

The *Islamic Review*

Edited by KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN, B.A., LL.B.

Vol. XI.]

ZILHAJJA, 1341 A.H.

[No.

Annual Subscription, 10s.

AUGUST 1923.

Single Copies,

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Notes	261
Words of Wisdom	271
The Woking Mosque. By Francis A. H. Williams ..	272
The Prince of Peace. By Prince Sadiq of Mangrol	273
I Salute Mohamad. By Professor T. L. Vaswani ..	275
Who Burned Smyrna? By James A. Sproule ..	280
In the Tents of the Moors	285
Professor Kay on the Semitic Religions. By M. Y. K.	288
Some Stumbling-Blocks. By Babar	292
Reviews :—	298
Zinda-i-Jawed	
Religion in Russia	
The Shrine of Wisdom	

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 £1 10s. Postage and packing for all qualities: United Kingdom, 2s. ; abroad, 4s. Prospectus and sample pages sent free on application. Apply to "Islamic Review," The Mosque, Woking, England, or to Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Ahmadiyya Buildings, Lahore, or to "Islamic Review" Office, Azeez Manzil, Lahore, India.

PUBLISHED AT
THE MOSQUE WOKING ENGLAND

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
نَحْمَدُهُ وَنُصَلِّي عَلَى رَسُولِهِ الْكَرِيمِ

THE ISLAMIC REVIEW

VOL. XI.

ZILHAJJA, 1341 A.H.

No. 8.

AUGUST 1923.

NOTES

“Thou Shalt Not . . .”

Dr. Samuel Zwemer, editor of the Christian missionary journal, *The Moslem World*, has, we understand,¹ just arrived in London. Discussing the interesting and important questions whether Western people and Moslems can live together in peace and whether the ideals of Islam and Christianity could be reconciled, the missionary pointed out the following as the main difficulties in the way :—

1. The fact that Islam was a Church-State and still taught that “infidels” were on a lower plane than worshippers of Allah.
2. Moslem social customs. They thought that traffic in slaves was desirable, but considered traffic in drink sinful. Their views about women were entirely opposed to ours.
3. The spirit of nationality or self-determination among the Moslem peoples, which had been greatly strengthened by the war.
4. The dominant position of the Turks in the Moslem world.

This is a typical instance of Church mentality. It is this mentality more than anything else that has so far kept the two vast sections of humanity asunder. Once this deplorable angle of vision is changed, the chasm will be practically bridged over. Barring the few noble exceptions here and there, the West has not been able, mainly through the Church, to understand and appreciate an alien people or their religion. Mainly through the Church, we say, and not without justification. Dr. Zwemer has been a churchman, having spent thirty years in Muslim lands, and yet

¹ *Daily Herald*, July 4th.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

he has been unable to foster in his heart a tender spot for the people in whose midst he has lived, moved and spent the better part of his life. Nor has he a kindly word to say of their religion.

A true churchman! Dr. Zwemer does not like to see any people other than his own breathe their own free air and live their own free lives. The Turk is still unchained, he moans in a pessimistic vein, and what is worse, in Muslim lands there is abroad a spirit of nationality or self-determination. This, he tells us, is a difficulty in the way of "comradeship" between the two peoples. What a divine conception of comradeship! If this is comradeship, we wonder what the doctor's definition of slavery could be. There exists no such thing as comradeship but amongst equals. All else is slavery pure and simple, though in a different guise. The East is now in a different mood. The slave-mentality is gone. To attempt to perpetuate that state is to attempt the impossible. Comradeship or no comradeship—these are now the only words, and which of these is taken up rests, in a very large measure, with the West. It looks incongruous that Dr. Zwemer—and he wears the robes of Him who taught, "Love thy neighbour as thyself"—should be one of those who view with dismay the legitimate aspirations of others to come into their own. Certainly no neighbourly wish, this! It is a flagrant contravention of the Master's dictum as well as a breach of the Tenth Commandment, which says:—

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house . . . nor anything that is thy neighbour's.

It is not only the Tenth Commandment that Dr. Zwemer's views, as set forth above, violate. Obviously, these show little regard even for the Ninth Commandment: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." Dr. Zwemer has spent quite a lifetime in a struggle against Islam, and surely he must know better about that religion than he represents it to be. That Islam regards the "infidels" to be on a lower plane than the followers of Islam, that the Muslims think that traffic in slaves is desirable—surely these statements could not be the outcome of unacquaintance with the attitude of Islam on these points. Anyone that runs can see the breadth of Islamic teachings:—

Surely those who believe and those who are Jews and the Sabaeans and the Christians—whoever believes in the Lord and the last day

NOTES

and does good—they shall have no fear nor shall they grieve (Qur-án, v. 69).

O you who believe! let not one people laugh at another people maybe they—(the latter)—are better than they" (xlix. 11).

As regards slavery, it must indeed require an uncommon conscience to calumniate Islam on this account, after having read this in the Holy Qur-án, chap. xc. 12-16:—

And what will make *you* comprehend what the uphill road is?
(*It is*) the setting free of a slave,
Or the giving of food in a day of hunger.
To an orphan, having relationship,
Or to the poor man lying in the dust.

To say, therefore, that Islam looks down upon non-Muslims and encourages slavery is an utter disregard of the Commandment: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." Contrast with this what another non-Muslim—a greater soul, of course—Professor T. L. Vaswani, says on this point in his article, "I Salute Mohamad," which appears elsewhere in this issue. Says he: "It must be remembered that the first blow at slavery was struck when Omar set all slaves at liberty after his conquest of Jerusalem."

"Islam or Christ?"

Touching upon the question of the native conversion in the course of a lengthy address at the opening of the second Synod, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Karney, Bishop of the Diocese of Johannesburg (South Africa), is reported to have indulged in the following observations:—

Did they really and truly believe that it was their business to convert the native? The support rendered by the white Churches to native mission work seemed to imply that they did not. Have they really come into contact with really converted natives? He did not mean the native whose Christianity was as superficial as his civilization, and who called himself a Christian because it was his one chance of getting education—but the real Christian. He had met them, and he made bold to say that many of these were not only Christians, but real gentlemen. And how could they doubt it? Did they believe that it was bad for natives to be taught what Jesus Christ taught; to believe in and love Him who was the very fount of truth and honour and justice and unselfishness? Was Jesus Christ wrong when He said: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature"? Did He really mean South Africa to be an exception? Had they faced the alternative? Did the white people realize that it was not a choice between Christianity and the ancient tribal religion, but between *Christ and Islam*? There were already over fifty million black Mohammedans in Africa. Twenty-three years ago there was scarcely a single Mohammedan in Nyasaland; now

ISLAMIC REVIEW

every village had its mosque. In the Cape Province people were beginning to be alive to this danger ; but had they realized it here in the Transvaal ? Did they realize that when a native became a Mohammedan other Mohammedans treated him as a brother, and that a black Mohammedan Africa might be used as the spearhead of an appalling attack on their Christian civilization ? It was well known that at the heart of Mohammedanism there is a group of burning fanatics who were longing to be up and slay the infidel ; and he supposed there was not a statesman in Europe who was not alive to the danger. These were not idle words. The question they had to face, sooner or later, was : “ Is it to be ‘ Islam ’ or ‘ Christ ’ for the native of South Africa ? ” I have come to believe in the last ten months that it would be a grave mistake to both white and native that we should generally worship together. Both, he believed, would suffer ; but was it going to be always necessary for them to maintain along the Reef tiny little coloured missions because they as whites would not allow them to worship even in a corner of their church ; would not allow them to kneel at the altar, even when they themselves had communicated ? Their Church Councils would do well to face these questions on occasions. He knew he would be told that he had not been long enough in the country to understand. He knew there was no ready answer to this question, and no short cut to the solution ; but one thing we could determine, that, without being sentimental, or premature, or in a hurry, they could be just.

Christians, at any rate, believed in a God of Justice, and the last question he would ask was : “ Can they expect God’s blessing on this country unless they show justice to the child races ? ”¹

A jumble of ideas, at once clever and contradictory, at times even comic. If the Bishop’s reference to “ a group of burning fanatics at the heart of Mohammedanism ” is an ingenious—and we may say, quite Church-like—stroke to enlist the sympathies of the Statesman, as he betrays in the very next line, as also of the Profiteer and the Imperialist, his talk of “ really converted natives ” and “ the real Christian ” cannot but force one to laughter. “ Real Christian ! ” as if Christendom were full of meek, humble, loving lambs, or at least those that profess to be the keepers of that fold, and now it was the turn of the poor native of Africa in his quiet hut to be stuffed with the same dose of love. But here again truth comes to the Bishop’s lips in spite of himself. “. . . these were,” he says, “ not only Christians, but real gentlemen.” Are we to understand that Christianity and real gentlemanliness are two things ? And if so, would it not have been more in the fitness of things for the Rt. Rev. Bishop to have stayed at home and concerned himself with making converts to the latter class—for, after all, it is such men, and not so-called Christians, that the world wants—rather than pose as the saviour of the

¹ *Rand Daily Mail*, Johannesburg, June 4th.

NOTES

natives of Africa ? But we said the Bishop's oration is self-contradictory, too. "Did they believe it was bad for natives to be taught what Jesus Christ taught ; to believe in and love him who was the very fount of truth and honour and justice and unselfishness ?"—so he delivers himself at a high moral pitch. But in the same breath he tells us, a few lines after, "I have come to believe in the last ten months that it would be a grave mistake to both white and native that we should generally worship together." What a short memory ! Is this what the Bishop wants the native to be taught, "what Jesus Christ taught" ? You feel he is too low for you to "worship together," and yet you want him "to believe in (Jesus) and love him." You tell him Jesus was the very fount of truth and honour and justice and unselfishness"—and most truly he was all that—but you kick him out of your place of worship. Is that how you convince him of the "truth and honour and justice and unselfishness" of Jesus ?

And as to the question, Islam or Christ ? We fail to understand why the Bishop speaks of the two as antitheses. "When a native became a Mohammedan," he tells us, "other Mohammedans treated him as a brother." What would Jesus do if he were to appear amongst these natives to-day ? Would he embrace the native as a brother, as does a Mohammedan, or would he do as do the whites, "not allow them to worship even in a corner of their church ; would not allow them to kneel at the altar, even when they themselves had communicated" ? In the answer to this question lies the answer to the question, Islam or Christ ? and when that answer has come forth in the one way possible, i.e. Jesus, like a true Muslim, would embrace the native as his brother, then the question will be, not Islam or Christ, but Islam and Christ. Islam and Christ are not two things. Let the native have Islam, if you would have him find Christ ; for it is not in your Church (where he has but licking in store for him), but in the Mosque (where he meets with a loving bosom), that he can find the true Christ.

"By their fruits . . ."

In a controversy in the columns of the *Pall Mall Gazette* a Catholic writer finds fault with Protestantism for its "two hundred sects," and the champions of the latter retort that Anglo-Catholicism is but an "organized pagan pageantry." As the fruits of Protestantism, one of the duellists counts the various societies—the Church Missionary Society, the Church

ISLAMIC REVIEW

of England Zenana Missionary Society, the London Missionary Society, the China Inland Mission, as well as "the millions of Christians from heathen races in India, China, Africa and the isles of the Southern Seas."

The relative merits or demerits of these rival camps in the Church we leave to the polemic skill of their respective champions to argue. We may, however, point out that the real value of a system cannot be judged through academic discussions. In such things the test of relative worth could not be but one: how far a system has promoted the good of humanity. And if we apply that test to the Church as such, whether represented by one camp or another, it will render a bad account. Why, what is the good of counting heathen converts by millions, when the hundreds of millions already in the Church are none the better for it? They illustrate the well-known adage: "The nearer the Church, the farther from God." And if a tree is to be known by the fruit thereof, we would first call attention to a few of such fruits which are the product of the Church-tree. Ireland! Ruhr! Russia! Greece! Turkey!—to keep within the geographical limits of the nursery of that tree. Turn whithersoever you will and you encounter the grim outcome of the Upas-tree. And yet a *Divine Church*, the Church of *Christ*!

Western Fuss about Khilafat.

It is ludicrous on the part of Western writers to project their own Church-fostered mentality to Islamic questions and Islamic institutions. Dogmatism is an essentially Church characteristic. Islam recognizes neither dogma nor ritual, and yet those brought up in the Church atmosphere, not able to divest themselves of their Church notions, unconsciously clothe Islam with similar paraphernalia. Islam—a plain, simple, natural mode of life on God's earth—does not admit of any such terms or trappings. There is no "man-God" in Islam. The Great Prophet of Islam was just a man like the rest of men. There is no "infallible Church" in Islam; nor is there any Pope or priest in Islam. Nevertheless, for the simple reason that religion in the West cannot be conceived of but in association with such appendages, Western students of Islam are prone to interpret Islam as well in some similar terms. They cannot, but see Islam through their own glasses, and hence the boring absurdity of all their pedantic talk of Islam.

The institution of Khilafat has been one such object of ill-informed fuss based on forced analogy from Church

NOTES

Papacy. Time and again we have elucidated the point in these columns that there is nothing sacerdotal about the person of a Khalif, no such artificial halo of sanctity with which a Pope is surrounded. Islam pooh-poohs such ideas. He is just an erring, wavering mortal as any other. He derives his authority from the people whose service is the sole justification of his office. Abu Bakr was the first Khalif after the Prophet, and these noble words of his in the course of his inaugural address will ever shine in the pages of history: "IF I GO WRONG, PUT ME RIGHT."

No ambiguity, no complexity. The Head of the people must be the servant of the people, subject to the will of the people. One is therefore surprised at the ignorant hue and cry raised in the Western Press concerning the present constitution of Khilafat in Turkey, which in fact is nothing new, no innovation, but based on the same fundamental principle of the will of the people which formed its essential feature in the palmy days of Islam. As a fresh instance of such ignorance, we read, in the communication of the *Glasgow Herald's* Constantinople correspondent, the observation: "... it is still an open question whether the Turkish people, possessing a Caliph, can countenance a republican form of Government, since, according to the fundamental principles of Islam, the Caliph is an executive whose business is to administer all the affairs of Islam, religious and secular." Democracy, not autocracy, is the fundamental principle of Islam.

Bible for Children.

Of all things, stories are perhaps the most welcome to children; the more so, the more fantastic. Church propaganda has not been slow to find that out and turn it to its own account, irrespective of any consideration for the interest of these juveniles themselves. At the annual meeting of the Nile Mission Press, Miss M. Dobson, speaking on the need of literature for children, emphasized that advantage must be taken of the pliant stage of child-mentality. Her own experience in India, she said, showed how hard it was to convince the adult of the truth of the Bible. "When a Mohammedan woman with whom she was reading the Bible and the Koran side by side came across a statement which contradicted the Koran, she said: 'Which is right, your book or mine?' Upon being told that the Bible was right, she refused to read any more."¹ But as regards children, they "are eager to read anything," she said. She had herself

¹ *The Christian*, July 5th.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

seen "a little girl in India reading an unexpurgated edition of the *Arabian Nights*." Why not the Bible instead? What a substitute! But, after all, is it fair to those young souls, whose welfare must be the primary consideration of all education? You stuff those tender minds with what, you are sure, no mature judgment will find it easy to swallow.

Red Propaganda : Appeal to Muslims.

The Russia of to-day is a land of mystery. All sorts of stories are current about it in the outside world, and one is at a loss to make the head or tail of them. In the recent British Note to the Soviet Government the latter was charged with anti-British propaganda in the East, and a pledge to abstain from such propaganda was demanded of it. Notwithstanding that pledge, however, the *Morning Post* Russian correspondent writes, there appears in the official Russian organ, *Izvestia*, an appeal to "All brother-Moslems residing in all parts of the world" and signed by the "President and Members of the Central Spiritual Administration of the Moslem population of European Russia," which speaks of the "British Government holding under its iron yoke the faithful sons of Islam," and goes on to say :—

We Moslems have prayed to Allah and Mohammed for the victory of Turkey and the expulsion of the Greeks from Asia Minor and Thrace. Allah has heard our prayers, and Turkey was victorious. But one of the chief reasons which contributed to Turkey's victory was the support given her by the Soviet Government. Therefore the whole Moslem world must remember with gratitude Soviet Russia's help, and now support her in her struggle against Great Britain.¹

Muslims in Java.

The Dutch East Indies has a Muslim population of 36,000,000, out of a total of 49,803,321. It seems they are in no way behind times and, like the rest of the world of Islam, are throbbing with a fresh impulse to live. The Muslims abroad will naturally be interested to know how their brethren in Java are faring. Commenting on a railway strike in Java, *The Times* Batavia correspondent writes :—

The suggestion of a strike of natives in Java would have been ridiculed a few years ago. From one end of the island to the other the various races are docile and happy. In the last few years a breed of professional agitators has developed. The "Sarikat Islam," formerly a merely religious society organized by Mahomedan priests, is now political and absolutely anti-European. Every little village now has its school; you find them in the remotest villages of the Sumatra mountains. One

¹ *Morning Post*, June 20th.

NOTES

of the drawbacks of this lavish educational system is that the old-fashioned teachings have been abandoned. A few years ago women and girls made wonderful lace and gold-worked cloth. All the houses in Padang were elaborately carved. Hand-beaten brasswork was made everywhere. Now the girls can read and write, but they cannot sew. It is a common complaint that "the Government has educated us and yet does not employ us."

British Peer on Pilgrimage.

Under this headline we read in the columns of the *Westminster Gazette*, July 5th, the following Exchange message from Cairo :—

Lord Headley was welcomed at Port Said to-day by deputations of Egyptian Moslems from Cairo and Alexandria. Lord Headley is spending a few days in Cairo before proceeding to Mecca on the pilgrimage.

It is close on ten years ago since the announcement first appeared of Lord Headley's conversion to Mohammedanism. His action in embracing the faith was the outcome, as he himself said, of many years of thought. Lord Headley explained that, although he had accepted Mohammedanism, he was still a Christian in so far as believing in Christ and following the teachings of Christ.

Needless to add that Lord Headley is not the only Muslim who is also a Christian. Muslims all the world over believe in the Prophethood of Jesus as much as in that of Muhammad, and so every Muslim is at the same time a Christian. In fact, we may go further and assert that a Muslim alone is a true Christian, in so far as he follows the Truth which Jesus lived and died for. "Not as I will, but as *Thou wilt*"—was not this the keynote of Jesus' life as of his death? And what is this but Islam pure and simple, which means submission to His Will? Compare a similar expression that we hear from the lips of Muhammad: "My life as well as my death are for Allah, the Lord of the Universe . . . and I am the foremost of those that submit to His Will."

The British Red Crescent Committee.

The British Red Crescent Committee includes among its members His Highness the Aga Khan, the Right Honourable Lord Lamington, the Lady Lamington, Lady Lowther, Colonel the Honourable Aubrey Herbert, M.P., General Conyers Surtees, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., Professor E. G. Browne of Cambridge, the Right Honourable Syed Ameer Ali (President), besides other prominent people. The Bankers of the Society are Messrs. Coutts & Co. The Honorary Treasurer of the Society, Mr. A. S. M. Anik, is a Moslem merchant in London of recognized position and standing. No cheque is issued

ISLAMIC REVIEW

on behalf of the Society without two signatures, viz. that of the President and of the Honorary Treasurer. The accounts are audited yearly by a prominent chartered accountant, Mr. Edwin Hayes, of the firm of Messrs. Hayes & Co., 28 Basinghall Street, E.C. The audited accounts are regularly submitted every year to the London County Council as required under the law. The work of the Society is carried on on the most economical lines by one clerk, who acts as Secretary to the Society, and works on an extremely moderate salary for three other societies, viz. the London Moslem League, the London Mosque Fund and the Woking Mosque Trust. In the distribution of its charity the work is entirely honorary, carried on by trustworthy local workers who regularly furnish the Society with a statement relating to the distribution of the charity entrusted to them.

An Acknowledgment.

Our thanks are due to the authorities of the L. & S.W. Railway, London District, for arranging a special service between Waterloo and Woking railway stations on July 25th, the day of the Muslim festival of Eid-ul-Azha. This afforded the Muslims resident in London considerable facility to join the celebration of their religious function. Cheap return tickets at half the usual fare were issued.

“Unprecedented Reception” to Lord Headley.

As we go to the press, we learn from a telegraphic message in the columns of the *Westminster Gazette*, from the latter's Cairo Correspondent, that in Egypt Lord Headley was accorded a “reception unprecedented in the case of a Britisher.” We expect in Arabia too he has been received with open arms. We are eagerly looking forward to the opportunity to be able to present our readers with a detailed account of such thrilling scenes from the pen of Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, if not of Lord Headley himself, and, if possible, with photographic illustrations.

Friday Prayer and Sermon.—At the London Muslim Prayer House
—111, Campden Hill Road, Notting Hill Gate, London—every Friday,
at 1 p.m. **Sunday Lectures** at 5 p.m.
Service, Sermon and Lectures every Sunday at the Mosque, Woking,
at 11.30 a.m.

WORDS OF WISDOM

WORDS OF WISDOM

THE SAYINGS OF MUHAMMAD

ACQUISITION of knowledge is incumbent on every Muslim.

* * * * *

A word of wisdom is the lost property of a Muslim ; he is entitled to have it wherever he may come by it.

* * * * *

The ink of a scholar is better than the blood of a martyr.

* * * * *

A moment of meditation is better than a whole night of devotion.

* * * * *

One learned man is harder on the devil than a thousand ignorant worshippers.

* * * * *

A Muslim is never satisfied with hearing good until he die.

* * * * *

Hunt after knowledge, even though it were to be had in China.

* * * * *

Who is the most beneficent ? He who attains knowledge and instructs others.

* * * * *

The worst of men is a bad learned man, and the best a good learned man.

* * * * *

The knowledge from which no benefit flows is like a treasure from which no charity is bestowed in the path of the Lord.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

THE WOKING MOSQUE

SEE the domèd crescent gleaming
Golden in the sunshine bright ;
Fittest type of might of Allah,
Ruler of the day and night.

Islam knows not creed nor colour,
Nothing cares for pomp or show,
Only that the One great Allah
All the world shall learn to know.

All the sweetness, all the beauty
That from human souls proceed,
Serve to show the path of duty
Set by Allah for our heed.

Times and times He sent His prophets
To reveal the heart of things,
As His people, Him forgetting,
Formed their vain imaginings.

Then He sent the last and greatest
Of His prophets, Muhammad,
Man of men, foretold by Jesus,
Sent to make the nations glad.

In the great new world now building
From the ashes of the past
Islam takes its share in welding
Brotherhood of nations fast.

Allah, Lord, the One, the Holy,
At Thy feet we prostrate fall :
View us in our deep abasement,
Guide us, help us, bless us all !

FRANCIS A. H. WILLIAMS.

THE PRINCE OF PEACE

THE PRINCE OF PEACE

By PRINCE SADIQ OF MANGROL

IN an age when toleration is claimed as an exclusive and peculiar virtue by those who profess and call themselves Christians, and the clear Faith of Islam is held up to obloquy among the ignorant as the dark creed of vengeance, blood, and slaughter, a brief reference to the testimony of History may help to clear the air a little and restore a true perspective, in some degree at least.

In A.D. 624 the Prophet granted certain concessions to the clergy of St. Catherine—then living near Mount Sinai—which had not been given to them even by the Christian rulers. These concessions, of which the Islamic world will always be proud and which proclaim to the world at large the just and worthy rule of Muhammad (the Peace of Allah be upon him), were enjoyed not only by these particular clergy, but by the Christians generally. These rights, which mark an epoch in the history of the world, put non-Muslims on the same footing as Muslims. This was the proclamation the Prophet issued :—

Whosoever of Muslims denies or opposes these concessions should be deemed to have committed a heinous crime and is liable to be punished in the same way as one who has turned his face from the religion of God. O my followers, do not forget to protect the Christians, do not forget to maintain and protect their Churches and to safeguard those houses where their Priests dwell ; to hear always the brunt of the charges and never to put heavy charges on the people, or deprive the Bishops of their Bishoprics. Compel not ever any Christian to leave his own religion to embrace another, neither deprive any Monk of his order, nor hinder any Christian from his worship. Do not pull down Churches in order to build Mosques, neither alter them to the appearance of Mosques. If a Muslim marry a girl who is not a Muslim, she must be permitted to keep her own religion if she so desire ; and it is the duty of the husband to help rather than to hinder her in her prayers. Muslims should help the Christians with money if need be in order to build new Churches or to help them in the cause of their religion. Every Muslim

ISLAMIC REVIEW

must follow and keep this declaration by the order and will of Allah and His Prophet. If war break out between Muslims and non-Muslims, the Muslims must not look upon those Christians living with them with an eye of hatred ; and if under such conditions any Muslim treat the Christians disdainfully, then he has broken the commands of his Prophet.

Therefore when the army which was to set out for Constantinople was ready, Muhammad (Peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him) called before him the officer in command and gave him these orders :—

Do not oppress the innocent, nor the Hermits ; always protect the women, and never cast down your eyes on a little child. Do no harm to those who are sick and bedridden ; do not pull down the enemies' houses, neither destroy the means of their daily bread ; and lastly, do not destroy the date-trees.

That this kindness and generosity shown by the Prophet towards his foe did not fail to bear fruit is proved by the action of his right-hand man and follower, Hazrat Aboobakar Sideeq, who in like manner gave similar instructions to *his* captain of the army :—

O Yazeed, you must bear in mind not to oppress or be cruel to the people, but to ask their advice in any matter when occasion arises. Accomplish only the thing that has been founded on justice and righteousness, for to turn your face away from this is to turn it away from salvation. When you encounter the enemy do not flee before them, but fight like men. And if you are victorious, slaughter neither women, children, nor old men, neither destroy the date-trees. Burn no crop-fields and cut down no fruitful trees, neither kill animals unless you are in need of food.

When you have made a promise, see that you keep it and never turn back on your word. When you advance into the enemies' territories you will encounter men who have quitted the world to worship for the rest of their lives in monasteries ; these believe that the way in which they are going is the true and right one ; do not disturb or injure such men.

I SALUTE MOHAMAD

I SALUTE MOHAMAD

By PROFESSOR T. L. VASWANI

[Professor Vaswani is a distinguished son of India, and a loving son too. In the world of thought and of letters he occupies a position of his own. A voluminous writer, his writings breathe the noblest of sentiments. Uplift of his motherland, a Great India—that is the burden of his sweet notes. Technically speaking, he is a non-Muslim; yet, a lover of Truth, his heart is full of love of Islam and of the Great Prophet of Islam. His recent contribution on Islam to an Indian paper, *The Light*, which we have the privilege and pleasure to reprint below, and which opens with the above words with all the force of eloquence, amply shows that in his love of the Holy Prophet he yields not to the most devout of Muslims.—EDITOR.]

I SALUTE Mohamad as one of the world's mighty heroes. Mohamad has been a world-force, a mighty power for the uplift of many peoples. Read the old records, and you will glimpse the grace and beauty of his life. A king and a spiritual leader, he yet mends his clothes, visits the sick, loves little children in the streets, lives on simple food—sometimes taking only dates and water—milks his cattle, accepts invitations of slaves, mixes with the people as their comrade. "I sit at meals as a servant," he says, "for I am really a servant." "Show us the way that is established—the way of those on whom is peace"—this is his constant prayer. For the word Islam means peace. He hearkens to the call of the unseen: "O thou enwrapped in thy mantle! Arise and preach!" They persecute him; his very life is in danger; but he is loyal to the "Call"; he moves about preaching the Way of Peace. Again and again he has the "fits"; the pressure of the Unseen is upon him; and his trembling lips utter the eloquent wisdom recorded in the Qur-án. Yet one European critic—Sprenger—speaks of Mohamad's "fits" as "epilepsy"! Carlyle has better understanding of Mohamad when he speaks of him as the type of the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

heroic Prophet. Mohamad was a hero and a prophet ; and I have often meditated on the last words whispered by him before he passed away : “ Lord ! grant me pardon, and join me to the fellowship on high—yes, the Blessed Fellowship on high ! ” Who will not say that such a man was beautiful in life, beautiful in death ?

And consider for a moment what the faith he preached has achieved. Islam has given the world a religion without priests ; Islam abolished infanticide in Arabia ; Islam enjoined on the faithful total abstinence from drink ; Islam emphasizes the great qualities of faith, courage, endurance and self-sacrifice ; Islam introduced a vigorous puritanism into Asia and Europe, deprecating even dancing and card-playing. “ Whoso is a Muslim,” says the Qur-án, “ he seeketh after the right way.” Islam moved out with its great message of “ Allah the Rahman, the Merciful,” and became the torch-bearer of culture and civilization in Africa, in China, in Central Asia, in Europe, in Persia, in India. The Chinese Muslims are still known to be stately, strong and brave. Of the achievements of Islam in the days of the Baghdad Khilafat every Muslim may well be proud ; and every Sindhi ¹ too ; for Sindhis had their share in the intellectual life of the Baghdad Court. Of the achievements of Islam in Europe, less is known to the Muslims and Hindus in Sindh ; yet even a rapid sketch will show how much Islam did for Europe in the Middle Ages. Islam founded the great University of Cordova which attracted Christian scholars from different parts of Europe. One of these scholars became, in due course, the Pope of Rome.

At a time when Europe was in darkness, the Muslim scholars of Spain held high the torch of science and literature. They taught medicine, and natural history, philosophy and fine arts.

¹ Sindh, a big province of India, has been the home of great Muslim saints and mystic poets. It is the birth-land of the writer.—
EDITOR.

I SALUTE MOHAMAD

Arabian scholars translated some of the Hindu books; and helped by these translations Hindu wisdom travelled to some of the seats of learning in Europe. In the days of the Muslim king of Spain, Al Hakeem, great irrigation systems were developed in Granada, Valencia and Aragon; the Muslims also built hospitals, and asylums for the poor in several cities in Spain. Many were the industries developed under Islam. Shipbuilding, horticulture, candied fruits, glass, iron and copper utensils, brocade, tanyards, silver-mines, cotton manufactures, woollen carpets, hand-woven woollen cloth, linen manufactures, and linen paper, mines of lapis-lazuli, silks and inlaid metal work are some of the industries of Muslim Spain mentioned by Arabic writers.

And it is no exaggeration to say that Islam has made several contributions to the thought and life of India. Islam has been one of the nationalizing forces in India. Islam has enriched the art and architecture, the poetry and philosophy of India. The Taj is, perhaps, the most imaginative architecture in the world. Islam carried in its heart a vision of manhood and democracy to which, however, the Muslims were not always loyal in India and other countries; but it must be remembered that the first blow at slavery was struck when Omar set all slaves at liberty after his conquest of Jerusalem. And the ideal of Akbar, the ideal of an Indian nation, a Great India, a Maha Bharata, has not yet been assimilated by India's English rulers. The reform movements of the fifteenth and sixteenth century—the movements of Nanak, Kabir and Dadu—felt the influence of Islam; and Muslim saints like the Pir Tabriz of Multan and Lal Shabaz of Sewan have still a hold on Hindu hearts. Muslim poetry and literature, Muslim architecture and decorative painting, made Spain famous at a time when Europe was submerged in barbarism. The Muslim Universities of Seville, Cordova and Barcelona taught sciences and philo-

ISLAMIC REVIEW

sophy in that free liberal spirit for lack of which the Christian Church burnt Bruno and persecuted Galileo ; Muslim kings opened free libraries, established observatories and endowed laboratories for chemical experiments ; Muslim singers introduced a new note of chivalry and romance into the life and literature of Europe ; and Muslim philosophers translated, interpreted and corrected the systems and speculations of Greek thinkers.

Two of these philosophers who greatly influenced European thought are known as Avicenna and Averroes. "Avicenna" is a Latin corruption of Arabic Ibn Sinna. This man showed the greatness of his soul when he renounced the honoured post of the Vazir in order to devote his time to philosophy ; and his name is celebrated in several Turkish tales. He wrote on logic, on psychology, on physics and metaphysics and ethics. He speaks of three kinds of mind—vegetative, animal and human ; his view of the "vegetative mind" reminds one of modern studies in what Sir J. C. Bose has called the "response of plants." He speaks of "active" and "speculative" intelligence, reminding one of what, over eight centuries later, Kant called "practical" and "pure" reason. He speaks of "three kinds of evil" and its "accidental" place in the universe, reminding one of the *theodicy* of Leibniz. Another Muslim philosopher who influenced the thought of the Middle Ages was Averroes—a corruption of the Arabic name Ibn Rushid. He speaks of the "evolution" of matter in a way which reminds us of the idea developed in Spencer's *Synthetic Philosophy* ; he speaks of a *soul* diffused in the heavens and the earth—an idea which reminds us of what to-day is called *panpsychism* ; he interprets "soul" in terms of "energy" ; he recognizes the unity of philosophy and religion. His commentaries on Aristotle and Plato have been translated into some of the European languages, and at one time influenced Christian and

I SALUTE MOHAMAD

Jewish thought and some of the non-Muslim centres of European culture.

The Sufi singers and thinkers of Islam have enriched poetry and the philosophy of religion. One of the world's greatest mystical thinkers was the Muslim Muhyi-ud-din-ibn-al Arabi; and in the whole range of literature there are not many mystical books so profound, so suggestive as the four volumes of his *Futuhāt-al-Makkāya*. His teachings of the Single One, of Seven Realities, of the "luminous darkness" that enshrouds the essence of God, of *surah* and *ruh* (form and spirit), of knowledge as a process of reminiscence of the correlation of the Creator and creature (*al-Khāliq* and *Khalq*), of the seven degrees of annihilation (*fana*), of man as a channel of God's self-realization, of God as the Self of things—these and other teachings of the Muslim mystic have a profound value for modern students of religion. The Qur-ān was given to a simple people, but has, in some of its texts, the seed of true mysticism. "Wheresoever ye turn, there is the face of Allah." What wisdom in this one text of the Qur-ān! And some of the great Muslim poets—our own Shah Latif included—sound, again and again, the purest notes of mysticism. "Knowledge is nearer to silence than to speech." "I fancied that I loved him, but on consideration I saw that his Love preceded mine." "Thou must daily die a thousand deaths and come to life again that thou mayest win the life immortal." "When thou givest to God thy nothingness, He gives to thee his All." "See in your own heart the knowledge of the Prophet, without book, without tutor, without preceptor." "The true mosque in a pure and holy heart is builded; there let all men worship God; for there He dwells, not in a mosque of stone." "He peeped through the window of my heart—He peeped and passed away." These are but a few passages taken from the songs and sayings of Muslim mystics.

WHO BURNED SMYRNA?

By JAMES A. SPROULE

SOME weeks ago a traveller addressed one of our commercial bodies on the horrors of the Turkish occupation and destruction of Smyrna. He drew a graphic picture of the terrors of Moslem fanaticism, wrecking, burning, ravishing, destroying, butchering the young and the aged, and driving the fair daughters of the Greek city into worse than death. The Press but a short time before had told the same tale—twenty-five thousand young girls captured by the Turks. The Turk, like the Hebrew of the Middle Ages, had none to take his part. And now, after all these months, a different story is beginning to find its way into some of our publications.

The *Literary Digest* of October 7th quoted Mark O. Prentiss, special representative of the Near East Relief. Mr. Prentiss said: "All kinds of stories of Turkish atrocities reached the American Consulate and the American Naval Commander; each story was promptly investigated and none were confirmed." It is also admitted that the Turks in their entrance to the city were well disciplined and tendered assistance to the Greek and Armenian wounded. It is also charged that the retiring Greek Commander armed the civil Greek and Armenian population, who fired on the incoming Ottoman troops. To avoid retaliation it is said Kemal withdrew his men from the city. Smyrna, thus left unprotected, became a prey to bands of brigands who infest that country.

Now, the *Literary Digest* of March 31st again quotes Mr. Prentiss, who shows some evidence that it was the Armenians, rather than the Turks, who were responsible for the destruction of the city. The Turks had captured Smyrna. The city as it stood was one of the greatest prizes taken in Oriental warfare. They had unquestioned right and title

WHO BURNED SMYRNA ?

to its foods, its commodities of all kinds, its houses. It was a storehouse of supplies most urgently needed for their peoples and armies. Why destroy it ?

It is a matter of common knowledge that the Greeks and Armenians were determined not to allow the booty to fall into the hands of their hated enemies. A generally accepted report was to the effect that a band of organized Armenians had sworn to destroy the city if it fell into the hands of the Turks.

Paul Grescovitch, an engineer born and educated in Austria, and head of the Smyrna fire department, both under the Greeks and the Turks, declared that the most serious fires broke out half a dozen at a time around freight terminal warehouses in the neighbourhood of the Armenian hospital, at the Armenian club and at the railway station.

It is noteworthy (he comments) that these fires broke out in buildings which it was greatly to the advantage of the Turks to preserve and equally to the advantage of their enemies to destroy. An unusual gale, for the season, fanned the flames and gave the fire-fighters no chance to stop them. The Turkish soldiers drawn from the interior of Asia Minor were probably poor fire-fighters, but we remember how a few years ago skilled firemen failed before the conflagration that laid San Francisco waste.

The writer holds no brief for the Turks, but the lurid tales of Turkish atrocities were too highly coloured to be genuine. It is but a short time ago that the Turkish delegates at the Lausanne Conference produced papers which refuted many of the stories current in Great Britain in 1878 of Bulgarian atrocities which sent Gladstone on his pilgrimage of passion in 1879 and resulted in the overthrow of the Beaconsfield Government in 1880. Following the capture of Constantinople in 1453 the Turkish conqueror gave the Bulgarian and Greek Patriarchs every opportunity to exercise their faith ; under Turkish rule were numerous Christian sects—the Copts in Egypt, the most ancient of all Christian Churches; the Nestorians were widely distributed in all parts of the Empire; the Armenians and Greeks

ISLAMIC REVIEW

had every liberty in the exercise of their respective denominations. This at a time when the Bishop of Rome with ruthless hand was burning and butchering those who would not acknowledge the authority of the Church. The Waldensians and the Albigenses, the Lollards in England, and the Hussites of Bohemia, were deprived of life and liberty at a time when various Christian sects enjoyed not only liberty of conscience, but special privileges under Moslem sway. All this changed through craft and politics.

Peter the Great, who wrested territory from the Swedes to build his capital, St. Petersburg (now Petrograd) had a dream of a capital in the sunny South, where the seas would not freeze in winter. Constantinople was the goal of his ambition, an ambition which he bequeathed to his successors. Russian agents stirred up strife among the Christian sects; they rose in revolt. To protect (?) their co-religionists, Russian armies moved southward, only to be swerved by the Western Powers jealous of Russian aggression. In 1854-1878 the prize was nearly won and lost. Again in 1914-1917 the ambition was almost realized when Russia collapsed and reverted to Bolshevism.

The Turks are probably the most lied-about people in the world. Christians will prevaricate about each other, but all will unite in believing almost anything about a non-Christian. A little over half a century ago Oliver Cromwell and Muhammad were probably the most lied-about historical characters in Christendom. Then Thomas Carlyle tore away the dust and cobwebs and restored these two great heroic characters to the world. The hero as a prophet bares the soul of the strong wild man of the desert, who turns from the idols of his people and the insane contentions that racked the Christian world to Allah, the compassionate, a God of mercy, pity, the sustainer of all things. No false man here, said Carlyle. No fraud could succeed here. In a century

WHO BURNED SMYRNA ?

the Crescent was carried in triumph from India to the Atlantic ; it crossed into Spain, where it evolved a civilization, the greatest of the mediæval world. It had paved and lighted cities when Europe groped in filth and darkness. The Moslems were ever true to their obligations. No Christian was supposed to keep a bargain with an infidel. Lord Bacon was the first to advocate the keeping of treaties with Turks and other non-Christian people. During the World War the Turks defended the Dardanelles against the British, mostly Colonials. A strange friendship sprang up between the Australians and the Moslems. The Anzacs declared the Turk a clean, fair fighter, differing from some of his allies.

Something of that fierce joy that warriors feel
In foemen worthy of their steel.

And while the Colonials lost many of their comrades at Gallipoli, it was accepted as the fate of battle. Kemel and the best and ablest of the Turks were opposed to the German alliance, just as General R. E. Lee was opposed to secession, but when his State left the Union the chivalrous Virginian felt constrained to follow her. Kemel, like Disraeli, is of Spanish-Hebrew extraction. Strange that Spanish bigotry should give to Britain one of its most sapient statesmen, and to a Moslem land its ablest soldier.

When one picks up an American paper and reads the lurid accounts of Turkish cruelty, contrasted, of course, with our Christian civilization, one's mind harks back to the accounts we read long ago of the great Caliph Omar, to whom Jerusalem surrendered. The Moslem conqueror entered the city riding side by side with Sophronius, the Christian bishop. The Caliph refused to hold services, even in a Christian Church, lest his action should be cited as a precedent on future occasions. When the Christian Crusaders captured the city in 1198, they spared neither sex nor age. The city streets ran red with blood. But when the great Saracen leader, Saladin, recaptured

ISLAMIC REVIEW

the city, how different the scene. His clemency, in spite of the strong temptation to take vengeance, astounded Christendom. Who were the real followers of the merciful Christ—the bloodthirsty Crusaders or the forgiving Moslem leader Saladin?

Frazer Hunt, correspondent for a New York paper, describes what he saw in Asia Minor. He tells of the old city that the Greeks had built there over two thousand years ago. Philadelphia it was named. Philadelphia was one of the seven great cities mentioned in the New Testament. The name signifies “city of brotherly love.” William Penn copied for the city he founded in the new world. The great Greek had built the city, the little Greeks, in their retreat to the sea, had destroyed its eighteen hundred houses. They destroyed everything on their way to the coast. And yet when they burned Smyrna they tried to pass the blame on to their enemies! Major-General Sir Charles Townshend, the British Commander who was captured by the Turks during the World War, has become one of their most ardent admirers. He contributed an article, which appeared in Asia, on Great Britain and the Turks. He said that the Turks had to deal with turbulent and treacherous peoples, and his way of dealing with them had the merit of strength at least. If the atrocities were totalled on either side of an account, we should find that many of the so-called Christian nations were deeper in bloodshed and guilt than the champion of Islam.

ONE that pursueth the road of knowledge, God will direct him to the road of paradise; the angels spread their arms to receive him that seeketh after knowledge, and everything in heaven and earth will ask grace for him; verily the superiority of a learned man over a worshipper is like that of a full moon over all the stars.—MUHAMMAD.

IN THE TENTS OF THE MOORS

IN THE TENTS OF THE MOORS

UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

“AN Arab has no superiority over a non-Arab, nor has a non-Arab any superiority over an Arab. You are all the children of man, and man sprang from the dust. Every Muslim is a brother unto another Muslim: all Muslims are brethren.” This was the last message of the Great Prophet of Arabia to humanity—a message of human equality, of human fraternity. Thirteen centuries have rolled by since this Mighty Proclamation was made—from no better throne than the back of a desert camel—and down through these long centuries this noble sentiment has reverberated over the length and breadth of the world of Islam. Generation after generation, it has moved countless millions of the children of Islam. It has thrilled the heart of the prince in his palace, of the peasant in his hamlet. Barriers of rank and of race, of birth and of breeding, it has pulled down one and all, welding man to man into the one true bond—the bond of common humanity. And to-day that same sublime sentiment surmounts the last obstacle. At its touch the impossible becomes actual. The East and the West experience the same throb and embrace each other in the arms of fraternity.

Our English Muslim brother, Mr. Salih Marin, who has just returned from a delightful trip to the wilds and vales of Morocco, sends us an interesting account of what he saw and what he felt. He met the Moors in their towns and in their villages, in their homes, in their mosques and in their huts. He met the high amongst them and the low amongst them. But wherever he went he was received with open arms. Amongst them, he tells us, he spent the most delightful hours of his life.

Mr. Marin had meant the account for our private enjoyment. We have, however, prevailed upon him

ISLAMIC REVIEW

to allow us to share it with our readers, and so with his kind permission we are able to reproduce it below :—

DEAR FRIENDS,

In spite of the best of intentions, I have postponed fulfilling my promise of writing to you until now that I have returned from Morocco. One of the reasons was that I wished to give you as correct an impression as I could of what I experienced there.

On my arrival at Tangier I went to see the qādi with an interpreter, and told him that I had joined Islam and had come to Morocco to learn. The qādi received me very kindly, and advised me to adopt the Moroccan dress, which I did with pleasure. I found that the costume was of great significance, and I must say that I soon felt more at home in my "jellaba" than I did in a European suit.

In Tangier I also found a group of English missionaries who were performing on the market-place amidst other public entertainers and distributing illustrated Gospels to the children. This and the debate which followed brought me in touch with the British Mission, an organization which was formed there a good many years ago, and which is doing good hospital work. It is composed of well-meaning people who very sincerely hold that we are all doomed because we do not believe that God sent His own Son as a scapegoat for our sins. As far as I could make out, their Moroccan adepts are limited to a few Jews.

From Tangier I went to Rabat, and then travelled in the interior. From the 1st of Rajab to the 15th Sha'bān I lived in a village near Fer, where I could be in close contact with the people. In the city of Fez I met with several doctors of theology and ulemas, and also with the trading people and the officials. Among the well-to-do classes I found some very good friends with whom I could talk science as well as religion and philosophy, but as a rule I found the rich people too "polite" to enable me to feel as much at home as I did with the villagers, for instance, who were more genuine, more sincere, more "themselves," and among whom I spent some of the most delightful hours of my life. Nowhere have I ever found such hospitable, kind, affectionate people. In spite of my difficulty to understand the language and of making myself understood, I often experienced that a few hours—or a night—spent in a tent were sufficient to give me the impression that I had known the inhabitants for years: they had become like brothers whom I was very much grieved to have to leave—a thing I never experienced in Europe.

I met with a good deal of superstition, as might well be expected in an out-of-the-way place like the wild mountains of Morocco, and in Fez notably. Mulai Idriss is almost as much "exploited" by the ignorant as Jesus or Mary are in Europe; mascots, taboos and other pre-Islamic survivals keep as strong a hold as they do

IN THE TENTS OF THE MOORS

in these countries, including Spain. But under the influence of the more educated class, who read Tunisian and Egyptian literature and papers, these are beginning to give way and disappear. Most people I met were quite aware that so-called "European science" is not the "work of the devil," but very largely the work of their own forefathers which was planted and thrived on European soils while they themselves were resting. I am pleased to say that I never came across the idea of an antagonism between science and religion, as is so often found among the Christians, though I did come across a few rather narrow conservatives, who drew a distinction between "science," which deals with things of this world and which they believed to be essentially European, and "I'lm," which should only concern itself with the world to come. On the other hand, I also met a few individuals who, dazzled by modern European technique, were prepared to take everything that Europe could offer them, whether good, bad or indifferent.

I found the mosque to be a very different place from a church. The church gives the feeling of death : it is crushing, cold, gloomy. The mosque, on the contrary, suggests life abundant and happy : it is cosy, homelike ; the larger ones suggested to me a glade flooded with sunshine, with its gushing fountain of crystalline water and its surrounding grove of colonnades : the Qaruyin in Fez especially. Above all, I appreciated the sentiment of absolute equality and brotherhood which prevails in the mosque, a brotherhood that knows no distinction of colour, race, language, nationality, wealth or social class. Although one does occasionally come across a wealthy man who takes a soft praying cloth with him, keeps his socks on and keeps well aloof from his fellow-creatures, such instances are extremely rare. In Tangier the idea of brotherhood is further emphasized by shaking hands with one's neighbours after the prayer—which I thought a very fine custom.

As I was handing over one of Lord Headley's articles to a Moroccan friend one day, he pointed out to me that whereas the "brotherhood of man" was the very essence of Islamic teaching, the "fatherhood of God" was a Christian idea, and he was therefore surprised to find those terms used by the author. I suppose there is, for us who have been educated in Christendom, this danger of making of the Divinity what psychologists would call a "Father projection."

The few French people I come across were in Morocco as officials or as speculators, and they did not interest me much, with perhaps one exception. Their early methods of colonization were simply disgusting. At present their policy is to flatter all those who have power in order to lead them more easily. In all things they show a very deep insight of the human mind, and use it to their own ends. The building of the mosque in Paris is considered by every Moor as a political move. They believe that, should France lose its hold in Africa, "this mosque would soon be turned into a museum or a hospital."

Your thankful brother,
SALIH MARIN.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

PROFESSOR KAY ON THE SEMITIC RELIGIONS

The Semitic Religions,¹ by D. M. Kay, D.S.O., D.D., displays quite a wealth of research into the birth, growth and development of the Semitic system of religious thought. As such, it must be of immense value to any student of religion, but what marks it from so many other works of the kind, old as well as modern, is its freedom from what may be termed little-mindedness. It is a just and generous appreciation of the good in each one of the great Semitic religions. It has none of the gibe or the vituperation of the pedant or the bigot. With an eye for the good and noble, it has succeeded in striking upon that, even in what would appear otherwise to a superficial or a predisposed observer.

No religion has been more misunderstood, and even still more misrepresented and calumniated, than Islam. The average Western writer on Islam has, as a rule, few words of praise to lavish on what to him is a "false religion," "an imposture." Nor have fantastic stories, to paint the religion and its founder as black as black can be, been wanting. These have been unscrupulously disseminated by ignorance and by fanaticism and readily believed by credulity.² In the midst of such unchristian writers, however, there have sprung up, here and there, souls too big and broad to be obsessed by the unreal and the artificial. These had the independence of character to soar above these clouds and the clearness of vision to penetrate to the real beneath the apparent. "The lies," exclaimed Carlyle, "which well-meaning zeal has heaped round this man [Muhammad] are disgraceful to ourselves only. . . . A false man found

¹ Crown 8vo, 206 pp. ; publishers, Messrs. T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh ; price 7s. 6d.

² Even those who could not but admit some good points in Islam, such as Muir and Irving, did so too grudgingly.

PROFESSOR KAY ON SEMITIC RELIGIONS

a religion ? Why, a false man cannot build a brick house." "If this be Islam," observed Goethe in the same strain, "do we not all live in Islam ?" And now, in our own day, Professor Kay's exposition of Islam breathes the same spirit of charitable appreciation.

Long before the Call, the Professor tells us, the Prophet was known by the nickname of "al-Amin," or trustworthy. He was instrumental in the formation, in that wild state of society where might was considered right, of a league of honest men to protect the victims of lawless aggressors, and attention is aptly called to the pride with which, in later years, the Prophet looked back upon this noble deed. "In later life Mohammed used to say: 'I would not exchange for the choicest camel in all Arabia the remembrance of being present at the oath which we took to stand by the oppressed.'"

The Professor deals, on the strength of facts and figures, a fatal blow to the prevalent sword accusation against Islam:

Alexander the Great (he argues) had conquered his world, but his empire fell into fragments when he died. When Moslem military power became weaker, their religion went on making fresh converts. Seldom do Moslems change their faith for another, never on a national scale. Islam displaced the religion of the Magi in Persia and extended its influence in Central Asia. The ten million converts in China have been made without support from military power. It would have been easy to exert political pressure in India; yet the seventy million India Moslems were won by the appeal to heart and mind. In Java, in Africa, Islam has spread with no assistance from military power. Careful computation places the number of Moslems at 201 millions in all; and no one can believe that war can make or retain a fellowship such as this. . . . The Moslem victors were deeply religious men; they were missionaries unconsciously by the intensity of their belief. The Moslem trader speaks of his religion as occasion offers, and without systematic organization he succeeds in diffusing his religion. A Moslem who was condemned to death in the Belgian Congo is reported to have spent his last hours in trying to convert the Christian missionary who was sent to minister to his spirit. . . . Islam from its birth had to fight for self-preservation; it accepts war as it accepts pestilence or famine, as something which cannot be avoided.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Polygamy, too, is, after all, not without some good :

The theory of polygamy (the author observes), which diverges so strongly from Christian feeling, provides all women with family protection ; and the moral degradation of great European cities has no equivalent among Moslem women.

Nor is the Qur-án to him what it generally is to an average Western student. He understands its value and appraises it at its true worth :

Read in English (he says), the Koran has been pronounced uninteresting ; read in Arabic, the diligent foreigner begins to understand why the native Arabian finds in it a superhuman excellence and beauty. To please the indolent imagination was never the purpose of this Book. The *Manual of Infantry Training* is also uninteresting to read. But the *Manual* makes blind multitudes into orderly armies, obedient to the clear purpose of a single spirit. Such, too, is the merit of the Koran.

The book pays a high tribute to the Islamic spirit of charity and generosity. Speaking of the fall of Mecca, it says :

The inhabitants were surprised that Mohammed forgave his persecutors without exacting vengeance. . . . Kindness to animals—horses, donkeys, dogs, pigeons—is required by religion and has become innate among Moslems. . . . The Moslem . . . respects the sanctity of the church and synagogue. . . . There is a true democratic element in Islam ; the negro and the Pasha are equal, and feel themselves equal, in the mosque. . . . On his death-bed, Mohammed inquired whether the half-dozen dinars in the house had been given away and ordered their instant distribution. “ Could he enter the presence of the Divine Judge having left so much power for relieving need unused ? ”

This instinct of Islamic charity is further illustrated by recalling Khalif Omar's generous treatment of the Christians at the fall of Jerusalem.

When Jerusalem peacefully capitulated to the Moslems (A.D. 636), the Khalif Omar rode from Medina to make terms with Sophronius, the Christian Patriarch. The Patriarch and the Khalif happened to be in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre when the Moslem hour of prayer arrived. Omar went outside and performed his devotions in the open air, explaining to the Patriarch that he had done so lest his followers in time to come might claim to pray within the church. Omar pledged the

PROFESSOR KAY ON SEMITIC RELIGIONS

Moslems to respect the sanctity of the church, a pledge which has been loyally kept for 1,200 years.

The book also refutes the baseless notion that the fixity of Islamic law does not admit of the exercise of individual judgment, and so it tends to stagnate intellectual growth. In this connection are mentioned the intellectual luminaries of Islam, such as Abn Sina and Al Ma'arri:

Aristotle was better known in Islam than in Christendom. . . . They had the same freedom which Mohammed conceded to the gardeners who were busy artificially fertilizing the palm trees to secure a crop of dates. "You know better than I do what concerns your worldly interests."

That the Qur-án does not put any restraint on the free play of one's mental powers is further corroborated by referring to some modern leading men of thought in the world of Islam. Maulvi Muhammad Ali, the renowned translator of the Holy Qur-án in English, is quoted—to bring out the same point—to say :

The present tendency of the Muslim theologians to regard the commentaries of the Middle Ages as the final word on the interpretation of the Holy Qur-án is very injurious, and practically shuts out the great treasures of knowledge which an exposition of the Holy Book in the new light reveals.

The work is intended to promote a better understanding between the great Semitic religions. In this understanding, and through the exercise of truly religious influence, the author hopes, lies the future welfare of humanity. The millions of the followers of these religions, welded in a bond of mutual understanding, would form a League of Nations with tremendous power to put a stop to warfare and bring about an era of peace and prosperity. "It is not in schools of science and philosophy nor in the assembly of delegates, but in the Temples of God, that the holy fire of philanthropy can be kept alive."

M. Y. K.

SOME STUMBLING-BLOCKS

PROFESSOR A. S. WADIA ON ISLAM

PROFESSOR A. S. WADIA's recent work, *The Message of Mohammed*,¹ is an attempt in a spirit of sympathy and friendliness to present a fair picture of the life of the Prophet Muhammad and of his message to humanity. If sympathy and friendliness were all, the sketch would have been different from what it is. Sympathetic study does indeed enable us to understand others and their deeds and see them in their true colours. But to understand cold intellectual truths, we must needs have something more than mere sympathy. We want critical research. So far as the chapter giving a brief narrative of the Prophet's life goes, *The Message* may be regarded as an improvement on most of similar works by non-Muslims, in so far as it is free from bitterness. But when it comes to deal with what may be called the theoretical or doctrinal aspect of Islam, it betrays the same lack of insight; and we could not do better than put it in the author's own words. "For the contents of the following pages," he tells us in his prefatory lines, "I lay no claim 'to novelty of fact nor to profundity of research.'" Profundity of research was, in fact, the one thing indispensable to understand the main current of thought underlying the Islamic teachings, but this one thing, as we are told, the work lacks.

Taking, for instance, the author's conception of "the Allah of Mohammed," we find that it is the outcome of inadequate research. He takes hold of an isolated verse, puts on it a hasty interpretation, and jumps to a faulty conclusion. "Allah misleadeth whom He will, and whom He will He guideth"—on this he builds castles of his own. The God of

¹ Publishers: J. M. Dent & Sons, London and Toronto; 155 pp. fcap. 8vo.

SOME STUMBLING-BLOCKS

Islam, he takes it, is an arbitrary God Who thrusts His will on others just as His sweet will may dictate. This, surely, is not the Islamic conception of God. In the matter of right and wrong, He has given man an absolutely free choice. Does not the Qur-án say: "We have shown him (man) the right way; it is for him to be grateful or ungrateful"? Does not the same Book say: "He does not cause to err by it any except the *transgressors* (ii. 26), the *unjust* (xiv. 27), the *extravagant* (xl. 34), the *unbelievers*" (xl. 74)? Why, then, base the conclusion on the foregoing solitary verse and not on so many of these?

This has been a great stumbling-block in the way of many a student of Islam. It is all a question of the right interpretation of the various Qur-ánic verses. The Qur-án itself gives us the true rule of interpretation. Says the Book (iii. 6): "He it is who has revealed the Book to you. Some of its verses are decisive: these are the *fundamentals* of the Book; and there are others that are *allegorical* (lit. resembling one another, and hence susceptible of different interpretations)." Now, this affords us the master-key, so to speak, with which to solve all the difficulties that might come our way in the interpretation of the Book: interpret the *allegorical* in the light of the fundamentals. Apply the same to this difficulty. It is of the very fundamentals of Islam, as is clear from the above-quoted verses, that Allah does not misguide any except those who misguide themselves. Nor does He force His guidance upon any, as it is stated in the very beginning of the Book: "this is a Book in which there is no doubt—a guidance for *muttaqin*, i.e. those who would be guided aright." This being so, the meaning of the first verse, "He misleadeth whom He will and whom He will He guideth," becomes quite clear. Guidance and misguidance are the handiwork of our own hands, but at the same time they are in accordance with certain

ISLAMIC REVIEW

fixed laws of God. To elucidate the point by a homely illustration, it is a law of God that whosoever should put his hand in fire, it will burn. It is left to me whether I do or do not put my hand in fire. And if I do, the burning is the result of my own action, and yet, in a way, it may be attributed to God—in so far as it ensues from His immutable law that fire shall burn. A criminal brings his doom on himself through his own choice. Nevertheless we say the law punishes all criminals. "Whom He will" is equivalent to "whom His law (guides or misguides)," for His will means His law, not His whim. He has no such thing as whims. He says in the Qur-án: "You shall not find any change in the Laws of the Lord." His laws are fixed, immutable, as we daily find them to be in the whole of the universe. Thus the significance is just this: whoever does right, it is His will or law that he may be guided aright; whoever does wrong, it is His will or law that he may be guided wrong. It is in this sense that He guides or misguides. The immediate and the efficient cause of our guidance or misguidance is our own deed. He is the remote cause as the Creator of a law that binds a particular deed to a particular consequence. That wheat shall grow out of wheat and barley out of barley—this is His immutable law. And if we want this crop or that, we must sow accordingly. The crop shall be what the seed is. In other words, the seeds give us the crop; yet we say God gives crops in so far as all depends upon the numerous laws of His but for which we could not tell what may spring from what we sow.

Equally erroneous is another common notion, that because God's knowledge comprehends everything, whatever is to happen must happen, and hence man's inability to avert the inevitable. This is sophistry pure and simple. The writer of *The Message*, with all his sympathy and friendliness, could not guard against this mistake as well. "No

SOME STUMBLING-BLOCKS

leaf falleth but He knoweth it; neither is there a grain in the darkness of the earth, nor a thing green or sere, but it is marked down on a preserved tablet"—from this he drifts to the conclusion that God has made man a mere tool in His hand. It is quite true that man depends for all that he has on the sole beneficence of the Lord, but it is equally true that in the choice between right and wrong He has been pleased to grant him perfect freedom. His knowledge does not imply any pressure on His part. It is an obvious fact that knowledge is always the *result*, not the *cause*, of an event. An assassin is hanged, and when he has been hanged we get the knowledge of the event. Now this knowledge of ours could in no way be said to have been instrumental in his doom. It was the outcome, and not the cause, of it. The same is the case with God's knowledge. The only difference is that our knowledge is confined to past events only; His knowledge is above tense limits. Past, present, future are just the same to Him. He knows forthcoming events as well as past. But the fact remains that knowledge is the *product*, not the *cause*, of the event.

Thus man is a responsible creature, not a puppet. And it is in this sense that the learned author of *The Spirit of Islam* says that Islam does not imply this puppet-like dependence of man on God, for the simple reason that out of His infinite grace He has been pleased to allow him some latitude. It is not a surprise that the Professor has been at a loss to make out what the Right Hon. Syed Ameer Ali means. Mistaking Islam for a religion of fatalism, he seems to think that a Muslim must look upon everything that befalls him as from God, and that he must look forward to everything from God without exerting himself for it. This is absolutely un-Islamic. "Whatever evil befalls man," says the Qur-án, "is the handiwork of his own hands." And again, "Man shall have naught ex-

ISLAMIC REVIEW

cept what he strives after." Under these erroneous notions, the writer is naturally perplexed when he reads in *The Spirit of Islam* that man's part in relation to God is not an absolutely passive one, but, "on the contrary, striving after righteousness."

Yet again, the author calls attention to what appears to him a flaw in the Qur-ánic conception of the Deity. Yet this time again the flaw lies, not in the Qur-ánic passage, but in the vision of the interpreter. It is lack of knowledge of the Arabic language that proves a stumbling-block this time. The Arabic word *makr* in chap. viii. 30 is wrongly rendered as "plot." The English word "plot" is used in a bad sense, but the Professor does not know that not so the Qur-ánic word *makr*. *Makr* means plan, and a plan might be good or bad. By itself the word is of indifferent significance. When a plan is of an evil nature, and it is wanted to be pointed out, the word "evil" is used before it, as in chap. xxxv. 43 of the Qur-án: "And the evil *makr* (plan) shall not recoil upon any save its authors." So the verse when rightly rendered reads thus:—

And when those who disbelieved devised plans against *you* that they might confine *you* or slay *you* or drive *you* away; and they devised plans and Allah too had arranged a plan and Allah is the best of planners (Holy Qur-án, viii. 30).

We can understand the author's difficulty quite well. The word *makr* has also been adopted in Urdu and Persian, but not in the original significance. In these the word is used in a positively bad sense, i.e. mischievous plotting; hence the author's perplexity. Had he not contented himself with mere sympathy and friendliness, but had taken pains to consult any Arabic lexicon to find out the meaning of the word for himself, the difficulty would not have arisen at all. And why could he not see that the Book that speaks of the Lord as "possessing the best of attributes" could not at the same time call Him a "plotter"? This is lack of research.

SOME STUMBLING-BLOCKS

Nothing could further from reality than the author's observation that "the whole Islamic conception of salvation . . . bears a strong general resemblance to the Christian." In the very next few lines he contradicts himself when he says: "The Christian conception is based more or less on the doctrine of Original Sin." From the Christian point of view, man is incapable of avoiding sin. Salvation is the mere grace of God to people of a particular persuasion. In Islam there is no such thing as sin-innate. Man has to work out his own salvation.

Iblis is spoken of as one of the angels. This is another common mistake. The one is created, according to the Qur-án, of fire, and the other, of dust. The book also shares the common notion of Western writers that Bible stories have been incorporated in the Qur-án, and the argument advanced is that there are discrepancies between the accounts of the two. It is quite true the discrepancies are there, but how it goes to prove that the Prophet got these from Biblical sources passes our understanding. If it proves anything, it proves the fact that the Qur-án is the revealed Word of God, and as such it has purged Bible narratives of their erroneous elements and preserved the original events as they were. The Professor admits that he lays "no claim to profundity of research," and yet he thinks himself entitled to speak of the Qur-án as at times launching out into "open contradictions," and slithering into "inexcusable incoherences." Why did it not strike him that perhaps his own confusion of thought might be responsible for this apparent confusion in the Qur-án? And he complains that "in the long list of prophets the Koran gives, the name of Hagar, strangely enough, is not even once mentioned." Perhaps the word "Hagar" is a misprint, for surely the Professor must know that Hagar was the name of Patriarch Abraham's wife, and there never was a prophet of that name. BABAR.

REVIEWS

Zinda-i-Jawed, or The Ever-Alive—a poetic composition of about 250 couplets in Hindustani. By SAYYEDAH ANĪS FĀTIMA. With a foreword and footnotes by the authoress.

A woman's heart is the shrine of the tender and the delicate, but when it is attuned to things high and heroic, it is indeed a sight for the gods themselves. The pages of Islamic history are aglow with a wealth of such sights, and to-day, when a wave of rejuvenation seems to have swept over the length and breadth of the world of Islam, history in this particular phase is also repeating itself. Turkey has her Halida Hanums; India has her "Umm-ul-Ahrars." Sayyedah Anīs Fātima is obviously the product of this new consciousness.

Zinda-i-Jawed is one impassioned plea to inculcate the great lesson: Better die an honourable death than live a life of dishonour. In sweet pathetic notes is depicted the daring stand of Husain, the Prophet's dear grandson and martyr of Kerbala, against the forces of high-handedness. Islam stands, first and foremost of all else, for the principle of human equality and human liberty, and when that golden principle was in jeopardy, the worthy grandson of a worthy grandfather could not keep still. "Government of the people, by the people, for the people"—this democratic principle of Islam was being thwarted by sordid ambition. Could the son of Ali, the "Lion of Islam," view it with indifference? No! It was a matter of life and death. Honourable death rather than a life of dishonour, so said Husain to himself:—

Kas li kamar Husain ne ye dil men thān kar
Jāye to jāye sar mirā baḥne na paye shar.

Bāqī hai dam men dam mirey jab tak majāl kyā,
Bigre zara bhī dīn rasool-i anām kā.

REVIEWS

Rāhe khudā men kat ke sari i'jz ye mirā
Haq ke fidāiyon ka bane ek rahnuma.

(His loins Husain girdled, resolved in mind :
My head—let it go off, but the evil must not spread.

As long as there lasts my breath in me, how dare
The Prophet's religion be corrupted even by a tittle.

Let this head of mine be cut off in His way
And be for evermore an example unto the lovers of Truth.)

The same sublime sentiment forms the burden of
her melodious tunes. Life or no life ! Principle first
and life afterwards ! Liberty, justice, public good—
these must be defended even though at the cost of
the blood of the Prophet's grandson. In the same
lofty strain we are told :—

Dildāda hurriyat ka fidāi wo 'adl kā
Bihbood-i 'āmmah ka wo hāmi bahot barā.

Thī jān uskī nazr juma'at ke wāste
Rehta thā sar ba kaf wo shahādat ke wāste.

(Devoted to liberty, lover of justice,
Of public weal a very great friend,

His life was for the good of others,
For martyrdom, his head he carried in his hand.)

Having drawn this stirring picture in glowing
words, the Sayyedah comes to present-day state of
Islam. Anwar Ghazi, Tal'at, Jamal and Kamal,
she tells us, are the sparks of that fire kindled on
the field of Karbala. And then comes the challenge
to the Muslim's sense of honour in these forceful
accents :—

Dekho ujaṛ rahā hai chaman āj quām kā
Be āb āj hai gohor-i-taj quām kā.

Hushyār faisale kī ghari sar pa ā gayi,
Kuch ṭo karo bachā ṭo lo 'izzat rahī sahī.

(Behold ! the garden of nation is desolate to-day,
The jewel of the crown of nation is without resplendence to-day.

Beware ! The hour of decision has arrived.
Be up and doing to save whatever honour is left.)

In the self-sacrificial example of Husain, the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

poetess tells us, lies the secret of the national existence of Islam. Honour above Life!—this must be the watchword. Lofty in thought, deep in sentiment, sweet in tunes, and strong in appeal, this precious booklet should find the widest publicity in Urdu-speaking circles.

The proceeds are to go to the relief of suffering in Anatolia. Price Annas 5/6; can be had from the authoress, c/o M. Ali Bakhsh, Musallahpur, Putna, (India).

* * * * *

Religion in Russia, by Dr. Walter Walsh (The Free Religions Movement), is a vindication of the Bolshevik regime against the accusation of religious persecution. The writer considers the denunciations of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Mercier, Dr. Scott-Lidgett, and other representative leaders of popular religious thought, to be both unjust and ill-advised. He thinks there is greater liberty of religion in Russia than in England. The recent execution of one bishop and the imprisonment of others was due to purely political crimes against the State, just as any churchman in England would have been visited with capital punishment, were he found, during the Great War, guilty of complicity with any of the belligerent Powers.

* * * * *

The Spring Number of *The Shrine of Wisdom*, the Journal of the Hermetic Truth Society (The Hermetic Truth Society), contains much that will be attractive to those who are capable of appreciating and interesting themselves in Synthetic Philosophy or the unification of the wisdom of the ages. The articles on "Sacred Mothers of Demigods and Heroes" and "Symbols" are suggestive, especially the former, though to meet with "Cronus (or Saturn)" (p. 84) gives a nasty shock to those who still cling feebly to the classical traditions.