullah, Peshawar	3	2	9
Mr. Nazar Ali, Peshawar	0	12	9
Mr. Bahaderdin, Peshawar	0	12	9
Mr. Osman bin Mahmad, Batu Pahat, S.S.	0	10	0
Mr. Haji Ahmad Gusti, Batu Pahat, S.S.	0	10	0
Hon. Secretary, U.R.I.I., Uganda	0	10	0
Mr. Mahammad Dawood	0	4	0
Mr. Ch. Ghulam Hussain, Okara	3	4	0
Major Mohd. Nasir Ahmad, Bangalore	2	10	0

Remitted through Lahore Office by Mr. Abdul Basith :—

Mr. Abdul Basith	Rs. 5	0	0
Mr. Abdul Azeez	1	0	0
Mr. Mohd. Shariff	1	0	0
Mr. C. S. A. Wahab	1	0	0
Mr. Abdul Wahab	1	0	0
Mr. S. M. Fazil	1	0	0
Mr. A. Lathef Khan	1	0	0
Mr. Abdul Basith II	1	0	0
Mr. Mohd. Shabuddin	1	0	0
Mr. E. S. A. Rahman	1	0	0
Mr. Mohd. Fasihuddin	1	0	0
Mr. M. Abdulla Baig	1	0	0
Mr. Mahboob Ali	1	0	0
Mr. M. S. A. Rahman	1	0	0
Mr. Mohiddeen Khan	1	0	0
Mr. Ashaque Hussain	1	0	0

Rs. 20 0 0 = 1 6 8

Yours most fraternally,

KHWAJA NAZIR AHMAD,

Manager.

SPIRIT OF ISLAM. By THE RIGHT HON. SYED AMEER ALI 30/-

INDIA IN THE BALANCE: British Rule and The Caliphate. By KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN 4/-

TEACHINGS OF ISLAM 3/6

MUHAMMAD AND CHRIST. By MOULVI MUHAMMAD ALI 2/6

WHAT IS ISLAM ?

WHAT IS ISLAM ?

[The following is a very brief account of Islam, and some of its teaching. For further details please write to the Imam of the Mosque, Woking.]

ISLAM, THE RELIGION OF PEACE.—The word Islam literally means: (1) Peace; (2) the way to achieve peace; (3) submission; as submission to another's will is the safest course to establish peace. The word in its religious sense signifies complete submission to the Will of God.

OBJECT OF THE RELIGION.—Islam provides its followers with the perfect code whereby they may work out what is noble and good in man, and thus to maintain peace between man and man.

THE PROPHETS OF ISLAM.—Muhammad, popularly known as the Prophet of Islam, was, however, the last Prophet of the Faith. Muslims, i.e. the followers of Islam, accept all such of the world's prophets, including Abraham, Moses and Jesus, as revealed the Will of God for the guidance of humanity.

THE QUR-ÂN.—The Gospel of the Muslim is the Qur-ân. Muslims believe in the Divine origin of every other sacred book, but, inasmuch as all such previous revelations have become corrupted through human interpolation, the Qur-ân, the last Book of God, came as a recapitulation of the former Gospels.

ARTICLES OF FAITH IN ISLAM.—These are seven in number: belief in (1) Allah; (2) angels; (3) books from God; (4) messengers from God; (5) the hereafter; (6) the measurement of good and evil; (7) resurrection after death.

The life after death, according to Islamic teaching, is not a new life but only a continuance of this life, bringing its hidden realities into light. It is a life of unlimited progress; those who qualify themselves in this life for the progress will enter into Paradise, which is another name for the said progressive life after death, and those who get their faculties stunted by their misdeeds in this life will be the denizens of the hell—a life incapable of appreciating heavenly bliss, and of torment—in order to get themselves purged of all impurities and thus to become fit for the life in heaven. State after death is an image of the spiritual state, in this life.

The sixth article of faith has been confused by some with what is popularly known as Fatalism. A Muslim neither believes in Fatalism nor Predestination; he believes in Premeasurement. Everything created by God is for good in the given use and under the given circumstances. Its abuse is evil and suffering.

PILLARS OF ISLAM.—These are five in number: (1) declaration of faith in the Oneness of God, and in the Divine Messengership of Muhammad; (2) prayer; (3) fasting; (4) almsgiving; (5) pilgrimage to the Holy Shrine of Mecca.

ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.—The Muslims worship one God—the Almighty, the All-knowing, the All-just, the Cherisher of all the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Worlds, the Friend, the Guide, the Helper. There is none like Him. He has no partner. He is neither begotten nor has He begotten any son or daughter. He is Indivisible in Person. He is the Light of the heaven and the earth, the Merciful, the Compassionate, the Glorious, the Magnificent, the Beautiful, the Eternal, the Infinite, the First and the Last.

FAITH AND ACTION.—Faith without action is a dead letter. Faith is of itself insufficient, unless translated into action. A Muslim believes in his own personal accountability for his actions in this life and in the hereafter. Each must bear his own burden, and none can expiate for another's sin.

ETHICS IN ISLAM.—"Imbue yourself with Divine attributes," says the noble Prophet. God is the prototype of man, and His attributes form the basis of Muslim ethics. Righteousness in Islam consists in leading a life in complete harmony with the Divine attributes. To act otherwise is sin.

CAPABILITIES OF MAN IN ISLAM.—The Muslim believes in the inherent sinlessness of man's nature which, made of the goodliest fibre, is capable of unlimited progress, setting him above the angels and leading him to the border of Divinity.

THE POSITION OF WOMAN IN ISLAM.—Men and women come from the same essence, possess the same soul, and they have been equipped with equal capability for intellectual, spiritual and moral attainment. Islam places man and woman under like obligations, the one to the other.

EQUALITY OF MANKIND. AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF ISLAM.—Islam is the religion of the Unity of God and the equality of mankind. Lineage, riches and family honours are accidental things; virtue and the service of humanity are the matters of real merit. Distinctions of colour, race and creed are unknown in the ranks of Islam. All mankind is of one family, and Islam has succeeded in welding the black and the white into one fraternal whole.

PERSONAL JUDGMENT.—Islam encourages the exercise of personal judgment and respects difference of opinion, which, according to the sayings of the Prophet Muhammad, is a blessing of God.

KNOWLEDGE.—The pursuit of knowledge is a duty in Islam, and it is the acquisition of knowledge that makes men superior to angels.

SANCTITY OF LABOUR.—Every labour which enables man to live honestly is respected. Idleness is deemed a sin.

CHARITY.—All the faculties of man have been given to him as a trust from God, for the benefit of his fellow-creatures. It is man's duty to live for others, and his charities must be applied without any distinction of persons. Charity in Islam brings man nearer to God. Charity and the giving of alms have been made obligatory, and every person who possesses property above a certain limit has to pay a tax, levied on the rich for the benefit of the poor.