

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
وَنُصَلِّ عَلَى رَسُولِهِ الْكَرِيمِ

THE ISLAMIC REVIEW

VOL. X]

MARCH 1922

[No. 3

CONTENTS.

Mr. H. Waheed-ud-Din Green, M.P.S.	<i>Frontispiece</i>
Notes	90
Christianity in Her Own Land	97
The Sufi's Diary	99
What They Think of Us!	104
Table Talk—Cinema Films doing what the Religion and Civilization in the West have failed to do	108
Democracy in Islam. By FAIZ MOHD. KHAN	112
The Secret of Existence; or, The Gospel of Action. By KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN	114
Notes from the London Muslim House—Friday Sermons. By By EUSOOF (BILAL)	119
Holy Anecdotes. By BABAR..	121
No Sects in Islam	125
Review	133
Woking Mission Letter	134
Islam and Socialism. By KHWAJA NAZIR AHMAD	137

THE HOLY QUR-ÂN

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

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

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

ISLAMIC REVIEW

NOTES

The Secret of Existence.

Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din's inspiring Urdu production of the above name deals, in the light of the Holy Qur-án, with the causes that have led to the general Muslim decadence, and breathes all through of a stirring appeal to arouse the dormant forces of Islam. It reiterates in a touching manner what the Book of God prescribes as the panacea for all Muslim ailments. The work was accorded a splendid reception throughout Hindustani-speaking India, and it was suggested to introduce it as a text-book in the Muslim institutions. Now, for the benefit of our readers, an English version of the same will appear in these pages, in a series of contributions, the first of which is inserted elsewhere in this issue.

Colour Distinction in the Church.

A revealed religion worth the name must, among other things, stand for the fundamental principle of universal human equality. Emanating from the common Father of mankind, it must embrace within its loving arms the whole mass of humanity as a vast family of brothers and sisters. No man-drawn lines of demarcation between man and man can possibly find any place in the all-embracing affection of the Universal Father. The Church of God must have its gates wide open for all alike. Its precincts must be too holy to admit of any partitioning of humanity into water-tight compartments. All distinctions, whether of class or of colour, must be unknown to it. Yes, such must be the Church of God, but such, unfortunately, is not the Church of England, as will transpire from the following extracts we have culled from the *Vedic Magazine* for December 1921. As these will show, the Anglican Church in India runs into two distinct channels—the “white” and the “coloured.” Poor fellow, the “coloured” Christian finds the door of the “white”

NOTES

Church banded in his face; his children, spurned out of "white" schools, as unworthy of contact with the "white" children. Nor can a "coloured" priest, however learned and able and noble, have access to a "white" pulpit, for no other fault than that he happens to be a "coloured" man. But was not, he might reasonably ask, the Lord, the "Saviour" of mankind (including the "white" man), himself one of the races dubbed "coloured"? It is but natural that the contemptuous treatment should excite resentment in the Indian Christian. A certain Rev. S. Ghose, of Delhi—a "coloured" priest—smarting under the same sense of humiliation, tells certain unpalatable truths in reply to an article by Rev. Dr. Western, his "white" Chief, as he calls him, in the *Challenge* of London.

Speaking of separate "white" and "coloured" Churches, he observes:—

And if you do insist on becoming Anglican Christians, then there is, for the like of you, the cheaper, ragged side-show—the native Anglican Church, founded and maintained, not by the Christian British Government, but by voluntary mission subscriptions. The so-called Christian Government takes your money, which it considers hallowed, but not your swarthy bodies and souls, which it excludes from its churches, its ministry, its graveyards and its schools.

Again, of schools he says:—

Of the children in these schools, 15 per cent. can be of pure Indian blood. This percentage is *permissive*, not *compulsory*. But as soon as two or three parents of even perfectly black children with European names object to "native" children reading with their hypothetically white children, the *permissive* nature of 15 per cent. rule is trotted out, and the "native" children, often fairer in skin than the objectors and their progeny, ebony-white but with European names, are asked to leave, or excluded, or threatened with summary expulsion. And then at the admission there are much wranglings and jestings and snubbings and turnings-up of ebony-white noses at "these natives."

As regards the ban on the "coloured" priests, he refutes his Chief's argument, who thinks, "it would obviously not be very natural for an Indian

ISLAMIC REVIEW

to be made a chaplain to minister to Europeans, and then proceeds to illustrate the iniquity from his personal experience, extending over twenty-five years :—

I have gone out, times out of number, for full twenty-five years, to Gurgaon, Rewari, Karnal and Rohtak, where there are English as well as Indian Anglican congregations, to take services on Sundays, etc., for the latter, and could easily have taken them for the former as well ; *but not once* in twenty-five years has it ever been hinted to me that I should take the English service as well. Does he not also know that when I have been in the above-mentioned out-stations on Sundays or festivals, taking service for Indians, *the English congregations there have invariably gone without any service at all?* Here and there, once in a blue moon, one chaplain among a hundred, regarded by his “ caste ” as a faddist, crank or fool, goes out of his way and asks a coloured priest to take a service in the English church.

Islam—the One Living, Levelling Force.

Come to a Muslim mosque, and what do you find ? No high-class or low-class house of worship ; no reserved pews ; no privileges in the house of God. The beggar stands, bows and prostrates shoulder to shoulder with the king, on the same floor and under the same roof. For, in the eyes of the Lord, both are equally His children. Then the annual Pilgrimage to the Ka’ba furnishes an impressive scene of this fundamental principle of human equality. The last emblem of distinction—dress—is also removed to drive home to man this all-important truth. All clad in the same apparel, the deep-dark African, the swarthy Indian, the yellow Chinaman and the white Turk—in fact, pilgrims from every nook and corner of the globe, of all shades and colours, merge themselves into one vast sea of *humanity*, one Universal Brotherhood of mankind. Thus Islam is the one religion to-day that pulls down all distinctions of wealth, rank, birth, clime or colour, not only in precept, but five times a day in practice. “ The most worthy of respect among you,” says the Qur-án, are not those in the most exalted stations of life, but those “ who

NOTES

are the most virtuous of you." Islam recognizes one and but one distinction between one man and another—the distinction of character. The God of Islam is the loving Father of all. How beautifully Bulleyshah, the well-known mystic poet of the Punjab, gives expression to this eternal sublime truth, in lines matchless in simplicity as well as sweetness! Addressing the Universal Father, he sings :—

In the Turk and in the "Zangi" (negro)
As also in the hatted "Farangi" (European),
In the tavern in the "bhangi" (the intoxicated),
Here, there, everywhere,
In all forms Thou dwelleth
Yet telleth us Thou art nowhere.

Suppression of the Name of the "Saviour."

As we observed in our last issue, there is a strong opposition among the students of the various Missionary institutions in India against the "Bible Period." Missionary authorities have also awakened to the situation. They are joining their heads together and confessing in low whispers that they must either have logic and ethics in their curricula or the Bible. The attitude of the Board of the London Missionary Society on the point, at its December meeting, deserves commendation both for its sanity as well as moral courage. The following from the *Daily News*, February 1, 1922, may be read with interest in this connection :—

At the last meeting of the London Missionary Society directors, which included 187 members of the Board, from all parts of the country, the question was debated at great length, but in perfect good temper and spirit, only two directors—one lady and one layman—voted for the following amendment :

That no sanction, however, can be given to the exclusion of the name and work of the Lord Jesus Christ from any part of the society's operations—i.e. schools, hostels and churches.

Supported by Dr. Jowett and others, the majority decided on a commission of inquiry.

At the April meeting of the directors of the London Missionary Society, therefore, will be submitted the names of those nomi-

ISLAMIC REVIEW

nated to form the commission of inquiry into the whole subject. These, it is expected, will include those having the confidence of the Society's supporters and competent to express an opinion on the situation. Moreover, it is understood they will not have prejudged the issue before commencing their labours.

Starting on their journey to India in the autumn, their report will be due not later than the early spring of next year.

The reference already given them is as follows :

That an inquiry be instituted into the methods of Christian worship now obtaining in the mission schools of India with a view to the adoption of a common policy for the London Missionary Society (while allowing for necessary local divergences), which shall ensure the fullest use of the worship, as well as of the Christian teaching of the schools and hostels, in furtherance of the evangelistic purpose for which the Society exists.

This commission will meet the same fate as often falls to the lot of its kind when things are already resolved. It is high time that dogmas should give way to reason.

The Lord's Honour Saved.

Dr. Jowett, of Westminster Congregational Church, whose speech at the meeting was in the main responsible for moulding the opinion of the Board, quite appropriately meets the general storm of criticism. This is how he defends the decision of the Board in the *Challenge* of January 6th :—

The action of the Board was not taken to dishonour the name of Christ among the Hindus, but to *preserve it from reproach*. How can we win the *intelligent* Hindu and lead him step by step to the vital fulness of our own faith? . . . It is a question of at once preserving the self-respect of the Hindu and his rights of conscience and reason and making Christ known as his Redeemer. . . . [Italics ours.]

We have time and again emphasized the point in these pages that the teachings of the Church are a libel on the fair name of Jesus. It is so painful to see all the irrational stuff met with in the Gospels associated with the good name of Jesus of blessed memory. Whatever his portrait drawn therein, a Muslim looks upon Jesus as enjoined by the Qur-án, as a true Prophēt of God, far above what has been

NOTES

ascribed to him. But surely an "*intelligent Hindu*," who is in no way bound by his faith to regard him as such, will hardly form, as Dr. Jowett seems to apprehend, an enviable estimate of the Lord's personality, as delineated in the Gospels. We are therefore at one with the doctor in thinking that the withdrawal of the name of Jesus will "preserve it from reproach" to which the Gospel records expose it. Dissociation of Jesus, we must reiterate, from these writings and from the Church dogmas is the one way of preserving his honour. We would refer the Church dignitaries to the pages of the Qur-án to look for a true picture of Jesus as well as his teaching. It is exceedingly gratifying that the Board has taken a step in the right direction to save the honour of the Lord.

"So the last error shall be worse than the first."

"Lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead" was the chief fear in the minds of the Jews when they approached Pilate to safeguard against it. They had brought Jesus to the cross, but they doubted if he was really crucified. The circumstances attending the scene at Calvary were favourable to such doubts. Instead of keeping him for three days on the cross they had to bring his body down, on account of the Sabbath, when only a few hours had passed. His bones were not broken, and his blood did ooze out from his body when pierced. This all led to the belief that Jesus, though seemingly dead, was only in a state of swoon. That the whole procedure of the crucifixion was wrong and not free from mistake is borne out by the above-quoted statement which the Jews made to Pilate. With them Jesus was a deceiver and not a prophet; they did not believe in his miraculous powers, and could not even imagine such a resurrection. But if Jesus did chance to arise from the sepulchre they

ISLAMIC REVIEW

could all ascribe the event merely to the faulty procedure of the crucifixion, which could not have caused his death. This is the only true and logical interpretation which could be given to their words when they said to Pilate: "Lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first."

What else could have been the mistake alluded to by the Jews if the crucifixion was not faulty? The Jews did doubt of Jesus' death on the cross. The Holy Qur-án advances the same argument to convince the Jews that Jesus was neither killed nor crucified, and it was a matter of doubt with them even at the very moment: ". . . *Wa mâ qatalû-ho wa mâ Salabû-ho wa lâkin Shubbiha lahum*. . . —And their saying: surely we have killed the Messiah, Jesus, Son of Mary, the apostle of Allah; *and they did not kill him nor did they crucify him, but (the matter) was made dubious to them*, and most surely those who differ therein are only in a doubt about it; they have no knowledge respecting it, but only follow a conjecture, and they *know it* not for sure."

Here is a problem for the evangelist. If Jesus did die on the cross and was not alive when his body was put into the sepulchre, then his own words become meaningless when he said: "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas. For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Jonas was alive, as the story goes, when he went into the belly of the whale. Analogy would be untrue otherwise.

Sunday Lectures.

The following Lectures will be delivered at the London Muslim Prayer House, 111, Campden Hill Road, Notting Hill Gate, W. 8, at 5 p.m. :—

CHRISTIANITY IN HER OWN LAND

March 5.—“Simplicity of Faith,” by Khalid Shel-drake.

„ 12.—“The Examples,” by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din.

„ 19.—“Qur-án, a Necessity,” by Mohd. Yakub Khan.

„ 26.—“Islam and Sceptic,” by Arthur Field.

CHRISTIANITY IN HER OWN LAND

A Vicar Bans a Psalm.

We quote the following from the *Evening News* of January 23, 1922 :—

On the ground that the 109th Psalm is not only un-Christian but anti-Christian, the Vicar of St. John the Evangelist, Leeds, the Rev. d'Arcy Rudd, announced to his congregation that he proposed to expunge it from the Psalter of his church.

He had been told, he said, though he had not counted them himself, that the psalm contained thirty different curses.

These verses, said the Vicar, were written *by a vindictive Jew longing for revenge.*

He would like to see these psalms, which *did us no good, cut out altogether*, he said. *They were of no spiritual value at all.*

Following are a few extracts from the psalm :

“Set thou a wicked man over him: and let Satan stand at his right hand.

“When he shall be judged, let him be condemned: and let his prayer become sin.

“Let his children be fatherless, and his wife a widow.

“Let his children be continually vagabonds, and beg: let them seek their bread also out of their desolate places.

“Let the extortioner catch all that he hath; and let the strangers spoil his labour.

“As he loved cursing, so let it come unto him; as he delighted not in blessing, so let it be far from him.

“As he clothed himself with cursing like as with his garment, so let it come into his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones.

“Let it be unto him as the garment which covereth him, and for a girdle wherewith he is girded continually.” . . .

The lines italicized by us are too eloquent to need any further comment, and we admire the Vicar for the boldness of his conviction. No one can question their *rationale*. Similar reasons led the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Canterbury deliberation in 1917 to expunge another Psalm from the Prayer Book. But if, according to the Vicar, their being of "spiritual value" is a true clarifying agency—and we see no reason why it should not be so—the present bulk of the Bible, we are afraid, will have to be reduced to a very small size, specially if the book is to be revised under the searchlight of truth and intelligence. In this connection the following from the *Daily Express*, January 25th, may be read with some interest :—

Not for the first, or, we fear, the last time, is the question of the revision of the Prayer-Book being raised. It is to be "modernized" and "brought into harmony with contemporary thought"—in other words, spoilt and re-written according to the passing fads of the day. If Englishmen will tolerate this kind of thing they deserve it. . . . If a beginning is once made in tampering with its language or its dogmas, heaven knows where the end will be. The Psalms will be sacrificed to the sentimentalists; the Marriage Service and the Pauline Epistles to the feminists. The trouble with this generation is that it is unduly puffed up with the importance of its particular opinions. To them it is ready to sacrifice a national tradition, a goodly heritage. By the time the sacrifice is made the opinions will be dead, the fads forgotten.

One thing is certain. The Book does not appeal to the modern mind. Man-made things do need to be "modernized" and "brought into harmony with contemporary thought"; but things made by Divine Hand are of permanent value. Prayer-Book, no doubt, is a human composition, but what about the extracts which it makes from the Bible, as they themselves are out of "harmony with contemporary thought" ?

"Disorders" in the Church.

We take the following from a protest by Dean Wace and some of his colleagues against what he calls disorder in the Church. It shows what is going on in the court of Christianity :—

We beg to raise a solemn public protest against the violation of law, and neglect of moral obligations, which are now allowed to prevail among many of the clergy of the Church of England.

THE SUFI'S DIARY

Solemn pledges given at ordination are to a large extent disregarded. Clergy who have declared, before God and man, that they unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, are proclaiming that the four Gospels contain elements of legend respecting the birth, life, and resurrection of our Lord; and, ignoring all but negative criticism, they treat the narratives of the Pentateuch as unhistorical and the testimony to them in the Psalms and the New Testament as unreliable. Professors in Holy Orders and other dignitaries openly avow opinions respecting our Lord's nature which are admittedly inconsistent with the received Creeds of the Church. The strict promises required at ordination as regards the observance of the Book of Common Prayer are treated by many as having little or no binding force. In the order of the Holy Communion this abuse is flagrant. . . .

Thus the whole basis of the Church of England, as established by law, is being undermined, and in this unjust and injurious state of things we have no resource but to make this protest. We desire only the observance of the doctrine and worship prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer and the Articles of the Church of England, which are formally acknowledged by all clergy to be agreeable to the Word of God; and we appeal to the authorities of the Church to maintain the rights of members of the Reformed Church of England in their most sacred interests.

The Times, February 8, 1922.

THE SUFI'S DIARY

(Continued from p. 60.)

WE often dream of people, alive, or departed from this world; but the figures which appear to us in such dreams and visions are not necessarily the spirits of the people they seem to represent. Here I speak of real dreams; and not of those fantastical experiences that come to us in our sleep, where imagination, passion, subconsciousness, indigestion, or some disorder in the system, are chiefly responsible for all that becomes visualized therein. Similarly dreams sometimes forecast coming diseases—a thing well known to physicians in the East. Strange figures appearing in dreams, in black and fiery colours, are not necessarily to be taken as the spirits of persons from Abyssinia, or of denizens of the infernal region. Rather do they indicate a prepon-

ISLAMIC REVIEW

derance of melancholic humour in the body in various degrees. There are times also when, in our dreams, we appear to go through the action of swimming; but that, again, is only the coming cold, or humid humour, in the body materialized; while a highly feverish temperature will assume the form of fire. Sometimes anger appears in the same shape; and the whole subject is full of interest and instruction, especially for the people in the West, who are just becoming awakened to psychic research. But I must postpone consideration of the question in its general aspects to another time, and confine myself to the point I have in view.

In order to show that the figures we see in dreams are not necessarily the spirits of the people of whom we are dreaming, I may record here a few incidents. In 1913 I was in Paris. I am an early riser, and one June night I left my bed between two and three o'clock a.m. for my midnight prayers and meditations. I felt a very peculiar sensation, resembling backache, some six inches below the neck. I did not feel it while sitting or standing, or while doing any work in an ordinary posture; but some particular movement of the body would make my back painful, as if something had become deeply rooted somewhere in the system. Needless to say that I consulted many doctors in Paris and London, and remained under their treatment for months. Turkish baths were also advised, but all was of no avail. My only alternative was, then, to pray to God for some guidance; and so I prayed for many weeks. One night in November, in the same year, H.H. Sir A—— appeared to me in a dream and suggested that I should write at once to India for a particular kind of lentil which grows only in certain hilly tracts of the country, and is unknown to the average Indian, and the lentils prepared in a certain way would give me relief. He also informed me that a

THE SUFI'S DIARY

nephew of mine was on the eve of his departure to this country. My letter reached the young man in time, in the same week that he had to leave for England. He brought me the needed grains, and their use, as directed, gave me relief after six months. I knew for a fact that Sir A—— was neither a physician nor interested in medicinal research. Though I knew the source of the dream, yet curiosity, accentuated by the new theories of thought-transference by spirit agencies now obtaining in the West, led me to ask Sir A—— when we met some months after. He not only denied possession of any medicinal knowledge, but added that he had not heard of the said lentil ever before in his life. On my questioning him further, he also had to admit, though with reluctance, that nothing in the last few months had occurred to remind him of me.

Another incident will, perhaps, better illustrate the subject under discussion. Some years ago I became a helpless victim to a form of nerve-trouble. The complaint reached its climax in the end of the following year. Harley Street doctors and Harrogate baths did me little good, and electric treatment only aggravated the case. In the next year I was advised to leave the country, but my sojourn in my home and the medical treatment there were of very little efficacy. My last resort was to Him who causes things to grow and places wonderful properties in them. One October night I saw in a dream two doctors attending me. They were, and still are, my bosom friends and next-door neighbours. One had a phial in his hand with some dark-red liquid in it, which the other was about to inject into my system with a syringe. When asked by me, they described the liquid as a mixture of — and —. The very next morning brought us together. When, however, I related to them the experience of the previous night, they not only denied any thought-transference from them to me

ISLAMIC REVIEW

during that night, but also denied knowledge of the properties of one of the two said drugs, as it was not "official." They were also very emphatic against my using it, as they ascribed my dream to some sub-conscious imagination. I had to submit to their judgment, though I knew well how to distinguish between a real dream and an ordinary phantasm, and the dream I experienced had all the signs of reality. I waited yet another year. Treatment from various physicians and doctors in my motherland brought no improvement. I became desperate, I obtained the mixture of which I had dreamed and applied it, and its use, for a week, produced wonderful results.

These are not isolated instances. I can record many others of a similar nature to substantiate my contention that apparitions of living persons in dreams and visions are not of necessity the spirits of the persons we dream of. No doubt I cannot make the same assertion with the same confidence as to those who have left this earth. But if our dreams of persons living have nothing to do with the spirits or the thoughts of those persons, the same may surely apply to the case of those who have passed from this earthly sphere. If we accept the two dreams I have cited as data, no one can question the conclusion that they were truth and reality. The theory of "subconsciousness," or "some forgotten knowledge," possibly received days before, of the revealed medicine, would not explain the phenomena. If the property of a drug is not known to the doctors, if the drug itself is neither on their official list of medicines nor is the product of my country, I wonder how it could come within my knowledge, even in my early days. Some twenty years ago, when I was shown a thing in a dream of certain good to me, its name was given in a language unknown to me. A month after I went to the man who showed it to me in the dream, though I

THE SUFI'S DIARY

knew that he had nothing to do with it, and had been a mere instrument used by the forces of the Unseen. He denied all knowledge of the thing. I inquired concerning it from many men who could have enlightened me in the matter, but all in vain. After full two years, another name of the same thing was given to me in a dream, this time in Sanskrit—a language which is at present not spoken, nor had I studied it. Anyhow it was a better clue, and I could find the thing out within a fortnight. Its colour and shape was the same as were revealed to me, and its effect that which I needed.

This experience of mine hushed all such voices in my judgment as ascribed visionary experiences to “subconsciousness,” or “knowledge forgotten.” Having dabbled in Western culture and materialistic philosophy, I had my own doubts about what I am writing here. Pro-and-con theories never reach a satisfactory conclusion. Personal experience is the only true key that will solve the mystery. I believe that most dreams and phantasmal experiences spring from the imagination, and can rightly be explained on materialistic lines. But there is another category of dreams, which cannot be traced to such a source, and, as I have explained, the theory of thought-transference is also of no great help. Our belief is—and it is borne out by the experience of generations of Muslim Sufis—that when a man prays to God, and He condescends to speak to him, the dream is one of the several means which the Omniscent uses in revealing His mind to His votaries. Phantoms and apparitions which appear to spiritually developed minds in visions or dreams in response to prayer, or in order to guide them when they are in darkness, are the momentary creations of God. Each form or figure which thus appears has nothing to do personally with the individual it represents; sometimes the figure is created on account of its very name, if it has got any meaning, as is invariably

the case in the East. Sometimes a special connection of the figure dreamed of with the dreamer explains the matter. In the first and third of the instances I have recorded a part of the name of the persons of whom I dreamt is the name of God, which means that the message has come from God.

Anyhow, I hail this awakening in the West. It is a good beginning, and the Western peoples will come to the true knowledge after all. Reactions in history have never been unattended with such experiences.

(To be continued.)

WHAT THEY THINK OF US!

Sects in Islam.¹

In reviewing Mr. Wm. Crooks' *Islam in India*, the translation of the *Qanun-i-Islam*, the *Spectator* says :—

Mr. Crooke has now revised the book and added a good deal of information relating to the Muslims of Northern and Western India, with an introduction. As the Caliphate agitators pretend that Indian Muslims are a well-organized and united body who are deeply concerned about the fate of Turkey, it is useful to be reminded of their many sects and of the wide variations from the orthodox Muslim faith which may be found among them. The chapters on the magical methods which are in daily use among Indian Muslims are peculiarly interesting.

French Plan favours the Turks.

I learn from a trustworthy source that the Near Eastern Conference of Foreign Ministers was postponed owing to the fact that the French memorandum advocated the immediate evacuation of Ionia by the Greeks, and that Eastern Thrace up to the River Maritza, including Adrianople, should be returned to the Turks. It was suggested that Western Thrace should form an autonomous province, taking into consideration the Bulgarian demands for an outlet to the sea.

Mr. Lloyd George declared that he could not agree to the proposals about Thrace, and suggested that the matter should be brought up at the Genoa Conference.—*The Times*, February 4, 1922.

¹ See page 125.

WHAT THEY THINK OF US !

Turkish Policy.

In reply to Sir Valentine Chirol's article, Mr. Aubrey Herbert, M.P., writes to the Editor of *The Times* :—

SIR,

All that comes from the pen of Sir Valentine Chirol is entitled to great respect, for he writes with a distinction and a knowledge of the East which are shared by few Englishmen. But surely his comments on Lord Northcliffe's message with regard to our Turkish policy are born of prejudice, not logic. He begins by saying that a minority of Indian Muslims, who believe the Sultan to be the Caliph of Islam, claim to dictate our policy to Turkey. He denies, by implication, that the Sultan is Caliph, and asks if any minority in the Empire—the Catholics, for instance—would have the right to control general policy.

The Indians with whom I have talked have not put forward these claims. They have asked that the Prime Minister's pledge of January 5, 1918, that we were "not fighting to deprive Turkey of its capital or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace, which are predominantly Turkish in race," should be carried out. Theology is one thing; keeping your word another. Let Sir Valentine argue about the first, which does not concern us, but not about the second. This pledge of January 5, 1918, was referred to by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons about a year later, when he admitted that it was unconditional and had increased recruiting in India. Sir Valentine does not distinguish here between general policy and the fulfilment of a particular pledge. And yet no man has spoken more trenchantly of the importance, not of British prestige, but of British honour in the East.

The Catholic minority of this country has certainly no claim to dictate what the action of the Government should be, but if, in a specific instance, the Government gives an undertaking to the Vatican, the Catholics have the right to ask that that undertaking should be honoured.

The controversy as to whether the Sultan is or is not Caliph by right has always seemed to me to be barren, and best left to Muslims. Sir Valentine may be right and they may be wrong, but the point is, that the Indian Muhammadans insist that they are the best judges in matters concerning their own faith.

He continues that the attitude of Lord Reading and Mr. Montagu is even more strange than the claims of the Indian Muslims. He blames Mr. Montagu for not resigning during the negotiations on the Treaty of Sévres, and Lord Reading for political and constitutional heresy, but his real complaint with both of these gentlemen is that they, like the Indian Muslims, do not agree with Sir Valentine Chirol, and have officially stated their expert opinions.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

He asks, Why should Turkey be allowed to evade the Treaty of Sèvres when Austria has had her fearful penalties imposed upon her? This is surely hardly a fortunate comparison at the present moment.

He goes on to say that to remit the penalties of the Treaty of Sèvres would be a further breach of faith with Christian minorities and would imperil the position of King Hussein and King Feisal. But France has already thrown the Treaty of Sèvres on the dust-heap, and Italy has followed suit. Sir Valentine Chirol desires the application of the Treaty of Sèvres in order to save the Christian minorities and to strengthen the hands of our friends King Hussein and King Feisal. The first, and, perhaps, the chief sufferers from the Treaty of Sèvres were the Christian minorities, and it is our continued and solitary support of this Treaty that is the main source of danger to our allies King Hussein and King Feisal. If we desire to secure the rights of minorities and an autonomous Armenian State, we must either achieve these ends *vi et armis* or negotiate the safety of minorities through a Treaty other than that of Sèvres. A recent speech of M. Hanoton, of the French League of Nations, reports favourably of the present treatment of minorities by the Kemalist Government, and repays study.

Sir Valentine then states that any concession is a betrayal of our dead in Gallipoli and Mesopotamia. I have met many men who served in those campaigns who feel little pleasure when their comrades who died for a great cause are remembered to buttress a political argument. This is, the same argument that was distasteful to most people in the mouths of Countess Markievicz and Mr. de Valera when they attempted to prevent peace by their appeals to the dead, who cannot answer.

I hope that Lord Northcliffe's message may be a monumental milestone. For the sake of all the unhappy people of the East it is high time that we should abandon a meaningless 'paper policy of ineffectual retribution and return to one of reality and sanity.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

AUBREY HERBERT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
January 28th.

Britain and France to Destroy the Turk ?

The next thing to take place in fulfilment of any prophecy is the end of the Turk.

The Turks will defeat the Greeks, drive the French and British out of Jerusalem.

France and England will be compelled to destroy the Turk.

An American correspondent, whose views on the fulfilment of prophecies in the East recently appeared in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, has sent further letters to a friend in England.

WHAT THEY THINK OF US !

If we are patient until next October, he says, I am sure it will then be easy to convince people of the truth of these things, for I feel quite sure that the way for Isaiah xviii. 3 will be clear by then.

This means that the Turk shall have reached his end, and Daniel xi. 45 be fulfilled by then. It cannot be much later than the Jewish New Year in our 1922 A.D.

Replying to an article by an astrologer regarding these questions, he remarks that as a consequence of their ignorance of the meaning of the events of May 19, 1780, and of November 13, 1833, their dates of any future war are of no value, and will have no fulfilment.

The date, July 28, 1926, cannot possibly be the opening date of the next war, for the next war is already commenced in the Near East. It will be a real terror before it is finished, but the Turk will be destroyed and Muhammadanism defeated utterly before it will be ended. . . .

A war is on between the Greeks and the Turks. The Turks do not want the Greeks, or the French, or the English in their territories. The Turks will defeat the Greeks, drive the French out, and drive the British out of Jerusalem.

The present Turk leader has already united all the Muhammadans from Asia Minor to India, and the Bolsheviks are friendly to him.

France and England will be compelled to destroy the Turk. England especially will be compelled to do this, and recover Jerusalem.—*Pall Mall and Globe*, January 18th, 1922.

We wonder when these yells from the wolves in sheepskin will be hushed up, at least in the interest of the world peace.

“Our Muhammadan Subjects.”

SIR,

I was pleased that Sir J. D. Rees, M.P., when speaking here on Tuesday night, referred to the necessity for friendly relations between the people of this country and the Muhammadan subjects of the Crown, numbering over 100,000,000.

I do not think this important matter has received the consideration it deserves, owing to the fact that the Government are credited with sympathy with the Greeks, who are still fighting Turkey, and the Armenian subjects of Turkey, who joined the Allies in the war. Owing to the fact that no peace has yet been concluded with the Turks, alone of our enemies, strong discontent and disaffection exist among our Muhammadan fellow subjects. The two branches formerly hostile to one another, the Persians and Turks, have now practically combined against us, and the Muhammadans in India, some 70,000,000, who were our staunch supporters, and helped us through the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Mutiny, have now joined hands with the seditious sections of the Hindus, and boycott our goods, including our Nottingham lace, etc.

It is good at times to indulge in sentiment, but sentiment and business usually do not go well together, and Sir J. D. Rees' thoughtful speech in Nottingham, and at the general meeting of the Imperial Bank of Persia, emphasize the importance of this matter to British trade generally, including Nottingham, which has so many important customers in the East. In my humble opinion the Government should be pressed for an early, and if need be generous, peace treaty with Turkey.

I am, Sir, etc.,

—*The Nottingham Guardian.*

ONLOOKER.

In reviewing Mr. Lothrop Stoddard's *The New World of Islam*, the *Birmingham Post* says:—

Islam to-day is a force deriving its power from many sources—religious, political, social, and economic. Britain, France and Italy are confronted by the effects of the Muhammadan revival which began early in the last century; they are faced by new forces called into being by political ideas and economic changes inspired by the West; and they have to deal with the social unrest which is the consequence of economic disturbance. To all these stimuli of revolt the peace treaties have added the culminating touch. It is Mr. Stoddard's contention that the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire has united Islam from Morocco to China in furious indignation against the Allies—indignation which has not been allayed either by French action in Syria or by British policy in Mesopotamia. He is, in fact, sufficiently critical of European policy and action in the Muslim States and the subject Muslim countries, not only during and since the war but before the outbreak. This is not the place in which to discuss the soundness of his views, but we may note that while he asserts "the materials for a holy war have long been heaping high," he tells us that "the Great War has so strengthened Eastern Nationalist aspirations and has so weakened European power and prestige, that a widespread relaxing of Europe's hold over the Orient is taking place. This process may make for good or for ill, but it is apparently inevitable; and a generation (perhaps a decade) hence may see most of the Near and Middle East autonomous or even independent."

TABLE TALK

Cinema Films doing what the Religion and Civilization in the West have failed to do.

PARENTS in indigence and sons in affluence exist side by side in the West—a shocking sight to an

TABLE TALK

Eastern eye! The men of the West talk big of Socialistic ideas and world-regeneration, but they are lacking in the primal element of well-doing, filial piety, and do not know how to do good to their own kith and kin. They speak of democracy, and yet when they rise in the world they feel ashamed of their humble origin if by any chance they own it. If birth or inherited wealth find no special favour in the eyes of democracy, a self-made man should surely feel proud of his birth in penury. To be a son of man was man's proudest boast in the judgment of Caliph Omar, himself the first and most practical expounder of democracy in the world's history. The plant of Democracy can only germinate and reach its full growth in such lands where the efforts of persons of lowly birth to achieve rank and distinction are not only encouraged but respected. But if we are ashamed of our birth, how can we make the thing we speak of a reality?

The civilization of a nation is hardly enviable if its members do not fulfil their obligation to their own parents. We are no better than other animals if self-indulgence is to consume all the proceeds of our labour. If the best capital wherewith to start life is the healthy condition of our joints and limbs and a wholesome upbringing in our early life, do we not owe most of our wealth and opulence to our own parents? But we cannot expect to find any such sense of obligation in minds that have been moulded by materialistic culture.

Unfortunately, Religion in the West has done very little in this respect. One must not, however, expect better things from the influence of a creed that tends to weaken man's sense of responsibility by teaching him to believe that his sins have become cleansed by his acceptance of certain dogmas. Certainly the Fifth Commandment runs thus :—

Honour thy father and thy mother : that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

But the reason assigned as an inducement to fulfil the Commandment would not appeal to the modern mind; and, unfortunately, there is but little further illumination on the subject in the whole Biblical record. The same Commandment has, it is true, from time to time been quoted¹ and referred to with amplification. Yet it seems to have failed altogether to create a temperament conducive to filial piety. Cinema films, however, have come to save the situation. In forcible colours they depict the heartlessness towards their parents of children who, from humble origins, have risen to rank and prosperity. "A nurse or a gardener in his father's house," is the usual introduction which the parents of such a "swell" may expect to receive should they chance to inflict their unwelcome presence on the son in the company of his friends. Such heart-rending scenes, which are a common occurrence in the West, are very rare in the East, more especially in Muslim countries, and the reason is obvious, for those who receive the inspiration of their life from a book like the Qur-án have no choice in the matter. The Book of God not only makes filial piety a duty next only to our duty to God, but brings the truth home to the minds of its votaries in natural colours and with compelling effects, only partially attained in the West by the pen of the film-writer, coming belatedly to the aid of a religion that has failed.

In chapter xvii the Book says:—

And *your* Lord has commanded that you shall not serve (any) but Him and goodness to your parents. If either or both of them reach old age with *you*, say not to them (so much as) "Ugh" nor chide them, and speak to them a generous word.

And make yourself submissively gentle to them with compassion, and say: O my Lord! have compassion on them, as they brought me up (when I was) little. —The Holy Qur-án, xvii. 23, 24.

The screen and the stage, even at the highest stretch of their author's imagination, cannot give

¹ Lev. xix. 3; Deut. v. 16; Jer. xxxv. 7; Matt. xv. 4 and xix. 19; Mark vii. 10 and x. 19; Luke xviii. 20; Eph. vi. 2.

TABLE TALK

that conception of a dutiful mind to the common theatre-goer which the reader of the following lines is sure to achieve if he approaches them in a religious spirit :—

Bequest is prescribed for you when death approaches one of you, if he leaves behind wealth for parents and near relatives, according to usage, a duty (incumbent) upon those who guard (against evil).—The Holy Qur-án, ii. 80.

The parents of a Muslim receive share in the wealth left by him on his death.

“Be good to the parents and to the near of kin” (iv. 36) is a repeated theme in the Qur-án, so much so that the parents have been declared to be the first deserving recipients of a son’s charity.

They ask *you* as to what they should spend. Say : Whatever wealth you spend, it is for the parents and the near of kin and the orphans and the needy and the wayfarer, and whatever good you do, Allah surely knows it.—The Holy Qur-án, ii. 215.

We need not emphasize too much the need of a Revelation from God, like that of the Qur-án, in the presence of other holy scriptures, including the Bible. Very little, however, do we find in all the other sacred books on this subject. The repeated chorus of “Honour thy father and mother” in the Bible has failed to achieve the desired results. The Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him!) was an orphan; his parents died when he was a child. He had no mother to whom he could show his devout fulfilment of these Qur-ánic injunctions. Yet to his nurse, Halima, he behaved as the Qur-án desired him to do, in all respects as though she had been his own mother. When he was Lord and Conqueror of Arabia, and she was brought before him in chains with other war captives from the tribe to which she belonged, they had not seen each other for scores of years, yet his eyes could not fail to recognize his old nurse. With tears of joy he goes to her, as a most dutiful son; he takes off his own mantle from his shoulders; he spreads it on the floor, and

ISLAMIC REVIEW

invites her to be seated. Nor could he show his filial spirit in a better way than by liberating all her fellow-prisoners along with her. Could there be a more practical illustration of the Qur-ánic teaching and spirit? If example is better than precept, the proverb never received such testimony in the case of any other prophet in the history of the world. Jesus did remind his followers of the Fifth Commandment, it is true; but Mary, we remark with reluctance, had a different treatment.

DEMOCRACY IN ISLAM (IN THE DAYS OF OMER)

ONCE, having been summoned to the Court of Justice, Omer had to appear to defend himself in an action brought against him. The principal demand of justice at all times has been the equality and impartiality by which both the parties should be taken into consideration. History has depicted Omer as a model of simplicity in everything he did or act. In a quiet way, unaccompanied by any pomp or ceremony, he entered the court by the same door as others. He was easily marked out by the crowd. Zaid bin Sabit, the judge, rose to honour the arrival of the Khalifa, and with him rose the entire conclave. Omer was here in the court, not as the Khalifa, but as an ordinary defendant, and this exhibition of uninvited ceremony did not create a very creditable impression on his mind.

“This is the first act of your *partiality*,” remarked Omer, giving a stern look to Zaid. He took his seat side by side with the plaintiff.

The plaintiff had, truly speaking, no justification of the action, he having no sound proof of evidence, while the defendant pleaded “Not guilty.” Before the examination of the defendant the plaintiff demanded Omer to be put on oath. Zaid requested

DEMOCRACY IN ISLAM

the plaintiff that considering the position and integrity of Omer it was no offence to slacken the rules and formality of procedure. This biased and preferential suggestion of Zaid no longer restrained Omer from hiding his anger.

"As long as you cannot refrain from making distinction between Omer and man, you do not deserve to be trusted with the responsibility of a judge," explained Omer in an authoritative voice. All the formalities of courts of justice then in vogue were observed, and the plaintiff for want of evidence withdrew his suit. But the tenure of Zaid as a judge came to an end. History can hardly quote a better example of a sense of justice and equality.

We will not encounter any difficulty in picking out a number of instances where Omer has shown the true trait of a democrat with natural powers in command to lay before his people the practical conception of what *man ought to be* towards his fellow-men. A man once suffered bodily injury through wanton anger of a son of the Governor of Egypt, who had no justification for the outburst of his anger. The matter came to the notice of Omer. He summoned both the parties. The son of the Governor of Egypt was found guilty and was brought to sense that he was on an equal footing with an ordinary man in the eye of justice, when he had to pay the penalty for the offence in the presence of the teeming public gathered at the moment. Then Omer said: "Mothers bring their children free into this world when they give them birth, and it is my duty to see that they should remain so." How far Omer respected public opinion may be illustrated by the following. On one occasion, while addressing the Muslims in the mosque, he said: "Supposing I did something contrary to the requirements of the law, what would you think of me?" Instantly a man sprang up from the gathering, and placing his hand on the hilt of his

ISLAMIC REVIEW

sword, said in a loud tone : “ Your severance from the Faith will cost you nothing less than the severance of your head from the body.”

To put the man to a sharper test, Omer inquired in a contemptuous tone, “ Do you know to whom are these words addressed, and do you realize the consequence of such a conduct ? ” “ Yes,” came the prompt reply, “ I am speaking to Omer, our benevolent Khalifa. The venerable Khalifa does not realize that the man who goes astray no longer remains our Khalifa, and he must deserve the fate I have just mentioned.” Omer’s face became wreathed with smiles of appreciation, and he said : “ Thank Allah, for He has given me such a following which in the event of my deviating from the straight path will make me on the right.”

FAIZ MOHD. KHAN.

THE SECRET OF EXISTENCE

OR,

THE GOSPEL OF ACTION

By KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN

“ Be aware that Allah revives the earth after its death.”—The Holy Qur-án, lvii. 17.

THE Muslim has fallen on bad times. His past glory has forsaken him. His might, his honour has deserted him. To his rivals, on the look out to pounce upon him; his days are already numbered. Nevertheless, thank Allah ! he has after all awakened to a sense of the critical situation he is in. But he is more like a man who has been enjoying a deep slumber but awakened all of a sudden through some turmoil around him ; he jumps to his feet and rushes about in the dark in utter consternation, to avoid what he vaguely perceives to be an imminent danger but cannot properly locate. Such exactly is the bewildered astonishment

THE SECRET OF EXISTENCE

with which the newly aroused Muslim looks around him. The grim danger is there, before him. But he cannot make out where to find a way out. Confusion has seized his senses and he is blindly scampering, now this way, now that, fondly hoping there to come across an Open Sesame. And no wonder. What he is thus after may prove to be his salvation or may turn out to be a will-o'-the-wisp, mocking him with a false hope of acquisition. Nay, it may be something positively harmful to him—a course drifting him against the rock of destruction instead of leading to a haven of safety. Death is staring him in the face. He is wildly struggling for self-preservation. He has taken a step, but it is a leap in the dark. Perchance it may fall upon the right path or it may bring him face to face with yet greater perils. And what is still more unfortunate, it is in a juncture like this that hypocrisy, putting on the mask of sympathy, friendship and fellow-feeling, turns the situation to its own advantage. Leaders, guides, friends and supporters crop up like mushrooms, posing as deliverers, but under that cover bending the unfortunate victim to be subservient to their personal ends.

But is there no way out of this confusion, no light to guide us out of this darkness? Has not the Holy Qur-án made this assertion concerning itself: "This is a book we have revealed to thee, so that it may with Allah's permission lead people out of darkness toward Light—towards the path which may make them respected and praised." The very object of the revelation of this Book was the revival of the dead to life. The world at its inauguration was morally and spiritually dead and was restored to life with this very Book. Even to-day we are in possession of the same Book. We have taken good care to wrap them up in fancy coverings and given them a place of honour in our houses, but we seldom open them to find out guidance

ISLAMIC REVIEW

therein. No doubt we do also uncover and open them at times, but only when we want to take an augury. We place it on our heads too, but simply to take an oath thereby. "O my Lord! Surely my people have forsaken this Qur-án!" were the prophetic words foretold over thirteen centuries ago concerning a section of the Holy Prophet's followers. Woe unto us that of all the posterity of Islam, our generation has turned out to be the one complained against in these words.

But better late than never. Even now let us rise to make up the leeway. There is no reason for despair and despondency. "Do not slacken and do not grieve," are the consoling words of the same Book, "for surely you are the highest people, provided you are believers." Now, if the Holy Qur-án is—and surely it is—the spring of life, why do you not drink deep at it? If it is the straight path—and surely it is—why then do you not tread along it? "We have not neglected anything in the Book," claims the Holy Qur-án itself, to cheer us up lest we should give way to despair in times of trials and tribulations. And do we not take it as such? Do we not look upon it as the panacea for all human ailments? Why, then, this consternation? Why this catching at every drifting straw? This is the right path; take to it resolutely and unswervingly, and however uncertain the weather and unchartered the waters, it is sure to steer your bark clear to the haven of safety.

The thought how recklessly the Muslims have thrown off the choicest jewels of the Holy Qur-án brings tears to my eyes. Never have I come across some standard European work on human civilization but I have invariably found it to be a dim reflection of the teachings met with in their perfect form in the pages of the Holy Qur-án. But woe unto us, we have ignored them as worthless pebbles. My heart aches within me and I say to myself: "These

THE SECRET OF EXISTENCE

laws of life are nothing compared with what we have in the Holy Qur-án; how is it that the people having the Qur-án for their guide are sunk so low? "The Holy Qur-án itself comes to tell me the reason for the fallen state of the Muslims. "They deserted me," it says, "so God deserted them."

To-day we mourn the loss of Khilafat, and what can be a more deplorable loss? The Holy Qur-án has promised us a Khilafat—a Khilafat with which is bound up the fulfilment of another Divine promise which is dearer to a Muslim heart above all else, viz. the security of the Sacred Places from hostile aggression. We are anxious, and legitimately so, to see our Holy Places in Muslim hands—hands free from all non-Muslim influence. We do not want to see an internecine war among the Arab tribes, set by their ears by foreign diplomacy, and the sacred soil of Arabia thus soaked in Muslim blood. We must have the land of Hedjaz for the exclusive rambles of the Haji (Pilgrim), and none but the Haji. Are these demands of ours illegitimate and these sentiments vain? What, I may ask, roused the zeal of the Mediæval Crusader? The few pieces of bricks, stones and timber, piled together in the form of what is known as the Church of Resurrection or the church built on the spot where Jesus is believed to have been interred after crucifixion, as well as to have arisen from the dead. This very edifice was at the bottom of all bloodshed. Does not the British Government undertake expeditions out of mere regard for the sentiments of the Christians? Does not the protection of the Christian missionary often lead to political troubles? *What special claims have the Christians upon the British Government? The Muslims form the major portion of the British subjects. The Government is in duty bound to show towards the Muslims sentiments tenfold the regard it has for those of the Christians.*

But I ask the Muslims if they have ever given a

moment's thought to the real causes that led to the downfall of the Khilafat. Deviation from the Qur-án was the chief cause at work in Muslim lands long before the Great War as much as to-day. The Muslim power was in fact already at its last gasp when the war came just as the last straw to break its backbone. The house was already hollow, and the war did no more than just the part of a gust of wind in pulling it down. We are anxious to retrieve our lost power, but unfortunately we lack the requisite worth and mettle to retain such power. It is not in fact the loss of power that we should mourn, but the loss of the virtues, the capacities that lead to the attainment as well as maintenance of power. These infuse life into dead nations, bring them to power and sustain them in power. But these cannot be had for a mere asking. Nay, they cannot come from without. They must spring up and be fostered from within. No external agency, however potent, can instil them into a human soul.

The Secret of Existence, so far as I have been able to glean from the pages of the Holy Qur-án, may be put in one phrase as the **POWER OF ACTION**—the power which was crushed some four or five centuries before the advent of Islam by the creed founded by St. Paul, wrongly labelled after the name of Jesus. In direct contravention of the teachings of his Master, he twisted what was a Gospel of action into the Gospel of inaction. He proclaimed that the world had so far been in the shackles of the law and action, of which Jesus came to liberate it. Salvation could thus be achieved not by means of virtuous deeds on man's part, but through faith in the blood of Jesus. Luther also endorsed the view that salvation was bound up with faith, having nothing to do with deeds. What detrimental effect it had on the European civilization during the early period of Christianity and the Mediæval Ages needs no dwelling upon. Roman and

NOTES FROM LONDON MUSLIM HOUSE

Grecian civilizations were swept off. The gates of knowledge and of deeds were blocked up. Indifference, indolence, inertness became the order of the day. In a word, Christian Europe was in the grip of exactly the same curse which we find has hold of the Muslim world to-day. Thick darkness of ignorance enshrouded the whole of Europe. India, too, fared no better at the time. The ascetic idealism of Buddhism on the one hand and the Hindu metaphysical theory of *Maya* tended to sap man's vitality. In this widespread state of death-like inertia the Holy Qur-án hailed the world to the GOSPEL OF ACTION. Faith and deeds were inseparably bound up to each other, so that the one could not exist without the other. Deeds were regarded as indispensable for the growth and development of faith as water for that of a plant. Wherever it spoke of "those who believe and do good deeds," it invariably illustrated this spiritual truth by inviting attention to the physical phenomenon of "gardens with streams of water flowing underneath them," thus teaching man that the secret of life, vitality and prosperity lies in the POWER OF ACTION, even as the thriving of a garden depends upon water. The SECRET OF EXISTENCE, it taught, must be looked for in the GOSPEL OF ACTION.

(To be continued.)

NOTES FROM THE LONDON MUSLIM HOUSE—FRIDAY SERMONS

IF God is universal in His Providence, religion from Him must come to every race, especially in olden days, when a Message from Him given to a particular tribe could not travel from place to place, in the absence of efficacious means of mutual communication—a plain truth, but only admitted by the Qur-án. But the Religion thus given to various races of mankind was, and must be, one and the same, as

ISLAMIC REVIEW

heterogeneity is unknown in His dispensation. Difference arose from human corruption in Scripture, a fact now admitted on all hands. All sacred books at the advent of Prophet Muhammad were a medley of God's words and human addition.

Could God remain silent and see humanity led astray by books which passed under His name but were not from Him in their entirety? To think otherwise would be a wrong logic. No other prophet besides Muhammad has claimed to bring a Message from God in order to purge sacred writs from human corruptions and set aright the difference which man has made in the religion of God. Is it wrong to conclude under these premises that the revelation of the Qur-án was a necessity? The Qur-án says the same :—

And We have not revealed to you the Book except that you may make clear to them that about which they differ, and (as) a guidance and a mercy for a people who believe.—The Holy Qur-án, xvi. 64.

But some people say they can make their own selection from ancient Scriptures in the light of reason and knowledge, and can dispense with the Qur-án. For the last two thousand years they could not do so, and have awakened to the truth very recently. But should not God do Himself what man with faulty intelligence and wrong data is trying to do now, and at the time when man's handling ruined the purity of His Book? Various religious movements of the modern days are making their own Bible by making selections from the Sacred Scriptures of the world, including the Qur-án. If such selections are urgently needed for our enlightenment, the work should be done by the Almighty Himself, as He only can distinguish between what is His and what is man's. The Qur-án claims to be such a selection from God :—

An apostle from Allah, reciting pure pages, wherein are all the right books.—The Holy Qur-án, xeviii. 2, 3.

HOLY ANECDOTES

A PARABLE.

Pure water from rains is a necessity for our life. A long drought creates illness and devastates life. Oceans of water are of no help to us. It is the same water which once came from Heaven in the form of rain, but became contaminated when mixed with earthly matter and lost all vitality. Irrigation of lands by the sea-water cannot bring any harvest, nor can it be used for other purposes of life. All human efforts would be a nullity if they tried to purify sea-water for ordinary use. If such efforts to meet all our physical needs will be futile, much more they will be so for our spiritual uplifting. If water from heaven when corrupt with earthly matter must go back to the regions above for its clarification, Words from God, when meeting the same fate, must go back to Him and return in their original purity. This is sound logic.

The earth dies when there is drought of rain. Rain is the only vivifying factor, and must come from time to time if the last supply loses its vitality through earthly corruption.

And Allah has sent down water from the cloud and therewith given life to the earth after its death; most surely there is a sign in this for a people who would listen.—The Holy Qur-án, xvi. 65.

EUSOOF (BILAL).

HOLY ANECDOTES

LOVE THY ENEMY.

EVER since the Prophet proclaimed the Divine Message he became the object of common derision and the victim of popular displeasure. The Meccan folk vied with each other in teasing and worrying him. Malice invented ingenious tricks to hold him up to ridicule or bring him into trouble. Never did he venture out of his house but he met with

ISLAMIC REVIEW

some sort of insolence or other. Nay, even violence was not uncommonly resorted to. One day, while prostrating before Allah in the sacred Ka'ba, the heavy womb of a she-camel, full of dirt, was placed on his neck. Prickly shrubs were strewn on his way to entangle him, in the dark at early morn, when he would go out to the Ka'ba for his prayers. Sometimes he was pelted with stones. Once he was assaulted: a piece of cloth was thrown round his neck and twisted, and while on the point of getting strangled to death Abu Bakr intervened, saying, "Do you kill a man simply because he says, My Lord is Allah?" One day when he came home with his head all covered with dust, his daughter began washing it, shedding bitter tears at the same time. "Do not weep, my daughter," the Prophet consoled her, "Allah shall surely come to the succour of thy father."

Despised and maltreated at home, the Prophet turns to the neighbouring town of Tâif. There he hopes he might obtain a hearing. With Zaid for his sole companion, he arrives at Tâif and delivers his message. But here, too, he finds the same deaf ear turned to him. He must begin his charity at home, everyone taunts him. And at last, after a futile stay for ten days there, he is asked to clear off. So he leaves the town. But the rogues and knaves, the dregs of the society, follow him as he walks along, jeering and sneering, hooting and booing. Outside the town the path is lined on both sides for about three miles by these wretched men, and as the Prophet passes along through them, at each step he is met with a volley of stones at his legs. He plods on his painful way, but at last his legs fail him. His shoes are drenched in blood. He sits down on the path to take a little rest; but a wretch holds him up by the hand. "Walk off," he gloats; "this is not the place for you to stop." And as he walks on, the same pelting comes down in showers

HOLY ANECDOTES

upon his feet. His legs refuse to carry him. He sits down again, but again the same treatment. Every time he seats himself he is made to take to his legs. Thus pelted, bruised and bleeding, he drags his failing feet full three miles, until he is left alone. Betaking himself to a roadside orchard to rest a while, he turns in this plight of uttermost helplessness to Allah his Lord.

But what do you think are the emotions agitating his bosom? Slighted and tortured at Mecca, he came to Tâif to receive better treatment. But there he finds still worse ill-treatment in store for him. His legs are swollen, sore wounded, still bleeding. Is it not but human that he should harbour a feeling of displeasure, if not of anger, towards his tormentors at Mecca as well as Tâif? Did not another great Prophet, Jesus, son of Mary, denounce his opponents in vehement terms as narrated in the Gospels, calling them vipers, serpents and all sorts of names? Nay, even the fig-tree did not escape his wrath, unmerited as it was, because it did not bear fruit in the *winter* season. But Muhammad (Peace on him!) was cast in a higher mould. His heart was overflowing with the milk of human kindness. At this hour of extreme anguish there is not a word of grumbling against his persecutors. His heart is as full of love for them as ever. He attributes his sufferings not to anything on their part, but to his own lack of resourcefulness. In these moving terms he addresses his Lord:—

“My Lord! Unto Thee I complain of the feebleness of my strength, of my lack of resourcefulness and of my insignificance in the eyes of the people. Thou art the most Merciful of all the merciful. Thou art the Lord of the weak. Whom wouldst Thou have me deal with—with an unsympathetic foe who would frown at me or with a close friend? Not in the least do I care for aught except that Thy protection be extensive for me. In the Light of Thy

ISLAMIC REVIEW

face do I seek shelter—light which illumines the heavens and dispels all sorts of darkness and sets right all affairs in this world as in the Hereafter. May it never be that I should incur Thy wrath or that Thou shouldst be angry with me. Thee do I implore until Thou art pleased with me. There is no strength and no power but in Thee, O Lord ! ”

Years roll by, and the field of Uhad presents another similar scene. The Meccans have turned their backs ; the Muslims are hot on their heels, and sure victory is within sight when an inadvertent abandonment of position on the part of Muslim archery turns the scales against the Muslims. The weak point thus created invites an attack by an enemy detachment from the rear. The pursued also turn round upon the pursuers. Thus pressed on both sides, consternation seizes the Muslim rank and file. And the Prophet's person becomes the target of every sword, spear and arrow. The devotees fight in defence of their beloved Master with a contemptuous disregard of danger, dropping one by one around him. Never a gap is allowed to remain in the solid human wall around the Prophet. No sooner one falls than another rushes into his place. One Abu Dajana bends over him, shielding him from enemy arrows with his own back. Another, Talha, parries a sword-blow directed at the Prophet's head with his naked hand, which is chopped off. However, one enemy champion succeeds in piercing the human fortification, and deals a heavy blow on the Prophet's face, who falls down. There he lies on the ground, with a deep gash in his bleeding cheek, arrows showering on him and swords falling on him. But hark ! What is this low murmur on his lips—
“ MY LORD ! FORGIVE MY PEOPLE ; FOR SURELY THEY DO NOT KNOW.”

BABAR.

NO SECTS IN ISLAM

NO SECTS IN ISLAM

We have the following question referred to us by a friend from Manchester, to throw light upon :

“ The *Encyclopedia Britannica* says that Islam has about 75 sects. How many are existing ? And does Islam possibly tolerate so many sects ? ”

We are not surprised at the misconception which has led to the conclusion that, like Christianity, Islam too is rent into conflicting camps. The Christian thought, nurtured in the hopeless heterogeneous atmosphere of the Church in the West, could not but read the history of its own faith in Islam. Unfortunately the Church in the West since the conversion of Constantine has been a pliant instrument in the hand of the State. It has often and often been used to give vent to and mould political opinions and further political ends subservient to those in power in the State. The first departure in England came into existence to achieve the same object. It was more to serve statecraft than to elevate the soul of the laity that England first tried to liberate her from the Papal yoke, and till to-day so has been here the fate of the Church since the days of Henry VIII. It is not, therefore, surprising to see that the political division of the Muslims into Sunnis and Shiahs in days gone by has been taken in ignorance as savouring of differentiations in religious matters.

Another, and the main reason that gave birth to numerous sects in Christianity is the fact that very little is known either of Jesus or of his true teachings. His whole life is enshrouded in mystery. He no doubt attacked the rigid conventional side of the Judaic faith, but he did not give us its substitute ; so much so that it is Paul, and not Jesus, who has rightly been styled the founder of the faith in the West. But Paul was not an inspired authority,

ISLAMIC REVIEW

and it was quite natural if creedal doctrines were to be sifted in successive Councils and faith to be formulated from time to time. This unfortunate feature in the Church of Jesus is to a great extent responsible for all the sections and sub-sections therein, differing from one another on fundamentals. The Roman Catholics and the Protestants are really sects in the true sense of the word. They differ from each other on cardinal tenets, and similarly sub-sections in Protestantism bear the same character. They are notoriously divided from each other by differences of belief of the most fundamental character. All Protestants do not believe in the Trinity. They do not believe in one common baptism. Some hold that baptism is only harmless water; some that it removes all sins, some that it should be given to children, some that it must be reserved for people of full age. Belief in the communion of saints is not the same. Some hold that Christians on earth can pray to Christians who are dead on behalf of other Christians expired. Others deny this. Even unity of Church is not upheld by all. Remission of sin raises difference of opinion. Must a Protestant priest or bishop be consecrated in regular succession by previous bishops? Can any layman without any consecration by bishops become a priest? On these points there is nothing but contradiction.

But such is not the case in Islam. Islam fared quite a different fate. The Qur-án, the fountain-head of Islam, has reached us in its original purity, and the authenticity of the life-record of the Prophet Muhammad has never been questioned. A religion with its sacred record free from subsequent human interpolation—the genuineness of which record has never been impeached even by its foes—and with teachings as complete as exigencies of religion demand, cannot give way to ramification and diversity of opinion in the cardinal teachings of the religion.

NO SECTS IN ISLAM

A RELIGION WITHOUT SECT.

The principles of faith being given so clearly in the Qur-án, Islam remained always above innovation and heresies. If Christianity was split into not less than five hundred sects, Hinduism as well gave rise to such an irreconcilable diversity of belief that, keeping in view the crucial differences of the innumerable sects of the said religion, it becomes utterly impossible to give to it a definition comprehensive enough to include all its sects and sub-sects. So has been the fate of every other religion of the world. Besides, the religion preached in the Qur-án was free from all kinds of dogmas, formulæ, and personalities. It gave simple fundamental principles of life appertaining to every side of humanity, and left it to us to construct further building of human edification with regard to conditions and contingencies of the time : and this was explained in terms too explicit to admit any kind of difference. Thus Islam remained always above divisions and innovations.

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF ISLAM.

First of all, every Muslim must believe in (1) Allah, (2) Angels, (3) Revealed Books, (4) Divine Messengers, (5) the last day of judgment, (6) the measurement of good and evil by God, and (7) the life after death. These seven truths are in one form or another the fundamental basis of every human society. No sooner did man emerge from his natural state and began to live in society than he had to make resort to some sort of law, some rule to govern mutual rights and obligations. Without this even two men could not live together.

To make the law, and to give it some binding force, the world had to adopt the above-given Islamic truths in one garb or other. Analyse those basic principles upon which every society even with

ISLAMIC REVIEW

a shade of civilization hinges, and you will find the following :—

Fundamental Principles of every Human Society.

1. Source of the Law (king or some sovereign political authority).
2. Intermediaries or functionaries of the Law.
3. The Law.
4. Persons who first receive the law and impart it to others.
5. Courts of justice.
6. Principles of criminal liabilities or otherwise.
7. Our appearance to receive judgment or reward.

Fundamental Principles of Islam.

1. Allah, the Fountain-head of the Law.
2. Angels, the functionaries of the will of the Divine Fountain-head.
3. The Divine Books.
4. Divine Messengers.
5. The day of judgment.
6. Divine measurement of good and evil.
7. The Resurrection.

That the Omniscient and Omnipotent Being can only be the best reliable source of the law is a truism ; and when you take Allah as the real source of the law, then your belief in angels, in Divine Books, in Divine Messengers, in the day of judgment, in the Divine measurement of good and evil, and in the life after death, is a matter of course. And is it too much to say that every civilized society in accepting the machinery of the law as the life of the society is Muslim in spirit ? These are the seven bases of Islam. Islam means obedience to Divine laws, and a belief in the law necessitates belief in the other truths.

The whole Muslim world, after accepting these cardinal principles of Islam, accepts the Qur-án as the repository of the law recapitulating every law revealed to and before Muhammad, and for the explanation of the law they unanimously look only to Muhammad and to no one else, in whose actions and sayings they read the translation of the Qur-án. Every other authority in Islam must bow down before God and His Prophet, who so

NO SECTS IN ISLAM

nobly says: "MY SAYINGS DO NOT ABROGATE THE WORD OF GOD, BUT THE WORD OF GOD CAN ABROGATE MY SAYINGS."

With these guiding words in his hands, could a Muslim look to any one else than God and His Prophet for his religion? Hence no human intermediaries, no intercession, no priestcraft in Islam. To guide my life I have only to look to the Book of God and to the words of the Prophet explaining the former and not abrogating it in any way, and there I find a perfect theory of life and its practical code. To give the code a practical shape and make me a practical Muslim then come five pillars of Islam: (1) Pronouncement of belief in the oneness of God and the Divine messengership of Muhammad, (2) Prayers, (3) Almsgiving and poor-rates, (4) Fasting, (5) Pilgrimage. That these five institutions have a practical bearing on our life, and enable us to lead a Muslim life and to fulfil all the law, is evident enough, and need not be dwelt upon here. This finishes Islam.

THE GENESIS OF SUNEES AND SHIAS.

Islam allows us freedom of opinion and personal right of judgment. It has preached democracy in religion as well as in every branch of human life. It gives some laws which are unchangeable and everlasting; but so are all those laws that rule the world and keep it healthy morally and ethically. But the Qur-*anic* laws are broad enough to cover all contingencies. One of course has to draw lines between freedom and license. To think is to differ, and the power of thinking was a Divine gift. Therefore Islam always respected difference of opinion. "Difference of opinion in my followers is a blessing of God," so says the generous Prophet of Islam; and this approval of the Prophet has opened a healthy avenue for the fair play of private judgment and opinion. *It has done away with individualism, so*

much so that on the very death of the Prophet the question of his successorship gave rise to strong difference of opinion. Abu-Bekr was the first Caliph, then Umar, then Usman; and Ali was the fourth. But a class among the followers of the Prophet arose who opined that Ali was the only rightful successor to the Prophet among the four. This occurred long before the Ommyad political differences, and had nothing to do with the genesis of Shiaism, the so-called sectarianism. Both accept the Qur-án and the Prophet as the final authority in religion, and never look to Abu-Bekr or Ali in preference to them; but the sense of the right of private judgment is so strong, and the respect for individual opinion is so great, that thirteen hundred years have passed and the Muslims have always afforded leisure to discuss the merits and demerits of the two immediate incumbents to successorship of the Holy Prophet. Those who side with Abu-Bekr are styled Sunnees and the others Shias. To divide the holders of these two opinions into two sects in Islam is simply to evince ignorance and to slander the clearness of the Qur-ánic teaching in matters of religion.

Then comes Muslim jurisprudence—things appertaining to personal law and ritualistic practices.

There have been four great jurists in Islam on the Sunni side—Abu Haneefah, Shafai, Malak, and Ahmad Hanbal. They have written beautiful books on the subject, basing always their reasoning on the Qur-án and the Prophet's traditions. Every Muslim has a perfect right to follow any one of them, or to make his own judgment on the things concerned, in the light of the traditions of the Prophet. The latter are called Traditionists, and the former named after the name of a particular jurist. But it should never be forgotten that all these schools of thought never differ from each other in matters which constitute Islam. The writer of these lines has always accepted Abu Haneefah as the best exponent of the personal

NO SECTS IN ISLAM

and ritualistic law. He is of Hanafi persuasion in juristic matters, and so are most of the Indians. But all the same they never believe themselves less the Muslim if they ever identify themselves in some points of personal law with the other jurists, who have also got their following. Many an Hanfiate does prefer to follow Shafiate adjudication in matters of ritual, and yet they are the same Muslims. It is the colossal structure of the faith which, allowing all such divergence, remains unshaken and admits of no sectarianism in the received sense of the word. Because when there comes the matter of religion, the whole Muslim world has to look to the Qur-án and the Prophet, and the religion has been so clearly explained therein that there is not the least difference in it in the different admirers of the different schools of thought.

Again, every century in Islam saw men of great piety and learning. The magnetism of their devotion to Islam and their self-abnegation told powerfully upon their contemporaries, and they got a group of pupils and admirers around them. They represent the esoteric side of Islam. The admirers of these saintly personages survived them, and every coming generation approached them with respect and reverence. These admirers were sometimes named after the name of these Muslim saints, such as Qadrees, Chishteers, Naqshbandees, Soharwardees, and Ahmadees of our days. These great divines enriched Islamic literature with their learned expositions of Islam, but never did they teach or preach aught that goes against the fundamental tenets and truths of Islam. They all respect each other; they may differ in their explanation of certain events of historic or academic nature mentioned in the Qur-án, but there is mutual respect all the same, the reason being that there are no two opinions in matters that constitute Islam. All precepts, moral or ethical, domestic or social, appertaining to the physical or the spiritual,

ISLAMIC REVIEW

have been so fully explained in the Qur-án, that they never admit of the slightest chance of difference in opinion. Besides, the variegated life of the Prophet comes with full light to explain everything. This we miss in all other religions. Go where you will, Muslim life, Muslim ethics, Muslim politics, and, in short, Muslim ideals in every form of human thought are the same, and so is the way to reach the goal. To call these different schools of thought—a necessary outcome of healthy deliberation always encouraged in Islam with a strong Muslim sense of private judgment—sects is an unpardonable mistake. You cannot call the different shades of thought different sects in religion unless you lay your finger on some fundamental basic differentia between them.

Now, as to the alleged seventy-five sects in Islam, as referred to in the question of our correspondent, on the authority of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. This seems to be the outcome of the misapprehension of a certain report from the Prophet Muhammad (peace on him!), which only sets forth the various types of Muslims, one being the perfect and the others falling short of the ideal, in this detail or that. Another report throws light upon it, which says that faith consists in about seventy virtues, modesty being one of them. A perfect Muslim is thus the one who should combine all these in his person. All the rest who are lacking in some particular form of virtue, out of the seventy, constitute, so to speak, a type of their own. Below the watermark of the ideal Muslim character, will thus range as many different types of Muslims as there are moral virtues. Is it not true to life, every word? Does not human character present diverse shades, some approaching more, some less, the ideal state? The ingredients of perfect faith, according to the Prophet Muhammad, being about seventy, there must needs be as many types of Muslim character. The object is simply to emphasize the necessity of cultivating

REVIEW

the perfect form of personality,—personality as exemplified in the life of the Prophet and his companions. It has absolutely nothing to do with the far-fetched interpretation into which it has been strained, simply to bring down Islam on a par with Christianity in this particular respect.

The Holy Qur-án, which constitutes the sole authority with a Muslim, says, “Do not say to anyone who should accost you with *Assalam-o-Alaikm*, i.e. ‘Peace be with you,’ that you are not a believer.”

REVIEW

The Literary Year-Book (Meredith, Liverpool) for 1922, which reached us too late for notice in our February issue, marks a new stage in the career of this most enterprising publication. It has been more than doubled in size, and in addition to its normal wealth of indispensable detail, it comprises a variety of new features both useful and desirable. The “Literary Who’s Who” has been greatly enlarged, and is now as complete as human ingenuity—necessarily dependent in this case, to some extent, on the co-operation of author and artist—can make it.

Full directories of Publishers—British, Colonial and American—and of Agents, literary and dramatic; together with lists of the world’s more important periodicals, with the fare they require and provide, will be found of obvious convenience; while among numerous features of outstanding interest to literary men and journalists, we may mention the article on “The Canadian Copyright Act,” by Mr. G. Herbert Thring, Secretary to the Society of Authors, that on “Publishing To-day,” by Mr. Jonathan Cape, contributions on “Press Photography,” and “The Field for the Free Lance in the Trade and Technical Press,” and a very helpful series of expert hints, with precept and example, illustrating the special intricacies attendant upon the writing of a kinema scenario.

The volume contains a store of information which, discerningly used, should go far to ensure for the literary aspirant of reasonable ability, a respectable income as the harvest of his labours.

In spite of its increased size and scope, the price of the book is only 10s. 6d.

The Woking Mission Letter

THE MOSQUE,
WOKING,
ENGLAND.
February 4, 1922.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER IN ISLAM,

Assalam-o-Alaikum !

Since our last letter we have had a busy time. Friday sermons, Sunday lectures, both at the Mosque and the London Prayer House, attracted quite a fair number of intelligent hearers. It is with no small amazement that these ladies and gentlemen, impelled by a sense of curiosity or a spirit of inquiry to attend these functions, listen to the sublime teachings of the Holy Qur-án and lovely, pithy sayings of the Holy Prophet. It is all unexpected to them. As dinned into their ears from their cradles, to them Islam is tantamount to Sword plus Woman. When, however, the moral and spiritual truths as inculcated by Islam, both in precept and in practice, are unfolded before them in all their richness of wisdom and beauty, they often ask in bewildered astonishment: Is that Islam? Is that in the Qur-án? And when referred to the particular verse in an English translation of the Book, the sense of their ignorance dawns upon them. Then follows correspondence and demand for literature.

As mentioned in our last issue, we are now in a position, so far as staff is concerned, to turn out the needed literature. As may be seen from the pages of the *Review*, the literature under such a variety of topics is all the output of our own staff. Four new series, "Christianity in Her Own Land,"

THE WOKING MISSION LETTER

"Notes from the Friday Sermons," "The Secret of Existence," and "What They Think of Us," have been started in this issue, which, we trust, will be of much interest to our readers. But our resources do not permit the publication of all our own staff is capable of producing. The number of pages of the *Review* had to come up to 48, and this time it has been increased to 56, but still there is a deal of surplus matter. We intend increasing the volume to 64 pages, the extra expenditure to be met from voluntary contributions, in which we invite the helping hand of such of our readers as are interested in the spread of Islamic literature.

The Church religion is growing in disfavour. It is fast losing its hold in quarters where blind faith is subjected to the searching light of reason. Time and again we hear of some aspect or other of the Church creed called into question. Our note, "A Vicar Bans a Psalm," will afford interesting reading in this connection.

Notwithstanding this growing spirit of revolt, arising out of free rational criticism, the propagandists are daily mustering their forces strong, for reasons of their own, to disseminate all sorts of things about Islam as well as to evangelize the regions of the Islamic world still unexplored. A circular letter, for instance, in connection with the notorious Christian journal, the *Moslem World*, issue for January 1922, attempts to inspire the Christian world to carry on the baneful propaganda with added energy. This is how it arouses the enthusiasm of its readers:—

"Near East and Disarmament," or What Hinders Disarmament in the Near East, is the subject of a very striking editorial by President Gates of Robert College, Constantinople, in the January number of the *Moslem World*. Dr. Gates views the present situation in the Near East, not so much as related to politics or present-day diplomacy, but in the far deeper issue of character and religions, ideals which he considers to be the only hope for permanent peace.

Another most interesting and informing article is on the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

great unknown territory of Central Asia, popularly called Turkistan, and is contributed by Miss Jenny de Mayer, who has herself crossed this desert and penetrated to the great centres of population. She gives a most valuable geographical and sociological study which reveals the great need and the opportunities for missionary work.

The extracts speak for themselves. The Christian missionary would let the world believe that the peace of the world cannot be secured so long as the two cults, Christianity and Islam, which are poles apart, exist side by side with each other. The only way, therefore, is to push on proselytizing activities, so that the Crescent might be replaced by the Cross. Then, he says, will peace reign in the world.

All this has to be combated with, which requires a lot of doing. Slipshod and indifferent efforts on our part will not do. We must appraise the due magnitude of the struggle, and accordingly summon our spirits to rise equal to the task.

The following are the donations already received towards the free circulation of Islamic literature :—

	£	s.	d.
Working Staff	19	8	6 ¹
Indian Staff	5	1	0
Mr. Ahmad Din, <i>Ishaat-i-Islam</i> Office, Lahore ..	0	5	0
Mr. Amanat Mohamad, <i>Ishaat-i-Islam</i> Office, Lahore	0	5	0
Mr. Mohamed Hossain, <i>Ishaat-i-Islam</i> Office, Lahore	0	5	0
Dr. Ibrahim Sufi, Calcutta	10	0	0
Mr. F. M. Khan	0	10	0
Mr. S. A. Aziz	0	10	0
Mr. S. M. Sadiq	0	10	0
Mr. K. S. D. Ahmad	0	10	0
	£37	4	6

These donations we beg to acknowledge with thanks.

Yours most fraternally,

KHWAJA NAZIR AHMAD,

Manager.

¹ Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din donated £7, and not £5, as acknowledged in our last Letter.

ISLAM AND SOCIALISM

Now let us consider the three main features of Socialism—liberty, equality and fraternity. Every Muslim enjoyed the most perfect liberty. He feared none but God. "There is no support and no strength but from Allah," says the Holy Qur-án. In our daily prayers we repeat and assert that we worship none but God and ask help of none but the Almighty. As far as equality and fraternity are concerned, Muslim Brotherhood is an everlasting monument of glory to Islam. The Muslims will always be members of one great family. Their feelings of affection for one another will be ever like those of real brothers. The Holy Qur-án says that God Himself put love and affection in the heart of every Muslim towards his brother Muslim.¹

To them grades of society and class distinction conveyed no meaning. By saying: "I am only a man like unto you,"² Muhammad (may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) took the lead and set a wonderful example for his followers.

Even in religious ceremonials Muhammad did not lose sight of these democratic principles. Our meetings in the Mosques, may they be for daily prayers, Fridays, or on our Eid gatherings, bear an ample testimony to the fact. Our very salutations are based on Socialistic lines.

It may be interesting to know the attitude of Islam towards labour, and I cannot do better but to read to you some of the sayings of Muhammad on the subject:

1. Pray to God morning and evening, and spend the day in your pursuits.
2. He who neither works for himself, nor for others, will not receive the reward of God.
3. Whoso is able and fit, and does not work for himself or for others, God is not kind to him.
4. O God, keep me from inability and laziness.
5. Those who earn an honest living are the beloved of God.

¹ The Holy Qur-án, xlviii. 29.

² The Holy Qur-án, xviii. 110.

* Continued from the last number.

ISLAM AND SOCIALISM

6. God is gracious to him that earneth his living by his own labour and not by begging.

7. Pay the workman his wages before his perspiration dries up.¹

Even Muslim Emperors like Mahmood Shah of Delhi and Aurangzeb, the great Moughal Emperor, had to do laborious work to earn their living.

The success of Muhammad's Socialism was due to the fact that he socialized the people first, and the State afterwards. He had won a complete victory over individualism, and Ali only demonstrated that, by following the noble example of Muhammad, he, too, like many others, was not far behind. It is related of him that while fighting for the people he was about to sever the head of one of the enemies, when the latter spat at him to show his personal disrespect for the son-in-law of the Prophet. Ali merely sheathed his sword and walked away, saying that he was not there to avenge his personal wrongs. I doubt if Christ even could have followed such a course.

As I have already pointed out, every member of the Muslim Commonwealth was regarded as a trustee in one form or another. Every one of them was given a ruling authority, and was accountable to God for the use or abuse of that authority, as the following sayings of the Holy Prophet show :

• You must one day appear before Allah to give an account of your doings.

Every one of you is a trustee, and every one of you will have to give an account. Every Imam is a trustee, and he will have to give an account. Every man is a trustee of his family, and he will have to give an account. Every woman is a trustee of the household, and she will have to give an account. Every servant is a trustee of his master's things, and he will have to give an account. So all of you are trustees, and all of you will have to give an account.

In short, Socialistic principles in the extremest sense were applied successfully. The Muslims of

¹ *Sayings of Muhammad*, by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din.

ISLAM AND SOCIALISM

the days of Muhammad and Omar did not require a police force to restrain them from crime, because they knew from the Holy Qur-án, that whether they manifested what was in their mind or hid it, Allah will call them to account according to it.¹ They did not commit robbery nor did they misappropriate trust property—not because of the fear of their fellowmen, but because they dared not displease the All-powerful and Omnipresent God. They spoke the truth, protected orphans, helped destitutes, sacrificed their interests for others simply because they loved to win the favour of the Almighty God. Thus the whole Muslim community became one body with one ideal. The State was conducted by selfless and God-fearing men, and as long as that belief was the guiding and controlling power, Egotism remained suppressed and Socialism in its truest sense triumphed.

SPIRITUALITY.

From all that I have said, it is evident that the lines on which the West has worked out Socialism are not only faulty, but are bound to result in chaos and the utter disintegration of Society. Socialism in its present form can never achieve its ultimate goal unless some higher motive is kept in view. If perfect Socialism aims at the equality of man and requires of us that we should live for others, it is surely futile to socialize the State without some attempt at least at socializing the individual mind as well. This, however, will require some high incentive, for it is obvious that self-sacrifice—in any sense of the word—can hardly be practised by one who has nothing to look to beyond this world, and so, as I have submitted, religion is the only remedy. Socialization of mind must lead to spiritualization of mind. Religion strives for that end. It enables us to live up to and obey the Divine Laws and to

¹ The Holy Qur-án, ii. 284.

ISLAM AND SOCIALISM

walk humbly with the Lord, for there is, inherent in us, some semblance of the Divine Attributes, though enshrouded in carnal coverings. Religion not only helps us to shake off these coverings, but also teaches us to live up to the innate potentialities which they conceal, leading us ever on to the highest peak of spirituality which, beyond a doubt, consists in imbuing ourselves, so far as our humanity is able, with the Divine attributes.

Let us put Islam to this test, and see how far she has carried the evolution of the human mind—how far succeeded in developing the spirituality of her adherents. I have already said enough to establish that Islam did discipline and elevate the individual mind to such a pitch that socialistic principles in their extremest sense were successfully applied in the early days of the Muslim Commonwealth; and again we find Islam to be the one religion which points out unhesitatingly that the height of spirituality lies in the cultivation of the Divine attributes. “Receive the colouring of Allah,”¹ says the Holy Qur-án. Muhammad (may blessings of Allah be upon him!) is the only Prophet of God who said: “Imbue yourselves with the Divine attributes,” that is, “Work out and bring to full fruition all of Divine that is in you.” Now, in this connection Islam has summed up the Divine attributes in the following three words: *Málik*, *Rahím* and *Rahmán*. It is not necessary here to go into a lengthy discourse to explain their significance. It will suffice to say that the blessings of the Almighty, though manifold, may be classified under three main headings. First, those that come to us as our due deserts; secondly, those that we receive in greater abundance than we deserve (more than our due deserts); and, finally, those that are showered on us without any effort on our part, in other words, those blessings which are not our due deserts at all.

¹ The Holy Qur-án, ii. 138.

ISLAM AND SOCIALISM

These munificences are from the Almighty, Who is *Mâlik, Rahím and Rahmán*. Unfortunately, the English language is not rich enough to convey their full import, and I am compelled to render these as *Master, Merciful and Beneficent*.

If we consider humanity at large from the Socialistic point of view, we find that it may be divided into three, and only three, grades. First, those who can earn enough for their requirements; secondly, those who do not receive substantial value for their labours or cannot earn sufficient for their maintenance; and, thirdly, those who cannot earn their living or are, in some way or other, disabled from doing so. Modern Socialists cannot point to any class of Society that does not fall under one of these categories. While the so-called Socialists of to-day have failed to meet the situation and have done nothing for its betterment, no true religion can afford to overlook it. Islam, and Islam alone, has come to the rescue. How? We are taught to “imbue ourselves with the Divine attributes.” Thus, if we wish to worship *Mâlik*, we must give others their due; if we wish to be the votaries of *Rahím*, we must be merciful and give others more than their due; and, finally, if we wish to be dipped in the colour of *Rahmán*, we must be beneficent and charitable to others, even without dreaming of compensation or reward from them.

Islam has worked out these principles to a further extent still. We are exhorted in the Friday sermon from the pulpit of the Mosque :

To do justice and to do good to others and the giving to the kindred, and He forbids indecency and evil and rebellion; He admonishes you that you may be mindful.¹

Thus we are reminded of our duty every Friday to give one his due justly; to be generous in our dealings with another; and, to a third, to be even beneficent, without any consideration of return from

¹ The Holy Qur-án, xvi. 90.

ISLAM AND SOCIALISM

him—just as we do in the case of our own kith and kin. These ordinances run in an exact parallel with the Divine Attributes of *Málik*, *Rahim* and *Rahmán*. So it will be seen that, according to Islam, the ideal of Socialism and the height of Spirituality are simply to be imbued with the Divine Attributes of *Rahmán*, i.e. to show beneficence to His creatures, regardless of desert or otherwise. This is the stage at which, when we have reached it, we are at one with the Almighty and can have direct communion with Him. As the Holy Qur-án says : “ The *Rahmán* taught the Qur-án,”¹ or, in other words, God only speaks to those who acquire the attribute of being beneficent. What a wonderful difference between the Muslim standard of life and that of the modern Socialist, who, in spite of the advancement he claims, has only just realized the duty laid upon him to be just.

In short, perfect Socialism can only be established through spirituality, and spirituality can only be achieved by good actions and piety, which without charity amounts to nothing. This can be substantiated by many verses from the Holy Qur-án, but I will only draw your attention to the following :—

O you who believe ! spend (benevolently) of the good things that you earn and of what We have brought forth for you out of the earth, and do not aim at what is bad that you may spend (in alms) of it, while you would not take it yourselves unless you *have its price lowered*, and know that Allah is Self-sufficient, Praiseworthy.

(As for) those who spend their property by night and by day, secretly and openly, they shall have their reward from their Lord and they shall have no fear, nor shall they grieve.—The Holy Qur-án, ii. 267 and 274.

By no means shall you attain to righteousness until you spend (benevolently) out of what you love ; and whatever thing you spend, Allah surely knows it.—The Holy Qur-án, iii. 91.

Have you considered him who calls the judgment a lie ?

¹ The Holy Qur-án, lv. 1-2.

ISLAM AND SOCIALISM

That is the one who treats the orphan with harshness, and does not urge (others) to feed the poor. So woe to the praying ones, who are unmindful of their prayers, who do (good) to be seen, and withhold alms.—The Holy Qur-án, cvii. 1-7.

The same theme is amply borne out by all the Five Principles of Islam. The Unity of God, Prayer, Fasting, Alms-giving and the Pilgrimage—all point to the one ultimate goal. If self-abnegation consists in a man's denying himself his own possessions of value, the spirit could not have better occasion for thriving than that which comes to a Muslim in the performance of the aforesaid five Pillars of Faith. Time, wealth, eating and drinking, the companionship of the sexes, the homeland—in short, everything that we strive after and that might destroy the spirit of self-effacement in us—is to be sacrificed and overthrown to please the Great Unseen. We fast, not to starve ourselves, but to learn the lesson of doing without food and drink and the companionship of our mates, though law and society permit of their enjoyment. We have to pay a certain tax on our annual savings, which, with the manifold other charities enjoined on us, give occasion for parting with our wealth. In performing our pilgrimage we separate ourselves from our homes and the company of those near and dear to us. Time is money, and yet we have to sacrifice it five times on hearing the call for prayers. One may willingly part with everything, but it is difficult to give way in matters of opinion, and yet in bearing testimony to the First Pillar of Faith, we have to bow before the Almighty. Thus it is evident that all these actions, which were seemingly ordained to uplift spirituality, become the chief factor of our socialization.

Further, the institution of marriage, as laid down by the Holy Qur-án, extends the sphere of our interest with its new ties, new affections, new responsibilities, all tending to the exclusion of self;

ISLAM AND SOCIALISM

and Islam has made selflessness and self-abnegation the bases of our uplifting and progress.

To sum up, the human mind must be socialized first, and Egotism destroyed. Individual consciousness should evolve a social or communal consciousness. I, therefore, venture to submit that he alone can be the true ideal of humanity who said : " Surely my prayer and my sacrifice and my life and my death are (all) for the cause of the Creator and Nourisher of the worlds." ¹ Unfortunately, he was centuries ahead of the time, and it has required 1,300 years—and perhaps will require still more—for humanity to understand and appreciate his teachings.

Friends, let our Socialism, like the Christian ideal of charity, begin at home. Let us be socialized ourselves, and go back to the ideals of Muhammad. He himself practised them and triumphed over his enemies, and I can assure you that if we follow in his footsteps it will not be long ere the day will be ours, and we too shall triumph over the enemies of Islam.

¹ The Holy Qur-án, vi. 163.