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The New Year.

All hail, thou new-born 1922! Fresh, unsullied, and full of promise, thou bringest in thy lap myriads of opportunities for good. May it please Allah that we turn them to the best account in the service of fellow-man! May we make the most of them in promulgating the eternal and imperishable truths of Islam!

Thy predecessor 1921, out of whose ashes thou hast sprung, came to us in the same splendour and glory, brimming like unto thee with opportunities, and is now no more. Some of us are looking back upon it with a sweet sense of satisfaction, arising out of service rendered, distress relieved, duty done, and truth vindicated. They find solace and strength in these happy reminiscences and an inspiration for the future. While others there are, unfortunately, who failed to realize its worth, letting slip the opportunities it brought or abusing them in unbecoming ways. To them it was a year less, so to speak, of their lives on this earth; for truly the length of life is not measured in the number of days and months, but in the amount of good done. But let the past bury its dead. Let them emerge yet wiser, even though sadder. Let them turn a new leaf, clean and untarnished.

May thy advent usher in a new era, so far as the propagation of the universal religion of mankind is concerned! May the sun of Islam, which has already dawned, penetrating here and there the thick fog of ignorance enveloping these islands, shine forth in all its dazzling splendour. May He grant us power to scatter the pearls of Islam broadcast, in every nook and corner of this benighted land! May our Christian brethren and sisters open their eyes to the beauties of Islam, which was the religion of Lord Jesus as much as of Lord Muhammad,
and may every Christian home resound with the exalted name of Allah!

With these humble prayers we tender our warmest greetings to every brother and sister with the words, *Assalam-o-'Alaikum wa rahmat-ul-lahi wa brakatuhi* — "Peace be with you, the mercy of Allah and His grace!" Amen.

Christmas.

Christmas came and went with its usual jollifications. It was honoured elsewhere more than in the houses of worship and in a different manner. So it has been its history from the very beginning. The Son of Man would hardly find anything to please him in the festivities celebrated in the honour of his birthday. They become more of pagan deity than of an austere Rabai whose nights were spent in prayers and days in calling others to the path of righteousness and virtue. But the present-day Christians cannot be blamed for it. They simply tread along the footsteps of their fourth-century-predecessors in the grave.

The said festivities received their inception long before the lord of Christianity was born. We know very little of Jesus independent of synoptical writings which are the only record of his life; but it is very difficult to locate the time of his birth on the strength of these writings. The history of the patriarchs before the royal conversion of Constantine is of no help to us in this respect. One could accept December 25th as the time-honoured date of the birth of Jesus in Christendom, had not the very day been fixed in the Roman Calendar to celebrate the birth of Apollo, the sun-god of the Romans and the favourite deity of Emperor Constantine. If the day fixed for the worship of the sun-god could easily substitute the Sabbath Day of Jesus, which admittedly was Saturday, under the convenient hands of Constantine, the birthday of
his deity could easily be celebrated in the name of the new god, who, like Apollo, was also a virgin born. Bishop Copernicus, in the change of the solar system, did more service to his own religion than to the world's astronomical calculation. In the twelve zodiacs of the ancient days, with the sun in the centre, he could easily see the origin of the story of Jesus with his twelve disciples. Is not the institution of Easter another remnant of the old sun-worshippers' celebration of the day when the sun is at its best according to the ancient calculations? All these facts are now above controversy. Even the Church cannot deny them, and yet she cannot say a single word against the time-honoured institutions. But facts are facts, and the Western world is still worshipping Apollo in the name of Jesus.

The Sword or the Cross.

The Moslem World, issue October, 1921, exhorts the Christian world in its Editorial, with the above title, to sheathe the sword and take up the Cross, in which, it says, lies the realization of the dream of the world-domination of Christianity. So far as the first part of the counsel is concerned, Dr. Zwemer may well claim the credit, at least, of opportunism. A right piece of advice given at the right time. Now that almost the whole world has come directly or indirectly under Christian domination, it would be the height of tomfoolery to dangle the sword in the face of the non-Christian. Through knee-deep streams of blood Christianity has waded to power; it is now quite seasonable that the sermons of peace should come forth to gloss over the bloody sheet of its record. Does it not look more of the nature of the crocodile tears?

As regards the Cross, however, the divine's call to take it up stands self-condemned. Why? Did not the "Son of God" bear it on behalf of every one who should care just to profess faith in his
blood, which is enough to ensure a passport to Heaven, do whatever one might choose to, right or wrong? Surely the editor must have a very short memory, or he would not have attempted to teach the lesson of the Cross, in the sense of "self-denial," "meekness," and self-"crucifixion," in these very pages, where he has all along been repeating the dogma that the blood of Jesus alone can wash off all sins, past, present, or future, thereby issuing a general licence for self-indulgence. To the Christian the Cross is emblematic, not of self-renunciation, but of self-gratification, which, as he has been taught to believe ever since his childhood, is his birthright as a believer in the dogma of atonement to indulge in with impunity. The Cross as thus conceived of is a curse to humanity, and the sooner broken to pieces the better.

It is, however, vain to look for the true Cross in the teachings of the Church. Turn to the pages of the Holy Qur-án and you will find the path of the true Cross outlined in the clearest possible manner: "And We will most certainly try you with somewhat of fear and hunger and loss of property and lives and fruits; and give good news to the patient, who, when a misfortune befalls them, say: Surely we are God's, and to Him we shall surely return" (ii. 155). This is the real Cross, the Cross which Jesus, as a true Muslim, bore.

Neither.

But the days of the sword are numbered. The world has awakened to a sense of self-consciousness, looking upon freedom as the birthright of man. The principle of self-determination is daily growing in recognition, and we hope the sword will, before long, be turned into the plough-share for good. Humanity is on the eve of a new era, where reason will reign supreme. Has Christianity, which is anything but rational, any chance of survival under the
changed state of society? Thus, to the chagrin of Dr. Zwemer, 

neither the sword nor the Cross of the so-called Christianity can prevail for long. The sword will automatically go into the sheath by sheer force of circumstances, while the Cross will be pulled down by the hand of the Christian himself. The sword of reason and the cross of self-suffering in the service of fellow-man, both the foundation-stones of Islam, shall have the day, supplanting the Christian sword of steel and the Christian Cross of self-indulgence.

Fond Hopes.

Further on the editor revels in the observation:

In winning Moslem lands for Christ the call is for men and women who will to-day follow the way of the Cross with the same courage and abandon with which the soldier yesterday served his country. At the Smyrna Students' Conference this year we heard Turks, Armenians, Bulgarians and Greeks sing in Christian unison, "The son of God goes forth to war." . . . It was the harbinger of a new day—that day when the Cross shall be lifted up in every pulpit where now the wooden sword of the Imam is the ever-recurring Friday symbol of conquest.

Charity, they say, begins at home. The "men and women," of whom there shall be no dearth, we may assure the editor, so long as Christianity walks in silver slippers, would be better advised to address themselves to their own fold, where the lambs are breaking loose on all sides, where seekers-after-truth refuse to be hoodwinked any longer and are day by day coming to realize the inherent irrationality of the Church creed, wrongly labelled Christianity after the Prophet of Galilee, whose religion was no other than the common religion of humanity, viz. Islam. The "Son of God" has after all turned out to be no more than the son of man, as discovered by the Church Congress the other day, but proclaimed as such by the Holy Qur-án over thirteen centuries ago. The bright rays of the sun of Islam are already
piercing through the haze of misrepresentations, and the day is at hand when it shall shine forth in all its glory.

The "wooden sword of the Imam," we need hardly point out, is but another figment of the editor's imagination. We should like very much to know whether there is a single pulpit throughout the Islamic world where the Imam wields, as alleged with such unabashed audacity, a wooden sword. Will the editor corroborate the assertion or contradict—as in honour bound to do—the misconception thereby caused? The conquering force of Islam does not lie in the sword of the Muslim; it lies deep down in the nature of man, which, if true to itself, cannot resist it. Its recognition, sooner or later, is inevitable—as inevitable as that of the law of gravitation; for what is Islam but another name for the sum total of the laws of human nature?

Additions.

The following is a list of our English and American Muslim brethren and sisters who recently joined the Brotherhood of Islam:—

Charles E. Wintle—Waheed.
H. W. Green—Waheed-ud-Din.
Frederick C. Crosley—Abdur-Rahman.
John H. Harris—Hamiy-ud-Din.
Louise E. Cathrine—Hamida.
Violet Evens—Aziza.
James Evens—Aziz.
Master Evens—Rashid.
A. J. Tonguc—Lissan-ud-Din.
Lewis J. Hill—Muhammad.
Jossie I. Gilbert—Mahmuda.
Alfred Gilbert—Mahmud.
Elizabeth Strode—Sakina.
Stewart A. Broad, Junr. (U.S.A.)—Sadr-ud-Din.

Sunday Lectures.

The following is the series of lectures to be delivered at the Muslim Prayer House, 111, Campden
Hill Road, Notting Hill Gate, London, W. 8, commencing from the 15th of January, 1922:—

22nd.—"My Consolation in Islam," by Khalid Sheldrake.
29th.—"Universalism," by Maulvi Muhammad Yakub Khan.
5th February.—"Soul in Woman and Islam," by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din.
12th.—"Islam and Socialism," by Khwaja Nazir Ahmad.

All are cordially invited. Lectures commence at 5.30 p.m.

The Woking Mosque.
Place of refuge, silence, rest,
Where the soul in its upward quest
Can solace find:
And finding—give,
And giving—get.
May I prove worthy, Allah, yet!
A Muslim Sister.

---

KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN—THE TORCH-BEARER OF ISLAM

It will be heard with deep satisfaction all over the Muslim world that Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, the torch-bearer of Islam to the West, has resumed charge of his labour of love, after an enforced absence of about two years and a half, necessitated through the break-down of his health, which, thank Allah, he has fully recouped.

It was about a decade back that the Khwaja, impelled by the spark of Divine love that kindled his bosom, made up his mind to devote the rest of his days to the promulgation of Islamic truths. Full well he knew that the path he had chosen was surely not strewn with roses. He was conscious that he was exchanging a life of felicity and plenty which he enjoyed as a flourishing legal practitioner for one of trials and hardships. But the imperative
call of duty had driven home to him. He could not possibly resist it. So, renouncing his practice at the bar and entrusting his family to the care of Allah, he set out, in the manner of the saints of yore, all by himself, to bring the light of Islam to these shores, which he found sunk head and shoulders in the quagmire of materialism. Thus it was that in the year 1912 he first set foot on this English soil.

The difficulties attendant upon launching a movement so stupendous can easily be imagined. It is so interesting to hear him recount, in his own sweet manner, the various incidents at that infant stage of the life of the mission. This little mosque he found in a badly neglected condition, and, setting it in order, took it up for the centre of his activities. And what could be a more suitable centre for the sacred undertaking than this only house of Allah in the British Isles? He was his own private secretary, his own clerk, and at times even his own cook. Single-handed would he attend to every detail of the vast and varied business. He would edit the Review, deliver sermons and lectures, hold interviews and do correspondence, all alone.

While yet in India, the Khwaja had made a mark for his sweet orations on religious problems. An advertisement of a public speech under his name would attract thousands, eager to listen to his eloquent addresses. The secret of his general fame lay in the fact that he brought a rational outlook to bear on religious thought. He had discovered that Islam was a religion in thorough accord with the nature of man, nay it was the religion of the universe at large. His heart filled with this conviction, he spared no pains to propound the doctrine with all the force of reason and the richness of language he commands in an exceptional degree. As a matter of fact, he may rightly be regarded as the maker of an epoch in religious thought.
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His discourses with scientific elucidations found the English soil especially congenial. Day after day he created a deeper and deeper impression on the thoughtful people. Seekers after truth rallied to him in large numbers. His selfless efforts were crowned with success. And the day came when the upholders of the banner of Allah, in the midst of irreligion and materialism, were counted by hundreds. This reminded one of the Holy Prophet Muhammad's prophetic words that the sun would rise, in the latter days, in the West; for the sun of Islam actually arose in these western islands as foretold.

In August 1914 the Khwaja went back to India, after ceaseless labour for a couple of years, entrusting the mission to his newly arrived assistants. In September 1916 he returned to these shores. Then came a period of trials and tribulations. His devotion to Allah was put to the most crucial test which is, of course, indispensable to bring out one's mettle, as the Holy Qur'án says: "And We will most certainly try you with somewhat of fear and hunger and loss of property and lives and fruits; and give good news to the patient" (ii. 155). He sustained a heavy shock in the death of his son. Worthy son of a worthy father as he was, he had renounced in the full bloom of youth his worldly prospects which his brilliant academic attainments amply held out to him, and was undergoing religious training, to join his father in the path of Allah. But the Khwaja submitted as a true Muslim to the will of God, with marvellous resignation. "When I stood before Allah," we recollect having heard him speak long since of his feelings at the tragic death, "I probed my heart to see whether the opening words of the prayer which say that God is the 'rab' (creator, nourisher and evolver) of the worlds were still the genuine outpouring of my heart. But, thank Allah, I felt cheerfully resigned to His supreme will; for it transpired to me there and then that the very
A CONVERSAZIONE

death of one dear and near, which at first thought looks out of conformity to the attribute of God as 'rab' (nourisher), is in fact calculated to the spiritual elevation of the bereaved, and, as such, quite in accord with the Divine attribute 'rab,' which also means evolver. The loss of a son, for instance, is the spiritual evolution of the father and vice versa." Such is the keen spiritual vision with which God has endowed this pioneer of Islam in the West.

The scope of his activities grew day by day, which meant additional labour on his part. His ceaseless application to work could not but tell upon his physique. His health failed him, and consequently in April 1919 he had to sail once more for his motherland, on medical advice. There were grave apprehensions whether he would be in a position at all to tend the yet slender plant he had so laboriously implanted on this soil. Even at home he was allowed little rest. He kept touring about, for the greater part of the time, over the length and breadth of India and even abroad, in the far-off islands of Singapore and Java, to acquire a first-hand and up-to-date knowledge of the conditions of the Muslims in these parts of the world. Wherever he went he electrified the Muslim populace with a fresh life and awakened them to the crying need of the hour—the propagation of Islam.

But, thank Allah, we have him back, at last, in our midst, with far improved health and a still greater conviction in and zeal for the cause of propagation of Islam. We feel sanguine that under his inspiration a still brighter future is in store for the movement in these islands. M. Y. K.

A CONVERSAZIONE AT OUR LONDON PRAYER HOUSE

On Saturday, December 10th, a large company assembled at the London Muslim House, 111, Campden
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Hill Road, Notting Hill Gate, W., to greet our brother Haji Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, who has recently returned from India. It was a source of positive delight to the onlooker to see the affectionate manner in which all present addressed Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din. He is dearly beloved by everyone, and his smile is as charming as ever. All the company were animated with a spirit of brotherhood and amity, and the guests chatted without any kind of restraint.

Mr. Khalid Sheldrake rose and asked for a hearing for Mr. Lovegrove (Habib-ullah), who wished to make a few remarks.

On rising, Mr. Lovegrove said they were all thankful to God Who had preserved the Khwaja, and brought him back to his numerous English friends in good health. They all awaited his arrival anxiously. Many enquiries were made, both as to his health and his time of return. He had been booked to speak at various platforms, but as he could not be there the speaker and Mr. Mustafa Khan did their best to fill the vacancy, and did it quite satisfactorily. After each meeting, people would ask when the Khwaja would be with them, which showed how much he was loved, apart from the religion he so ably taught. They would all have to show their regard for the Khwaja, in a practical way, by helping him in the great work he had undertaken. It had been very uphill for brother Mustafa, who came to a strange land in troublous times, both here and in India, to teach a religion quite new to these islands. But he did his duty in spite of criticism and his disadvantages of not knowing intimately English customs. The speaker was sure Mr. Mustafa Khan did his best to fill the gap caused by the Khwaja's absence, and even physically, it was obvious, it would take some doing (laughter).

The Movement had felt the Khwaja's absence; it seemed to them as a house without a father. He could not help admiring the pluck and energy of Brother Mustafa, working hard against long odds, ever undaunted, overcoming all criticism and enjoying the confidence of the people. They heartily wished him a pleasant and safe voyage, and trusted he would find all of his household and friends in good health. They were all sorry to lose him and hoped he would be able to carry to their Indian brethren and sisters a better opinion of English people than was generally supposed to exist amongst his beloved countrymen. He would leave England, concluded the speaker, with the satisfaction of knowing that he was leaving behind friends who would often think of him, and prayed that Allah's blessings be with him.
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He was followed by our beloved brother Lord Headley (El Farooq), who spoke feelingly and must have gone straight to the hearts of his listeners. He said:

he heartily endorsed all that had been said about his dear old friend and brother, and the welcome extended to him was no empty profession, but a most sincere outcome of affection and regard. Religionists are not, as a rule, very lovable people, because dogmas (with which the very foundations of their tenets are encrusted) place vital importance upon matters absolutely outside the only practical part of religion, i.e. resignation to God’s Will, and duty to one’s neighbour. But in his dearest brother the Khwaja he recognized the qualities of resignation and toleration combined with great abilities, which made him probably the greatest living champion of Islam.

What seemed to him so sad and regrettable was that in this country true religion was languishing simply and solely because the people were taught by the clergy to believe things the priests and parsons do not believe themselves. He could not but realize that the Christian dogmas were still being forced on people whose intelligence was outraged by the absolute nonsense advanced. He looked upon the clergy both of the Church of Rome and the Church of England as perjured men for this reason:—The vast majority of Bishops, Priests and Deacons are men who have had good education either at Colleges or Schools, and it is impossible to understand how they really can believe in their inmost heart all the Articles of the Christian Faith. They have to most solemnly accept the Thirty-nine Articles, and they must believe in the divinity of Christ, the necessity of the Sacraments, and, following up that outrageous creed of St. Athanasius, have to assert that salvation is dependent on the way we “think” of the Trinity. He well remembered being told that if he did not believe in the divinity of Christ he could not be saved, and this was laid down by highly religious Christian people. If you talk this over with a clergyman he will invariably put you off with some remark of a non-committal nature such as: “Well, we don’t take all that too literally now,” or “Times have changed,” anything, in fact, to put one off the scent. What one wanted to get at is the reason why the Religion which should guide us and bind us should be still put before the people in such a form as to create ridicule. Why should our children be encouraged in a contempt for religious matters? Why should our young men be driven from places of worship by nonsensical, dictatorial and dogmatic statements? The time has come for the clergy of all denominations to freely admit the unpleasant fact that half of the foundation of that Christianity, which was set rolling some three or four hundreds of years after Christ, was merely the
fabrication of monks and holy fathers who were bidding for the temporal power.

The whole of history shows this so clearly that it is a wonder that the patent and pious frauds, once detected, were not exposed and abandoned. But the terrors of the unknown are great; the power of the monks to cajole the uneducated and superstitious into believing that they could push people either into the bottomless pit or through the gates of Heaven was persevered in, and the whole concoction became traditional and, as it were, formed part and parcel of the everyday life and belief. Similarly if we, from earliest childhood, had been told and had read in books, described as an important fact, that the moon was made of green cheese and that this was one of the important articles of our religion, we might perhaps believe it, but surely there could be no reason for believing that the composition of the moon was of the same importance for salvation as abstaining from murdering and stealing?

He heartily welcomed his arriving brother, and deplored the departure of Maulvi Mustafa Khan; it was, however, fortunate that they had them both together, if only for a short time.

At the conclusion of Lord Headley’s words, Mr. Khalid Sheldrake said:

Brethren and sisters, you have listened to the words of Mr. Lovegrove and Lord Headley, and it is needless for me to say I heartily endorse all that they have said. I am glad that Khwaja is back with us once more; no one is more happy to have him than myself, but my joy at his return is tempered by a feeling of sadness also. My dear brother Mustafa Khan, whom I have learned to love as a dear friend, is going away from us. What a pity it is that he cannot remain also. I fully realize that after two years of exile from home he must be anxious to return, but I am sure we shall all miss him very much indeed. How happy it would have been to have had Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din and Mustafa Khan here together. I know, however, that our thoughts will go with him.

You do not want a long speech from me, and I now must request Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din to say a few words. We are all most anxious to hear him; he cannot speak to us too often.

Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din and Maulvi Mustafa Khan then addressed the gathering. [Their speeches will appear in our next issue.—Editor.] This gathering at the London Muslim House was unique. Not only Muslims but Christians also came to greet our beloved Leader on his return. Among those who should be mentioned as helping to contribute to the high success of the gathering, one must not forget the labours and
cheeriness of Khwaja Nazir Ahmad, who seemed everywhere at once. Our Muslim sisters served tea to the assembled guests, and as they laboured, on their faces was reflected the happiness which all present felt. It was as if the father of a rather large family had returned home after a long absence.

Time sped by, and one was loath indeed to leave such an atmosphere of peace and brotherhood, but with the realization that Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din was again with us, and that we should often be near him and hear his addresses, we departed, feeling that we had benefitted spiritually and morally for having the good fortune to be present at this Conversazione.

KHALID SHELDRAKE.

TABLE TALK

By KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN

On board S.S. Ap-car, from Singapore to Rangoon.

Darwin and Evolution.

DARWINISM is on its wane. No one cares to trace its origin to ape ancestry. Even physically, there are many gaps to fill between man and monkey. The research of the last fifty years could not find out “the missing link” between man and orang-outang. The imaginary thing is a nonentity and will remain so ever. The genesis of man as given in the first book of the Bible could not satisfy Darwin. No one with an intelligent head on his shoulders can satisfy himself with the account given in the Bible. But it is no reason why we should swallow the pill prepared by Darwin. His theory, no doubt, has all the plausibility about it, and could possibly be accepted if man was only flesh and bone. His charts may disclose some semblance between human skeleton and the physical frame of a monkey. But what about the consciousness of the two entities? The gulf between human and ape-consciousness is wide enough to disprove the Darwinian theory. His
naked eye even with the help of science could not see that vast difference between human brain-cells and ape brain-congeries which the two said consciousnesses disclose. The frame of the human body apparently may show a little improvement on the physical constitution of monkey, but there is no comparison worth the name between human mind and that of the most perfect in the ape category.

**Human Consciousness.**

Man is the miniature of the Universe. The Qur-án teaches us so. Many among the subsequent philosophies support this Qur-ánic view. Every atom in nature finds room in the human frame. I may go further and say that every organism has its representative in human constitution. The theory specially holds good as far as human consciousness goes. Every animal has got special traits of his consciousness. If consciousness is only sum total of certain passions, hankerings, and appetites differently observable in different animals, the theory of Darwin falls to the ground if the consciousness of various animals is examined. The consciousness of a cat is quite different from that of a pig. Lustful, dirty and unclean habits of the animal—the flesh of which makes a delicious dish to some taste, carrying along with it the ways of the animal to its eaters—cannot be observed in the tidy, clean manner of a cat. It is an interesting subject to study the manners of different animals, as in it lies the study of their consciousness, but the diversion would be a digression from my subject. Suffice to say that there is a big contrast in the animal consciousness of different categories. While human consciousness comes to make a new departure in this respect, it collects every animal consciousness in it. Nature collocates minds of every other animal in human mind. Cat and dog, wolf and lion, pig and horse, serpent and crocodile, in short,
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wherever there is exhibition of consciousness in animal lives it finds its place in human consciousness. Human consciousness, so to say, is cosmic-consciousness.

If so is the case, man cannot be the descendant of an ape, even thousand generations removed, what to say of one or two missing links of Darwin between man and ape. If monkey was our ancestor, his mind should have collocated at least minds of other hundred animals, as our mind represents millions of minds. Even on the basis of physical constitution Darwin was not a true prophet. His charts showing skeletons of different animals may excite an admiration in a few superficial minds. But if mentality is the outcome of physical frame, variety in mentality observable in various categories of animals necessitates variety of physical frame. Hence, different species in the animal kingdom cannot be in lineal descent to each other. There may be apparent kinness in different physical frames to deceive human eye—and Darwin was unfortunately misled by it, but really there exists no kindredness even between the body-fabric of various species in the province of animals.

Origin of Species.

It is difficult to locate origin of species, but one thing is certain. Species is not outgrowth of natural selection as suggested by Darwin. In their classification you may arrange divisions and sub-divisions under certain genus, but in the light of what has recently come within scientific ken, any species can be traced for its origin to the world of atoms. Ethereal specks, no sooner they are converted into electronic complex, travel with mathematical precision on prescribed lines to reach their goal in the form of any organism. In various stages of development they may undergo different specializations or collocations, but they never leave the
Page or pages missing here.

We hope to supply later.
THE TRIUMPH OF AL-QUR-ÁN

of August 20, 1921, give the readers of this Review some idea of the importance of this epoch-making “explosion that hit the Church”:

During the last few days orthodox Christianity has received the greatest blow it has suffered for many years. Outside the Church, scores of people, learned and skilled in the ways of theology, have been attempting to prove that the basis of Christianity was all wrong, and that modern science had destroyed its very foundation. This time, though, a blow has come from the inside itself; and three highly-placed theologians, all avowed members of the Church of England in which they live, preach and have their being, have united to use words which lay men take to mean that Christ was not the son of God, but a Palestine Jew. . . .

Now, what Renan argued in The Life of Jesus, what all scientists outside the faith have expressed in learned tomes, has been suddenly put into a bomb which, thrown at the Modern Churchmen’s Congress at Cambridge not a week ago, has staggered the Anglican Church so much that the reverberations of the shock will be felt for years. . . . Dr. Rashdall, the Dean of Carlisle, Dr. Bethune-Baker, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, the Rev. R. G. Parsons of Rusholme, have stood up at an Anglican conference, and—if their words have been reported rightly—denied the Godhead. . . .

“Christ was not divine, but human,” said Dr. Rashdall. “I do not for a moment suppose that Christ ever thought of himself as God,” said Dr. Bethune-Baker. “Jesus was a man, genuinely, utterly, completely, unreservedly human,” said the Rev. R. G. Parsons—“a Palestine Jew who expressed himself through the conditions and limitations of life and thought peculiar to his own time.”

These three men are not people whose opinions can be disregarded even by the most orthodox of all Christians. They are men of the highest intellectual attainments, men of brilliant achievements in the world of theology; all of them men who, as lecturers and fellows and professors, have instructed scores of Anglican divines before their ordination and since.

So goes the description which is one of a thousand others now resounding throughout Christendom, making the truth ever more and more manifest to the thinking minds of all those who have been following Churchianity. The pronouncements of these fearless doctors are doubtless the seeds of the greatest upheaval yet to be known by orthodox and conventional Christianity. What has been so suddenly and forcibly blown up is the very foundation itself.
Whereas it is on this foundation that the superstructure of all recognized forms of that religion has been built up, formed and reformed, ever since the second and third centuries after the Prophet of Nazareth. Thus the situation created by this explosion is most significant of the complete disruption that is certain to befall the alleged religion of Jesus (Peace and Blessings be upon him!); and along with that disruption, the final triumph of the Holy Qur-án and the Religion of Nature which it expounds—the religion which, in the words of this Holy Book (xxx. 30) "is the true religion with God," and of which another name is "al-Islam." In declaring that "Christ was not divine, but human," and that "Christ never thought of himself as God," and that "Jesus was a man, genuinely, utterly, completely, unreservedly human—a Palestine Jew," etc., these three giant-professors of Christianity are but reverting to the truly original foundation of the religion of Jesus, and thereby confirming in the clearest terms the contention of the Holy Qur-án which spoke in the following words even thirteen centuries ago when referring to the absurd doctrine of Christ's "son-ship" or divinity:

Certainly they disbelieve who say: Surely God is the Messiah, son of Mary; and the Messiah said: O children of Israel! Serve God, my Lord and your Lord. Surely whoever associates (others) with God, then God has forbidden to him the garden, and his abode is the fire; and there shall be no helpers for the unjust" (Sura v. 72).

"Certainly they disbelieve who say: Surely God is the third of the three; whereas there is no god but the one God, and if they desist not from what they say, a painful chastisement shall befall those among them who disbelieve" (Sura v. 78).

"And they say: The Beneficent God hath taken (to Himself) a son. Certainly you have made an abominable assertion. The heavens may almost be rent thereat, and the earth cleave asunder, and the mountains fall down in pieces, that they ascribe a son to the Beneficent God, whereas it is not worthy of the Beneficent God that He should take (to Himself) a son" (Sura xix. 88-92).

Nothing else but the above truism could be the original foundation of the true religion of Jesus—
THE TRIUMPH OF AL-QUR-ÁN

that same religion which all messengers of God in any part of the world taught with slight differences in secondary details to suit different times and climes; that same religion which became corrupted from time to time after the respected founder of it was no more, and which, for that very same reason, was revealed again thirteen centuries ago to the world through Muhammad; who, by Divine aid and revelations, expounded it and improved upon it in such a way as to make it perfect for all humanity and all times; and who so took care to preserve the purity of his Book that the appearance of another teacher after him with a new Dispensation is made entirely unnecessary.

The Holy Qur-án has further proved true in what it says above, regarding the punishment for associating others with God. "Whoever associates (others) with God," it says, "then God has forbidden to him the garden, and his abode is the fire." Absolute unity of God is demanded even by the very constituents of human nature. It is part and parcel of human reasoning. In the degree that one accords unity or oneness to God, in that degree is he allowed into the garden and saved from the fire even in this world. But as not all the world have been perfectly free from polytheism, in one form or another, so not all the world have been allowed the garden and saved from the fire. Slavery to the low desires is one form of associating others with God, and this is prolific of crimes, immorality, drunkenness and so forth, which have been everyday scenes throughout the centuries, calling for punishments and "fires" of every kind. In those lands where Jesus has been associated in the Godhead of God, or where some war-lord is raised more or less to the level of the Supreme Deity, war has again and again scorched the earth. Other countries and other ages, on account of idolatry, sank deep in ignorance, superstitions and the most abject form of intellectual
bondage. Only complete recognition of absolute unity of the Supreme Being can save the world from these painful and un-garden-like chastisements even in this life. Only a religion based on this principle of God’s absolute unity can be the true religion. Hence the words of the Qur-án: “He (God) has commanded that you shall not serve aught but Him; this is the right religion (i.e. the religion of Nature), but most people do not know” (xii. 40). This is not because God is jealous or has any personal interest in being accorded absolute unity. It is because His absolute unity is as much a law of nature and of human reasoning as the essence of all existence. Polytheism in any form, conscious or unconscious, violates this law of God’s undivided unity in Nature. Any idea of division or plurality in the Godhead does, by nature, tend to produce forgetfulness of the One true God; and such forgetfulness results in all sorts of sins and transgressions, fire and sufferings, of which one of the most palpable and hellish forms in Christendom on this side of the grave was the recent Great European War.

In short, the one Supreme Fact of the universe, the one Supreme Message pervading the whole Qur-án, the absolute undivided oneness of God, is being made triumphant without the slightest shadow of equivocation. And to this triumph in the West, the three reverend gentlemen named above are the great eye-openers and first witnesses within the precincts of the Church. When the history of the development of Islam in the Western world has been written, these three great names will stand among the foremost. Missionary zealots of the Church like Zwemer and Walter, who have all this time been devoting their energy to the abusing of Muhammad, his Qur-án and his religion, might well ponder now. Their years of labour to revile Muhammad and defend the Trinity against him have at last become null. The accusation that Muhammad could
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not understand the "beautiful" doctrine of the sonship, but took it in the carnal sense, turned out hollow. For, if it is to be taken in the spiritual sense, we all are sons of God. Why should Jesus alone be regarded as such? Alas! What a pity! What an irony of fate! These zealots truly deserve the highest congratulations. So many years of labour to overthrow Muhammad and his religion! Far from overthrowing, the arrows, like boomerangs, return to the senders. Churchianity is being utterly routed by rationality from within. And if it is said that what the newspapers have reported of those doctors' words is not true—that is to say, their words have not been rightly reported—it will nevertheless be true one day. The Qur-án will triumph and Islam will triumph. For Truth is more powerful than doctors and all popular oppositions put together. Truth is one-sided and Truth must prevail. When it has prevailed these zealots need not be sorry; for:

Every day is a fresh beginning;
Every morn is the world made new.

THE SUFI'S DIARY

Meaning of the term "Sufi."

What a misconception of our holy Order in this land of misrepresentation and misunderstanding. The whole Western World, I am afraid, is labouring under the same. They think we Sufies have got no religion. They mistake the universal sympathetic attitude of the Order for our non-identification with any faith or creed. They ought to know that Sufi Order is purely a Muslim Order, and Muslim sympathies under the teaching of the Holy Qur-án know no man-made limits and boundaries. The Qur-án claims to bring a message to the whole of mankind. We fail to find any tribal or sectarian God in it. The God of the Sufi is the God of the Qur-án—Rub-bul-alamen, Creator of all nations and creeds. If a Sufi has to
accept the Holy Prophet as his exampler—and I wonder how he can perfect his course of self-discipline without doing so—the very ideal before the prophet which was to devote his life to the service of humanity would make Sufi a lover of mankind. Yes, we have to serve humanity. All our sympathies and antipathies are for God. We hate what the Almighty hates. We love what He loves.

**Human Body the Temple of God.**

Is not the human body the temple of God, with the human heart the fittest throne for my Lord to sit upon? How can I hate this very temple of my Beloved? Every man is an object of love for me. He is the house of my God. It is true that some of the temples have become damaged and disfigured by the carelessness of their mortal care-takers. But if I cannot afford to demolish any place of worship, no matter, how dilapidated, my duty is to repair and not to destroy. Similarly, people of different persuasions and conduct, if going on lines contrary to the prescribed routine of righteousness, disfigure that Divine tabernacle, I cannot harm it. I must go to make amends.

The religion of Islam inspires me to do so. Love for all and hatred for none, excepting to fulfil God’s commandments, is the true Islamic principle, so strictly observed by our Order. Why it should be taken to mean our non-identification with the religion is a mystery to me. There is one explanation. Religions have been at strife from times immemorial. Snarling and biting each other has been the nature of a clergy everywhere. Religionists are usually narrow-minded, a thing unknown in our Order. Possibly for this reason we have been taken to belong to no religion under average judgment.

**Worship to God—Service to Humanity.**

God does not need my praising Him. He is above all human glorification. He is all praise
and glorification Himself; so the Qur-án says. What does this worship of God mean? I think our book throws a flood of light on the subject. Service to humanity is worship to God. How could a man worship his Creator, if he hates God’s other creatures, specially man? At least, a Sufi cannot afford to do so. He must love every unit of humanity. Perhaps this Sufi attitude towards his fellow beings has led the Occident to think that he has got no religion. His religion is to serve humanity. How could he do otherwise if he receives inspirations from these words of the prophet himself:—

“My prayers and my sacrifices, my life and death, are to serve the cause of the God of all nations and races.”

What a noble ideal! I never read of any other prophet keeping such a sublime ideal before him! I cannot understand Jesus in this respect. No doubt he was a Jew of Jews. He might chalk out certain limits for his activities, but he should not have refused light to those who came to him for it from out of the pale of Judaism. An old woman so anxious to be enlightened upon Divine truths should not have been awarded a cold rebuff: “It is not meet to take the children’s bread and to cast it to a dog.”

Biblical Records a Libel to Jesus.

Jerusalem was his only care. The Israelites were perhaps the only people in his judgment who could be classed as men, and the rest of the world mere dogs and swine. No, it could not be. Jesus, that beloved prophet, that teacher of high morals and ideals, the very name which I have learnt to revere since my days in the lap of my mother, under the teachings of my Qur-án, could not be the author of such horrid expressions as he has been reported to have made in the so-called records of his life. It is a libel to his good name. He is one of our prophets.
He has been highly spoken of in the Qur-án. A true lover of humanity, as every messenger of God is expected to be—and he was one of the blessed race—could not style others as dogs, swine and serpents. My conception of a prophet cannot tally with the portrait given of Jesus in the Bible. God be glorified. His book came to save the situation. It redeemed the memory of our beloved Jesus, when it said that the Biblical records have been corrupted by human beings, and are not genuine. We should not go by what is narrated of Jesus in the Bible. He was after all a Sufi, of the Order of John the Baptist, and an Essene; his love for humanity knew no bounds. He could not abuse others.

ISLAMIC AND CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION

By R. LISSAN.

One of the surest proofs of civilization is the regard of and treatment meted out to woman. The sayings of Jesus and the accounts given in the Gospels exhibit a regard and respect for her. Muhammad also in his life, actions and teachings attaches great importance to that natural humanity and chivalry which should be adhered to by Muslims and Christians. His saying “Paradise lies at the feet of mothers” speaks for itself. Polygamy was not introduced by the Prophet, it existed in nearly all the ancient races; the Jews, Thracians and races settled in Europe and Asia practised it, and it was much abused; the general position of all but the first wife was an unenviable one. Muhammad placed it on a stable and just basis, guaranteeing the wives equality and not permitting more than could be afforded. “You may marry, two, three, or four, but not more, but if you cannot deal justly and equitably, you shall marry only one.” This restriction went a long way to enhance her status.
He had only one wife during Khadija’s lifetime, his subsequent marriages were the desire for offspring, to which so much importance is attached in the East, and one of them was particularly to reconcile a possible breach among his immediate followers. Seclusion in the harem as a sanctuary was helpful in stemming the tide of immorality. Women under Islam came to the fore and occupied exalted positions. Zobeida, wife of Haroun, played a conspicuous part. Sakina, granddaughter of Ali, was the most brilliant, accomplished and virtuous woman of her time. Buran, wife of Mamun, Umm ul Fazl, Umm-i-Habib, his sister and daughter were famed for their scholarship. Sheikhor Shunda lectured at Baghdad to large audiences on literature, rhetoric and poetry. Zemora fought side by side with the bravest knights, and was the heroine of many battles. The saintly Rabia and others of later times may be mentioned. In the colleges at Cordova were women students and doctors in attendance on operations and surgery for women patients.

Christianity has somewhat different views regarding woman. Chrysostom says, “What is woman but an enemy of friendship, an unavoidable punishment, a necessary evil, a natural temptation, a desirable affliction, a constantly flowing source of tears, a wicked work of nature, covered with a shining varnish.” The word femina is attributed fe=faith, minus=less, hence was deduced “faithless”. “She was formed of a crooked rib, and her spiritual nature has been distorted and crooked ever since.” She was conceived of by some as “the gate of hell,” and other choice epithets: Tertullian describes her as “the devil’s gateway, the unsealer of the forbidden tree, the deserter of the divine law, the destroyer of God’s image—man.” Another says, “Among women he sought chastity but found none.” This is from the Church which exalts Mary the mother of Christ to the pinnacle of veneration.
Lea (Superstition and Force) gives accounts of tortures inflicted upon women during the Middle Ages, under accusations of witchcraft, by the witch-finders, and instances one who admitted that he had illegally caused the death of 120 women, who were burnt. This atrocious custom continued down to 1722, when an old woman in her dotage was sentenced to the stake, and who mumbled out her satisfaction at warming her hands at the fire (Rogers, Scotland, Social and Domestic, page 301).

The Malleus Maleficarum (Witch Hammer), the Papal Bull directed against witchcraft, says: "It is easy to see that when woman does not love God, she must resort to the opposite extreme and hate Him. It is thus clear why woman especially are addicted to the practice of sorcery."

In various communities in France and Germany, all the women were sent to the stake. Rensberg estimates that the witch persecution cost nine million lives. With the Bible in their hands, the theologians sanctioned and the learned defended. The Protestants vied with the Catholics. Even Luther and the first reformers did not check but promoted the belief in devils. In short, the belief in the devil, says Colquhoun, has had the effect that all rational knowledge had disappeared and the powers of hell and darkness, born of a diseased imagination, reigned upon the earth. J. A. Farrer, in Books Condemned to be Burnt (preface x), says: "It was not until 1790 that woman ceased to be liable to be burned alive for high or petit treason, and Blackstone finds nothing to say against it. He saw nothing unfair in burning a woman for coining, but in only hanging a man. The punishment for petit treason, he says, in a man was to be drawn and hanged, in a woman to be drawn and burned.

St. Gregory the Great approved and congratulated Phocas, the usurper of the throne of Byzantium, on the murder of the Emperor Maurice,
who was dragged from a sanctuary where he had sought refuge, his five sons were beheaded before his eyes, and he was then murdered. The Empress was inveigled from the Church of St. Sophia, tortured, and with her three young daughters beheaded. The adherents of the massacred family were pursued with ferocity and vindictiveness, some were blinded, others the tongues torn out or hands and feet cut off, some whipped, others burned. This, because they were not orthodox. Gregory wrote Phocas the usurper two letters full of scriptural quotations, congratulating him and his wife on their triumph.

It has been sought to demonstrate the influence of animism on Islam by a recent writer. Animism has been truly defined as “the seed of religion” by which man turns from things to ideas. Islam was never in that stage; from its first conception, it was a pure monotheism, unmixed with elements of polytheism. The pre-Islamic religion which was overthrown and destroyed by Muhammad was, one may say, almost pure animism. There is more animism in the Christian Church of to-day than one would expect to find in a monotheistic or trinitarian faith. The crowd of saints and angels and martyrs clustered into the Church darken the light of true worship. There is more superstition believed and recognized in Christianity than in Islam. In Belgium there are still three fetish trees on which little bits of rag are hung as votive offerings, and the people pray at the tree; in an engraving is represented Jesus and Mary at the top of the tree. Christianity did not destroy the old faith but absorbed it, with its feasts, its images, its temples, its superstitions and beliefs, and its gods, making them into saints. The Druids venerated the oak and the hazel, which tradition has not died. In the Roman Campagna to-day, and in Naples and Rome, the jettatura, the evil eye, is universally believed in; one of the recent Popes is said to have had it. In Brittany many of
the old Druid customs are carried out still. The brass decorations on horse harness are simply charms to avert the evil eye. Superstition dies hard, particularly when it is tacitly overlooked by a religion. In the Middle Ages every monastery had its master magician who sold "Agnus Dei," conception billets, magic incense, salt and tapers consecrated on Candlemas Day, Palms on Palm Sunday, and other appliances belonging to the great magical system of the Church (Rydberg).

And to-day they put up horse shoes, to keep out bad luck, witches and spirits, and coral round infants' necks to keep off evil influences, etc. In short, there are abundant evidences to show that there is a very considerable foundation of animism and evil fetishism in the form of mascots in England of to-day in popular general usage.

To summarize. It is not sought to cast any shadow on Jesus of Nazareth as Prophet and Reformer; it is recognized by Muslims that he was a divinely sent messenger, and to him reverence and regard are given. Luther was not so tolerant. He describes Muhammad in terms incompatible with a Christian priest, but no doubt in harmony with his mental world-view, and there are Christians to-day who have bizarre notions as to the Muslim belief.

Facts are stubborn things which no amount of religious sentiment or bigotry can gloss over, and when we are asked to compare the comparative benefits conferred on humanity by the Islamic and Christian civilizations, we quite agree with Canon Isaac Taylor: "It is not the first propagation of Islam that has to be explained, but the permanency with which it retains its hold upon its converts. Christianity is less tenacious in its grasp. An African tribe, once converted to Islam, never reverts to paganism and never embraces Christianity. Islam has done more for civilization than Christianity."
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Take, for example, the statements of English officials or of lay teachers as to the practical results of Islam. When Muhammadanism is embraced by a negro tribe, pagan devil-worship, fetichism, cannibalism, human sacrifice, infanticide, witchcraft at once disappear. The natives begin to dress; filth is replaced by cleanliness; and they acquire personal dignity and self-respect. Hospitality becomes a religious duty; drunkenness becomes rare; gambling is forbidden; immodest dances and promiscuous intercourse of the sexes cease. Female chastity is regarded as a virtue; industry replaces idleness; law, order and sobriety prevail; blood feuds, cruelty to animals and slaves is forbidden. A feeling of humanity, benevolence and brotherhood is inculcated. Polygamy and slavery are regulated, their evils restrained. Islam, above all, is the most powerful total abstinence association in the world, whereas the extension of European trade means the extension of drunkenness and vice and the degradation of the people. Islam introduces a civilization of no low order, including a knowledge of reading and writing, decent clothing, personal cleanliness, veracity and self-respect. The restraining and civilizing effects are marvellous. How little have we to show for the vast sums of money and all the precious lives lavished upon Africa. Christian converts are reckoned by thousands, Muslim converts by millions.”

From a reading and a comparison of the above statements and opinions, it is conclusive that Islam as a civilizing force has been and still is far superior to Christianity, from the humanitarian as well as the social and religious view-points.

The persecutions and crimes of Christianity during the ages, with the millions of victims of the stake and sword and drink, cannot but have their reaction. The truth of the axiom is recognized by all. “As one sows so one reaps.” One must not
expect to sow with the torch of persecution and reap with world-wide extension. It is admitted that Christianity is losing its hold on the people. In America and European countries, statistics show a laxity of faith; churches are not attended, and the cry is the people are reeling towards infidelity. To whom is the blame? Has the Church ever done anything for the people or their welfare? Even the present sorely needed divorce reform, which would confer much benefit in the case where needed, is opposed by the Church tooth and nail. The Church is like the Bourbons; they learn nothing and they forget nothing.

Islam has always fostered civilization, culture, learning, the welfare of her votaries, and strives to realize the ideal of the Prophet, of the Unity of God and the Brotherhood of Man.

HOLY ANECDOTES

"It is not for me, O uncle, to desist from upholding the sacred name of Allah, even if you place the sun in my right hand and the moon in my left. The cause of truth must triumph or I must perish in the attempt." Such was the manly reply of Muhammad (Peace on him) to his uncle Abu Talib. But it was not without a heart-rending pang that he had thus to disappoint one who was deeply attached to him. While yet an orphan boy of eight, with no earthly shelter, Abu Talib extended his paternal care to him and had since brought him up with tender affection. He had so far shielded him against the wrath of his deadly foes and stood by him in thick and thin.

But now affairs had taken an extremely critical turn. The entire clan of the Quraish was up in arms against him. He must either throw in his lot with Muhammad against the overwhelming odds, or desert him. Thus placed between the horns of a dilemma,
he was at a loss to decide which course to adopt. He had not the might to withstand the united onslaught of the Quraish, nor could he reconcile himself to the idea of throwing Muhammad (Peace on him) into the hands of the sullen foe. In such a state of perplexity he sent for Muhammad (Peace on him), and put the problem to himself. "Have pity on me," he said, "and don't charge me with a responsibility too heavy for me." Muhammad could refuse nothing to a benefactor such as Abu Talib was. But this was just the request he could on no account grant. There was but one reply, and the Holy Prophet had to give it. Was any compromise possible in the matter of faith? Come what might, Muhammad (Peace on him) must carry out what was to him the sole mission of life. He would perish in the attempt, he said, rather than give it up.

But conscious of the disappointment thus caused to his dear uncle, the Holy Prophet's eyes bubbled up with tears and he departed with a sad heart. Abu Talib had not abjured his ancestral form of worship, but of the Holy Prophet's morals he was much enamoured. It was far easier, he thought within himself, to face death rather than leave him alone. Forthwith he sent for the Holy Prophet again and thus addressed him: "Do whatever you will. Under no circumstances will I desert you."

The Quraish had little doubt Abu Talib would yield to their united demand. They were much surprised when they heard of his determination to stand by the Holy Prophet, come what might. An internecine war among themselves, they thought, was fraught with grave danger. This might ruin the sovereign authority of their clan, for good. This time, therefore, they made an attempt to prevail upon Abu Talib by offering him a lure, instead of forcing him with a threat. Taking 'Ammara-bin-Walid, a handsome youth, along with them, they asked Abu Talib to adopt him as his son and make
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over Muhammad to them, to be executed for his offence against their established ancestral religion. “What a funny proposal!” replied Abu Talib. “You want me to take charge of your boy to bring him up, while you should have mine to be put to death. This can never be.” Thus the Quraish were disappointed once more. Apprehending lest they should resort to some violent measures against his family, the Bani-Hasham, Abu Talib summoned together all the members of the family, and forewarned them against the danger. It was unanimously agreed upon that the Holy Prophet would in no case be given over to the Quraish, whatever measures they might adopt against Bani-Hasham. With the solitary exception of Abu Jahal, who had joined hands with the Quraish, the entire family was prepared to take up arms in defence of the Holy Prophet. Such was the popularity he enjoyed among the whole family of Bani-Hasham. They were all devoted to him heart and soul, for his lofty morals. Notwithstanding their religious differences with him, they were ready to protect him with their lives.

The Quraish, however, had not yet exhausted their resources to arrive at a settlement without resort to bloodshed. They had yet another hand to play. Persecution had proved futile, but allurements, it struck them, offered direct to the Holy Prophet, might still succeed. Abu Talib and Bani-Hasham were inexorable, and thus the only alternative left was to try this method. A deputation was accordingly formed to come to an understanding with the Holy Prophet on this basis. They called on the Holy Prophet and offered him the most tempting terms, which were:

“If your ambition is to possess wealth, we will amass for you as much of it as you wish; if you aspire to win honour and power, we are prepared to swear allegiance to you as our overlord and king; if you have a fancy for beauty, you shall have the
hand of the finest maiden, of your own choice.” Irresistible temptations no doubt! From a destitute, helpless and persecuted man to a mighty potentate is a big lift. But the Holy Prophet’s heart was un tarnished by the least alloy of worldliness. To the utter disappointment of the Quraish delegation, this is how he replied: “I want neither pelf nor power. I have been commissioned by God as a warner unto mankind. I deliver His message to you. Should you accept it, you shall have felicity in this life as well as in the life to come; should you reject the word of God, surely God will decide between you and me.” This frustrated the last attempt of the Quraish at a compromise. Persuasion through temptations proved as fruitless as persecution. Both were tried in an extremely high degree. Persecution was unbearable, but the temptation was far more irresistible. Were it not for Divine steadfastness infused into the Holy Prophet’s bosom, the tortures inflicted on him and the allurements placed in his way would have shaken him off his position. But there he stood, firm as a rock, baffling all attempts to unhinge him from his mission. It is to this that the Holy Qur-án alludes in the verse: “Had it not been that We had already made you firm, you would certainly have been near to incline to them a little” (xvii. 74).

BABAR.

CORRESPONDENCE

Copy of a letter dated December 12, 1921, to the Editor, the Leicester Daily Mercury, Leicester.

DEAR SIR,—Your issues of the 5th, 7th and 9th inst. give publicity to certain views concerning the Prophet Muhammad under the title, the “Problems of Pan-Islam,” which give rise to some very serious misconceptions. Will you extend me the courtesy of your esteemed columns to say a word in that
connection, with a view to throwing light on the misapprehensions?

Major Davy's otherwise interesting and informed discourse fails to do justice to the Prophet when he observes that "he was at times cruel and cunning and addicted to sensuality, having many wives." Permit me to point out for the information of your numerous readers that the reflections are unmerited, not warranted by historical facts and figures.

Any one acquainted with the alpha and beta of the Prophet's life must have noticed that long before the Call came to him, in fact from his very early days, he enjoyed universal reputation for his righteousness, uprightness and honesty, so much so that he was nicknamed "Al-Amin" or the trustworthy. He was the general depository, and even in the days when the whole of Mecca was against him, he had several trusts in his custody. When his house was surrounded by his foes in order to put an end to him as soon as he should come out next morning, his one anxiety was not so much on his own account as for the due return of the deposits with him; for he wanted to make his escape good for Medina before dawn, in which case he feared he would be causing anxiety to the depositors. Hence he sent for Ali, his cousin, and informing him of his intention, made over all the deposits to him, to be duly returned to the owners the following morning. Mark the gravity of the situation and the anxiety of the Prophet, not for his life, which was hanging in the balance, but for his honour, which he was too jealous to throw into suspicion. Can such a man be justly called cunning?

Now as regards his alleged cruelty. Who does not know that the Prophet and his companions were subjected to incredibly inhuman tortures. The

1 We have now reasons to believe that Major Davy's address was not correctly reported in the Leicester Daily Mercury.—Ed.
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legs and hands of one, for instance, were fastened to four camels, each one being driven into different directions, thus tearing his body into pieces. After such-like tortures to which they were put for about a decade, they had to bid farewell to their home and hearth, to seek shelter elsewhere. There, too, they were allowed no rest, the Meccans making incursions after incursions on them to extirpate the movement, root and branch. But the time came when the exiled, persecuted and detested Muhammad became the sole master of Mecca, his torturers at his sole mercy. What was the treatment meted out to them? They were granted general pardon. Is it fair to accuse such a man of cruelty?

On a certain "Eid" festival, while the Prophet was walking along towards the congregation, with his two grandsons, he met a child on the way, lonely and sad. "Why don't you go to the congregation?" asked the Prophet. "My father is dead," replied the child, "I have none to carry me." "Come along," said the Prophet lovingly, taking the child up on his shoulder, "I am your father; I will carry you to the congregation." One of the Prophet's companions once happened to come across a dog licking mud by a well on account of excessive thirst. There being no arrangement for drawing water, the companion made his turban into a rope and his leather-sack into a bucket, and drawing water, quenched the animal's thirst. This came to the Prophet's notice, on which he remarked that the single act of kindness to a creature of God was enough to entitle him to access into heaven. A heart full of such tenderness even to lower animals, but cruel to fellow-man—is it conceivable?

Again, female infanticide was a point of honour with the Arabs in pre-Islamic days. The father would dig a pit outside in the open, take the child there and with his own hands hurl the child down and heap earth on the screaming child. When...
one such incident was related to the Prophet, he burst into tears. A heart so full of the milk of human nature! Is it not cruel to call it cruel?

Now with regard to the charge of sensuality. Youth is the time when human passions are in their full vigour. It is at this stage that one's passions may run riot and have the better of him. Till the age of 25 the Prophet leads a bachelor life, admitted by friend and foe alike to be one white sheet, perfectly spotless. At 25 he marries, no young girl, it may be noticed, but a widow 15 years older than himself, i.e. 40 years old. Up to the good old age, 58, he leads his life in the company of this single wife. Is it not absurd on the face of it that one who has led a life of continence so long should be accused of sensuality at an age when the vigour of youth has absolutely left him?

If the Prophet was out, as alleged, to attain power in order to minister to his self-gratification, the object could be attained without undergoing the untold hardships he was subjected to. At a very early period of his mission the Meccans offered him all this if he would only give up preaching his new creed: "If you want power, we accept you as our overlord; if you want money, name the sum and it shall be at your disposal; if you have a fancy for beauty, point to the girl and she shall be in your arms." But what is the Prophet's reply? "Should you place the sun on my right hand and moon on my left, I shall not give it up until it should triumph or I perish in the attempt." This surely cannot be the reply of one who aims at self-gratification.

Then come to the mode of the Prophet's life, at a time when he owned the spiritual as well as temporal allegiance of the whole of Arabia. A matting made of palm-leaves, an earthen jug for water, an ordinary bed, formed the only furniture of his house. For days no fire was made in his
CORRESPONDENCE

house to prepare food, dates being the only provision on which the family would live. Could you honestly style such a man as sensual?

As a matter of fact circumstances do arise when polygamy becomes a necessity; after a state of warfare, for instance, when in consequence of the falling of the male element of the population the female element preponderates. How to provide for this surplus portion? A woman might work for her living, of which the present-day state of society no doubt permits, but bread and butter is not all she must have. What is the inevitable consequence if left alone? Why, that worst type of the curse of human society—sex-immorality. And what do we find in this country, where the fair sex pre-dominates and polygamy is disallowed? If polygamy in practice means intercourse with more than one woman, it may safely be asserted that the people here are more polygamous proportionately than in a Muslim country, where you will hardly meet one in a thousand having a second wife. The only difference between the two forms of polygamy is this: In a Muslim country, where it is recognized by law, the husband keeps her in his own house, at his own expense, on a footing of perfect equality with the first wife; the children born are free from that life-long stigma of bastardy and are entitled to due share in the father's heritage. In a non-polygamous land she is kept at another's expense, the offspring bear the stamp of illegitimacy, the pair is guilty of committing fornication in the eye of God, of man, and of their own conscience. Thus polygamy, though undesirable in ordinary circumstances, becomes an unavoidable necessity under such abnormal conditions in order to obviate such an extremely corrupt state of society.

Let it be remembered that Islam does not enjoin polygamy; it only permits it, of course, to provide for such-like abnormalities. As a rule, a Muslim is
a monogamist. It was under such a necessity that the Prophet had to take other wives after the good old age of 58, which period of life, it is noteworthy, he spent with but one wife. He was anxious not only to provide for their living, but also to safeguard their chastity, the priceless jewel of a woman's character from the point of view of the East. Among these, it may be noted, only one was a virgin girl, all others being widows of advanced age.

I hope this will convince many of your fair-minded readers that the Prophet's character was far above what he is unfortunately misrepresented here to have been. I regret the space of a newspaper article does not permit of a lengthy discourse, or I would have attempted to place before your readers some of the numerous bright gems of the Prophet's character. The correct spelling, by the way, of the Prophet's name is Muhammad.

I trust you will not, as an English journalist true to your worthy calling, hesitate to give publicity to this refutation of the charges, so light-heartedly brought against a man who founded a civilization unique in the history of the world, who owns to this day the spiritual allegiance of one-fifth of the world's population.—Yours, etc., Muhammad Yakub Khan.

[We are thankful to the Editor of the Mercury for inserting the above, though a little abbreviated for reasons of space, in the issue for December 14th.—Ed.]
AN APPEAL

Islam and Christianity have for long ages been engaged in a deadly struggle against each other for world-supremacy. In the early stages of the contest, when religion was the end-all and be-all of a Muslim’s life, the cross was never a match for the crescent. But ever since religion ceased to play the main part in his life and was relegated to the background, he encountered disaster after disaster. When religion was his watchword, he won the homage of the major part of the world. It was his enthusiasm for the promulgation of Islamic culture that carried him far and wide over the globe, and made him the founder of a civilization unparalleled in the history of the world. But fortune ceased to smile on him no sooner he exchanged his lofty ideals for sordid temporal desires.

If he is anxious to retrieve his lost honour and glory, and we are sure he is, there is but one way out of the straits. The sooner he returns to his original rule of life, the better. Unless he should once more hold fast to the “Habl-ullah,” the Holy Qur-án, all his efforts are doomed to come to nought. “Verily, Allah never alters the condition of a people, until they should bring about a corresponding change in their own ways.” Service of Allah’s religion made him the master of the world; it must be through reverting to the same mode of life that he can ever come to his own.

The final struggle between the cross and the crescent has to be decided at the point of the pen, rather than through the clash of arms. The world at large is hankering after a more peaceful state of life. Peace is the general cry all the world over, and it seems likely that, before long, the sword might be changed into the ploughshare. Islam is thus on the eve of a yet keener strife against Christianity; but conclusions this time are to be tried on
paper. This is an age of publicity and propaganda, and the adversary is already at an advantage over us out of all proportions—advantage in men, in money and in resources.

But the handicap is more than amply made up for by one circumstance. The intrinsic irrationality of Christianity is a canker at the very heart of Christendom. The recent pronouncements on the part of responsible Church dignitaries, such as the Dean of Carlisle, Principal Major of Oxford, and others, denying the divinity of Jesus, is nothing of the nature of a bolt from the blue. Nay, they manifest the spirit of a large and sensible element of the Christian population up in revolt against the irrational dogmas of the Church. On the other hand, the sublime teachings of Islam, so far as we have been able with our limited means to press them on their attention, have almost miraculously fascinated both their head and their heart. The battle is thus already half won. We must only take heart, have a vigorous and united pull and, Allah willing, we shall achieve phenomenal success before long.

It is now an open secret here, in enlightened circles, that Christianity has spun its day and must now make room for a better order. Europe has grown sick of its irrational dogmas, with practically no code of life, and cannot stand it for long. Christian thought, rudely shaken and unhinged of its traditional ruts by the Great War, is in the process of making afresh. Almost every one of its numerous institutions is at the moment being overhauled and thrown in the melting-pot. All around there is an eager hankering after a higher and nobler form of life than Christianity has been able to give and an earnest groping for genuine light and truth. The new spirit of the times has manifested itself in diverse forms, each of which embodies partial Islamic truth. The Spiritualism, the Universalism, the New-Thought, and such-like other currents of thought,
are but piecemeal representations of Islam. Is it not a Muslim’s duty towards man as well as God to reveal the whole truth to the Western mind? Is it not the highest form of service to mankind to direct this current of thought into the right channel—Islam?

Our mission has, by Allah’s grace, done its bit in this direction to the best of our means. We have been able to arouse a spirit of enquiry concerning Islam. We have been able, though on a very limited scale, to disabuse many thoughtful minds of their erroneous notions about Islam. We have been able to implant in hundreds of Christian hearts the imperishable truths of Islam. But is this all? No, not even a drop in the ocean compared to the stupendous work calling for immediate attention. Never before had Islam received so much public attention here as to-day. In the Press as well as on the platform, Islamic topics are discussed with astonishing interest. Even the stage and the screen have been influenced by this new trend of popular mind. Theatres and cinemas, showing Islamic scenes and pictures, attract unusually large spectators. The adverse criticism of Islamic institutions that we often meet with, such as polygamy, women not having a soul, the use of the sword, and so forth, are also the direct outcome of this inquisitive spirit of the times.

Under the circumstances, numerous are the calls on us for enlightenment on various Islamic questions. We are invited to various churches, chapels and societies to address the audience on this or that Islamic topic. Thanks to the unflagging interest of our Patron, Her Highness the Begum Sahiba of Bhopal, in our cause, as also to the quite recent generosity of His Highness the Nawab of Bawalpur, we are in a position to meet such calls. Side by side with these illustrious rulers, we are also indebted, in this respect, to the generous assist-
ance of Sir Abdul Karim Jamal, prince merchant of Rangoon, who has supplied us with a number of capable missionaries to assist us in our labours in the path of Allah. But we must confess we are not a match for the demands for Islamic literature pouring in from all sides. We are unfortunately not in possession of the requisite literature. We feel it our duty to bring it to the notice of our Muslim brethren and sisters interested in the cause of the propagation of Islam, that the production of standing literature in the form of booklets, tracts and pamphlets, to be scattered in hundreds of thousands over the length and breadth of this country, is the paramount need of the hour, a need the importance of which cannot be too much emphasized. The booklet, Islam and Muslim Prayer, for the production of which we are indebted to one of our ardent supporters, who would not allow a public acknowledgment by name, was met with a splendid reception. Of the 5,000 copies published not a single one is now available of the first edition, and the same benevolent friend has now come forward to enable us to publish its second edition. Likewise the other publication, The Sayings of Muhammad, of which too we brought out 5,000 copies, by the generosity of the Begum Sahiba of the late lamented Nawab Hakim-ud-Daula, Chief Justice of the Haidarabad High Court, is also out of print. There are a hundred and one such-like topics which must be fully dealt with in separate volumes and circulated on a vast scale.

In view of the unique situation, we would call upon the Muslim public, each and all, with all the emphasis at our command, to rise equal to the responsibilities, the new world conditions impose upon them. Never before was the Western world in a better frame of mind to lend ear to the call of Islam than to-day. And never before was the call of duty to the Muslim in this respect more imperative
than to-day. The awakening to Islam is there, it is now for us to turn it to the best account. The indifference is over, we must do our level best to uncover the fair face of Islam. Let us each do our bit, and take it from us, that Allah's help will meet our humble efforts more than half-way, to crown them with success beyond all expectations. Therefore, we appeal to every Muslim brother and sister to contribute their quota towards the cause. We are anxious to see this English soil flooded with Islamic literature. We wish to be able to supply a copy of the *Islamic Review* gratis to every library throughout the English-speaking world, as well as to produce the much-needed literature for free circulation. Will you respond to the call?

Of the series of booklets which we contemplate publishing on the burning Islamic topics, the foremost to appear is a refutation of the flagrant accusation that, in Islam, woman is considered to possess no soul. The charge forms the very opening words of the cinematographic picture, the "Virgin of Stamboul," to which we referred under our Notes in our November issue. The best method to combat the misrepresentation is the publication and circulation of the proposed booklet in thousands. We hope every promoter of the cause will come forward with a befitting response to the call.

**The Manager,**

**The Islamic Review.**

**The Mosque, Woking,**

*January, 1922.*