

The *Islamic Review*

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

Vol. XI.]

[No.

RABI-UL-AWWAL—RABI-UTH-THANI, 1342 A.

Annual Subscription, 10s. **NOVEMBER 1923.**

Single Copies

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Notes	381
True Khilafat. By Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall	389
Woman. By Khwaja Nazir Ahmad	391
The Character of Muhammad. By Masud Ali Varesi	395
Is English Christianity Dying?	399
The Humanity and Divinity of Jesus. By Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din	403
Allah O Akbar. By Al Haj El Farooq (Lord Headley)	417
Review.. .. .	418
What is Islam?	419

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

RABI-UL-AWWAL—RABI-UTH-THANI, 1342 A.H.
VOL. XI. NOVEMBER 1923. No. 11.

NOTES

The Church Congress.

The discussions carried on in the Church Congress held at Plymouth during the last week of September are interesting, in that they prove conclusively that the Church with its dogmas has now become a dead-letter, and has lost its hold upon thinking men and women. That it has failed to receive the slightest response is now an established fact. Most of the people, it was admitted, attended church from force of habit. But since the war the outlook has changed. The clergy have themselves realized it, and in the Congress there was not a single subject in which the question, "What is the Church doing?" in this or that matter to modernize her principles, was not raised.

The Rev. George Sampson, vicar of Ramsdell, dealing with "worship and the country Churches," said that those who had worked long among the country folk could recall evidence of worshippers being inarticulate, keenly sensitive to ridicule, and very shy of talking about holy things. Such a lack of results was a trial even to the faith and courage of the country priest. He further told the Congress that where ten people came to church before the war, five, perhaps, came now.

Needs of the Slums.

Mr. R. Kennedy-Cox said that the slum-dweller's view of Christian ideals was a strange one. It was difficult for him to picture Christ dwelling in his slums; and he certainly does not picture Christ as dwelling in one of the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

houses of God adjoining his slums, which from his point of view were semi-official and necessary for functions such as marriages, funerals, etc. All these functions, to him, symbolize officialism, and he has begun to regard the Church in much the same way as the Labour Exchange. He has ceased to look for any kind of message from the Church.

This is true of all honest thinking men and women. Mr. Kennedy-Cox terms them "uneducated." Surely they are better off without the education and advancement of the Church which is always engaged on work as arduous perhaps, but assuredly as futile as the treadmill. The Church of to-day looks at modern requirements through the glasses of the Middle Ages. It cannot do otherwise.

Mr. Kennedy-Cox asks the reason why these men of the slums regard the Church with such indifference. Why is it that with the power of the Holy Ghost behind it, the Church has failed so miserably? Who is to blame? The Holy Ghost. With its intolerance, so long as it could bring the thumbscrew, the rack and the fiery stake to save the damned soul, the Church flourished. So long as ignorance prevailed and men were blind spiritually, the Holy Ghost was dominant on earth and made a splendid prince of persecutors in the Middle Ages. The blood of hundreds of thousands did not matter. No tortures were too great or horrible, so long as the Church held sway. Now common sense has prevailed, and thinking men and women are leaving the Church—and the Christian clergy are wondering why.

The Church and the League of Nations.

Lord Hugh Cecil, M.P., in the opening session of the Congress, devoted his speech to a consideration of whether the League had justified the hopes held out for it at its Inception! Candidly speaking, we can but say "Yes" and "No." Yes! for it has well served the cause of its creators, the dominant Christian Powers of the West. It has upheld the creation of the National Home for the Jews against the wishes of ninety-five per cent. of the population of Palestine. The Jews are too powerful in Europe. Christianity has failed to drive them out or exterminate them. The Zionist movement was a stroke of luck. The Jews, however, saw through the "bluff," and, in consequence, only worthless starving Polish and Russian Jews have reached Palestine.

"No"—because the League is more of *notions* than that of *nations*. Its death-blow has already been dealt by Signor

NOTES

Mussolini, during the recent Græco-Italian conflict. The League has indeed succeeded in creating dissatisfaction, and new wars, where content and peace prevailed. Prebendary Gough is right in declaring that the League can never accomplish anything like what has been claimed for it. After the Great War a nation—nay, the whole wide world—looked for a machine to protect it from further wars. The League would enable the greatness of England, or the soul of any other great Western Power, to repose in a kind of protection at the expense of a weaker nation. Indeed, Western civilization exists solely by its “bluff.”

Fifty-Fifty Marriages.

Should not the Christian Church give a lead to the State and to the individual on the difficult and urgent question of marriage and divorce? This is a question ever on the lips of the laity and the clergy. The Rev. Professor Clement F. Rogers, Lecturer in Pastoral Theology at King's College, London, speaking recently on the subject, referred to the “alarming increase of divorce,” and made a natural, but, to our Western modern Christians, a startling, assertion. He said: “There is no half-way house between the Christian view of marriage—that is, indissoluble relationship—and free love.” To allow divorce for adultery was, he said, to put a premium on vice. Re-marriage of either of the parties, innocent or guilty, meant adultery. Dr. Carnegie Simpson, of Cambridge, who followed in the discussion, argued that marriage could not be broken without sin; therefore he was “against everything that facilitated divorce.” But in the case of a union broken both in its spiritual and physical aspect, the Church ought to advise the State as to what was to be done. He appealed to the Church to find a Christian principle—as if there could be any other solution than that expounded by Professor Rogers—and not a sliding scale.

An American, Dr. W. C. Pool, was the next speaker. He said that in California one marriage in every five was legally dissolved within two years, and two in every five within every five years. “But,” he quickly added, “please do not deduce from this that the morality of the average American is worse than that of other people.” Why are there so many divorces in America? He explained, to the surprise and disgust of the Conference, because in no country in the world has woman held the place she occupies in America. There the dominant male comes up against

ISLAMIC REVIEW

a stiff proposition. The American woman does not feel that she has to take orders from a man simply because he is man. She lives on a fifty-fifty per cent. basis, and if her husband wants to change it to a fifty-five-forty-five per cent., he will die in a spasm of unrelieved disappointment.

Then a stalwart young minister, the Rev. S. W. Hughes, rose up and indignantly protested against the position taken up by Professor Rogers and other speakers. Was a woman, he demanded, married to a man who proved to be a bestial half-devil, who violated every sanctity of matrimony, to obtain no release? or, if allowed a divorce, was she to be for ever debarred from the rightful development of her legitimate aspirations and never to know the joy of true marriage? Such an idea, he thundered, was a reflection upon God Himself.

Indeed it is a reflection upon God Himself and His wisdom, if Professor Rogers's view (needless to say he stood his ground) is a correct one. We must confess that his is the Christian standpoint. The somewhat strongly worded exhortation with which the Church of England marriage service begins, and the words "obey" and "serve" in the vow made by the woman, are significant. The wedding-ring, which is nothing more nor less than a relic of the days when Christianity held woman to be a man's chattel, also throws light on the subject. The "chattel" awaits, at the altar, the pleasure of her lord-to-be, in custody of her master, father, or guardian, who is there to *give her away* as though she had no will of her own. The phrase, "with all my worldly goods I thee endow," is not merely an overstatement of facts; be it remembered that before the Married Women's Property Act of 1882 the man, in fact, took the woman's property as well.

The Feminists inscribe on their banner, "Equality of Sexes in all respects." But can they do so, and remain true Christians? Jesus came to fulfil the Law, so he accepted "thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee," as the maxim of married life for woman. But present-day Christianity is, as a matter of fact, much more indebted to St. Paul than to the Master himself. St. Paul says:—

Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but *they are commanded* to be under obedience, as also saith the law.

And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church. (1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35.)

In face of these *commands* can the Christian Feminists

NOTES

honestly claim the admission of woman to the ministry?
And again :—

In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety ; not with braided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array ; but (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works. Let the women learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." (1 Tim. ii. 9, 14.)

Woman under Christianity is really a pitiable being in spite of all her education and culture. If she really wishes to free herself from the shackles placed around her by Christianity ; if she desires to take her proper share in the salvation of the world ; if she wishes to be man's equal, then she must turn to Islam, to Muhammad, who has done more for the uplifting of her sex than all the rest of the philosophers and reformers in history put together. His sayings need no comment.

Paradise lies at the feet of thy mother.

Women are the twin-halves of men.

The rights of women are sacred.

A virtuous wife is a man's best treasure.

Do not prevent your women from coming to the Mosque.

To acquire knowledge is the equal duty of men and women.

" Pagan " Youths and Maidens.

The Rev. T. W. Pym, in a paper before the Congress, raised the question, "Are the young men and women of to-day pagans ?" He himself was inclined to answer it in the affirmative, especially in the case of the more serious and intellectual amongst them. Why ? Broad-minded clergymen like Dean Inge, Canon Barnes and Mr. Pym recognize the current movements and try to make their account with them. They know well enough that it is not of much use to try to stem the tide by a mere repetition of old dogmatic formulæ. They feel that it is futile to appeal to the Bible, when its authority is challenged and hardly recognized ; and they also perceive that it is useless to deal with the problems of the twentieth century in the light of the Dark Ages. The great majority nevertheless fail to reconcile science and religion. Can they do it ? The answer is obvious. Either they have to do away with the doctrinal part of Christianity or doom her to perdition.

The younger generation are not eager to hear about the Kings of Israel or Judah, or the missionary journeys of St.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Paul. The Thirty-Nine Articles are to them meaningless. "The doctrine of the Trinity," says Sir Sidney Low, "seems fantastic to the impatient inquirer with so many grim actualities thronging all round him." What has the Church to say on these points? It finds it easier to ignore them; it prefers a fool's paradise and is loud in lauding the blessings of Christianity and quick to persuade the young to "find" him who is supposed to have died for the sins of mother Eve. The Church has wandered far away from the simplicity of the teachings of Jesus. He was a Muslim, his religion was Islam—submission to the will of God. The practices which he had denounced, the evils which he had reprehended, were, and even now are, incorporated with the faith which wrongly bears his name.

But are the young men and women of this country pagans? They are indeed indifferent to the Church; but after a residence in these isles of over seven years it is our honest belief that Western people are not irreligious. Every thinking person has formed an ideal religion of his own—a religion of nature and science—which is nothing else but Islam. They are not aware of the fact. We invite them to solve this riddle of life from a scientific point of view, in keeping with the religious spirit which is inherent in them. In all sincerity we can assure them that they shall not seek in vain.

He is a hypocrite who, when he speaks, speaks untruth.

God has not created anything better than Reason, or anything more perfect or more beautiful than Reason.

Acquire knowledge, for it enables the possessor to distinguish between right and wrong.

Torment not yourself. O man, only follow His laws, and you shall become like Him. (Sayings of Muhammad.)

Against all the absurdities of the Church and the like, the life-aim of the Holy Prophet was directed. He, with the voice of Truth, inspired by deep communion with the God of the Universe, never travelled out of the province of Reason. Should we be wrong to follow his example?

The Late Colonel Aubrey Herbert, M.P.

We deeply regret to record the death of Colonel the Hon. Aubrey Herbert, M.P. His untimely death brings to a close, at the early age of forty-three, the crowded and adventurous career of an extraordinary personality. A great traveller, diplomatist, soldier and politician, he was a champion of the just cause of Muslims in general and the Turks in particular. He refused luring offers to betray his friends

NOTES

the Turks. As a soldier he fought against them in Gallipoli; but in the diplomatic field he absolutely refused to join hands with the policy of the Home Government. We wonder how far the assertion that the *Greenmantle* of John Buchan's famous romance was inspired by his personality. We know that he loved the Turks and never believed them to be guilty of massacres, which he termed, and always on good authority, clever and abominable propaganda. He had little respect for the Treaty of Sèvres, and we well remember his prophetic words, that the only consolation he had was that the treaty was so bad that it would die out, of its own mere rottenness.

Colonel Herbert's rare qualities and extraordinary charm were such as to surround him with innumerable friends. But to those who knew him best, the loss must be irreparable.

The Muslim congregation in London, gathered for Friday Prayers at the London Muslim Prayer House, 111, Campden Hill Road, Notting Hill Gate, W. 8, on Friday, September 28th, expressed their sorrow at the sad news of the death of Colonel Herbert, and passed a resolution of gratitude for the services he rendered to the cause of justice in the East, and of condolence with his family in their bereavement.

“East is East . . .”

Kipling's “never” has oft been refuted:—

God made the East, God made the West;
Behold! they blend at His behest.

BASHIR PICKARD.

The *frontispiece* of this issue speaks a great deal more to the effect than the pen can ever portray. There a British peer, side by side with the Easterns, is dressed in the *Ithram*, a garb which is worn during the days of pilgrimage by high and low, king and vassal, master and servant. In the eyes of the Lord there is no difference, nor could there be any in the House of God. Hundreds of thousands, from one quarter of the world to the other, throng to that Sacred City every year to give the lie to the Western ideal. Lord Headley, who has very interesting stories to relate of his novel experiences in Arabia and elsewhere, has come back with a profound impression. To him the ideal of the brotherhood of man is now a living reality, just as it was to the writer in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* when he observed:—

The brotherhood in the faith of Islam, as in Israel of old, is not, as unfortunately it has come to be in the Christian world, a mere empty phrase, but a very real force (vol. iv, col. 4658).

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Our Activities.

A certain aspect of Muslim life—the position of women under Islam—has lately come into great prominence. Even men of position and letters have thought fit once again to misrepresent Islam and to advocate the groundless claims of Christianity. We have received many inquiries, some from editors of daily newspapers, on the subject. To meet the demand, and in order to place the problem before the Western world and our readers in its true aspect, from an historical, moral, political and ethical point of view, we have inaugurated a series of lectures on Sundays at Woking at 11.30 a.m., and the London Muslim Prayer House, 111, Campden Hill Road, Notting Hill Gate (Central London and Metropolitan Railway Stations), at 5 p.m. These lectures will appear from time to time in our pages, and the first instalment of the series will be found elsewhere in this issue. The following is the syllabus :—

September 23rd : “ Woman under Ancient Civilizations ” ; 30th : “ Woman Under Christianity.”

October 7th and 14th : “ Woman Under Christianity ” ; 28th : “ Woman Under Islam.”

November 4th and 11th : “ Woman Under Islam ” ; 18th : “ The Spirit of Islam ” ; 25th : “ Psychology and Phraseology.”

The British Muslim Society.

The First Annual Meeting of the above Society was held on Sunday, the 21st October, at the London Prayer House, 111, Campden Hill Road, Notting Hill Gate, London. The attendance was considerable, and bore abundant testimony to the vitality of the Society and the energy and enthusiasm of its members, which bid fair to achieve for the Society the position which is its due amongst the influential bodies representative of religious thought in England.

Afterwards a conversazione was held, at which members of the Society and their friends assembled to accord a hearty welcome to its President, Al Haj Lord Headley (El Farooq), and Al Haj Syed Abdul Muhyi, on their return from pilgrimage. A full account of the proceedings will appear in our next issue.

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. **Thursday Debates** (British Muslim Society) at 7.30 p.m. **Qur-án and Arabic Classes**—every Sunday at 3.30 p.m.

Service, Sermon, and Lectures every Sunday at the Mosque, Woking, at 11.30 a.m.

THE TRUE KHILAFAT

THE TRUE KHILAFAT

By MUHAMMAD MARMADUKE PICKTHALL

“And when thy Lord said to the angels : Verily I am placing a *Khalifu* (Viceroy) in the Earth, they said : Wilt Thou place in it one who will make mischief in it and shed blood, while we hymn Thy praise and sanctify Thee ? He said : Surely I know that which you know not.”—THE HOLY QUR-ÁN.

WE often find the minds of people exercised concerning man's position in the world. The Qur-án tells us plainly that the position of mankind is that of Viceroy. In another chapter of the Book, reputed to have been the first revealed, we read : “Verily man is rebellious when he imagines himself independent. Surely to thy Lord is the return.” And there is another matter which exercises people's minds : the reason for the existence of evil in the world and of the capacity for evil in man. The angels were bidden to bowdown before Adam, yet the angels could plead perfect service, perfect innocence. They had not the capacity for evil. But when they pleaded that they were better qualified than man to carry out God's purpose in the earth, He made answer : “Surely I know that which you know not.” It is just because he has the choice of good and evil that man, who makes mischief and sheds blood, has a destiny beyond the comprehension of the angels and beyond his own comprehension, if he chooses good and guards himself from evil, and is a loyal, not rebellious, viceroy. There is an old legend among Muslims which tells that the angels objected to the presence of a certain saint in paradise because he once committed a great sin on earth. They said it was a shame for them to have to wait on such an one, and they were told that if a hundredth part of the desires which had been placed in man had been implanted in them they would have been worse than any man that ever lived. The legend is of no authority, but it illustrates the teaching of the Holy Qur-án on this point. Evil

ISLAMIC REVIEW

is a part of that which Allah knows and the angels know not, a part of Allah's purpose for mankind. Without evil there could be no positive, no lustrous good. That is true of the individual man, and it is true also of mankind as a whole. Just as the individual must strive to establish the Kingdom of God, the triumph of goodness, in himself, so collectively we have to strive to establish the Kingdom of God on earth. The Kingdom of God is real, not imaginary ; the bounds of man's viceroyalty are evident in birth and death, and his confinement within laws which he never made and which he is powerless in any way to alter or control. It is not the Kingdom that we have to establish, but loyalty to the laws of the Kingdom as against rebellion. Other religions limited the Kingdom to their own community. That is, in fact, rebellion, for mankind is one in the sight of the Almighty Sovereign ; His Law is one for all, His judgment one. To despise any of God's creatures is to take up a rebellious standpoint, to oppress them is open rebellion. Man has charge, within the bounds we have already indicated, of the earth with all its plants and rocks and animals, and he has charge, within those limits also, of his fellow-man. A great deal has been done for the development of natural resources, but hardly a beginning has been made at the development of humanity as a whole and in a world-wide sense. Yet that is what the Qur-án-esh-Sherif calls progress, and that is what seems indicated in the text : " And ye shall not be judged save as a single soul." The teaching of Islam shows pure theocracy to be the only way of progress for mankind as a whole. The progress of one group or nation at the expense and by the degradation of another is, in fact, rebellion. In the earliest revelation of the Holy Prophet are the words : " Verily man is rebellious when he imagines himself independent." And the Prophet, throughout his mission, bore steadfast witness to the Sovereignty of God and the viceroyalty

WOMAN

of man. He taught the heathen this great humanizing truth, and to those who knew of the One God, he cried : " You believe in the One God. Then come into the one Theocracy." They were rebellious and made war upon the messenger of God. The first Khalifas of the Holy Prophet carried on the war for Allah's sovereignty, bearing their witness faithfully as he had done. To bear that witness is the duty of all Muslims : " So we have appointed you a middle nation that you shall bear witness against mankind, and that the Apostle shall bear witness against you."

The Apostle witnesses against the Muslim world to-day, for it is very long since we have done our duty, borne our testimony. For centuries the Khilafat of Islam has been identified with a military despotism, and the thoughts of Muslims have been intent upon defence and enmity, with the result that the appointed witnesses to universal truth have seemed to the world as narrow and contentious as their enemies. But now, thank God, we have been given a great opportunity of revival and reform. The Khilafat of Islam is now no longer identified with a military despotism, nor with the political ambitions of a certain country. It is for us, the Muslims of the world, to make it once more what it ought to be, the standard of Islam, the greatest Power in the world for righteousness, a faithful witness to that greater Khilafat—the viceroyalty of man to God—showing mankind the only way of human progress.

WOMAN :

HER SUBJECTION, EXPLOITATION AND EMANCIPATION

By KHWAJA NAZIR AHMAD

It has become an article of faith with the modern Christian that by some means unspecified, and at

ISLAMIC REVIEW

some time unknown, Christianity has, in the words of Dean Farrar, "ennobled man, elevated woman and lent a halo of innocence to the life of the child."

I have lived in this civilized Christian country for over seven years, and the claim is still beyond my understanding. It is hard, I should say impossible, to justify it by an appeal to facts of history. The force of repetition is great; it is, in fact, taken by a vast number of people as the equivalent of proof. To repeat certain statements, while ignoring all rebutting facts, is a sure way of carrying conviction to the minds of thousands. And thus it happens that this particular claim that I have mentioned is accepted as a mere statement of historic truth by a vast majority of modern Christians.

There are sweeping misrepresentations of peoples and things, non-Christian and pre-Christian, with a gross distortion of things Christian. Civilizations are blackened so that Christianity may appear white by contrast. History also is written in harmony with Christian prejudice. In the interest of Christianity, history often enough becomes "nothing but a parcel of lies we play with the dead." So commonly is this done, and of such traditional respectability is this practice, that even men of repute are found yielding to it.

A typical example of this phenomenon is to be found in the recent utterances of Sir Edward Marshall Hall, that eminent actor of the English Bar. But he is not the only one who lives in a fool's paradise. Mr. (now Lord) Justice Phillimore, not long ago, while summing up a trial, said :—

The religion of the world which has done most to elevate the position of woman is Christianity; the religion of the world which has done most to repress woman is Mohammedanism. Christianity in all its earliest and purest days, and Christianity during the last great revival of the past eighty years, has been a religion which has never advocated, but which has always suppressed, acts of outrage and lawlessness. Mohammedanism is a religion which has been promulgated by the sword.

WOMAN

I will not bother myself to contradict these groundless statements. I will further quote some more militants of Christ.

There is Mr. Max Pemberton, the distinguished *fictionist*, humming the same tune in the *Sunday Pictorial* of September 16th. To safeguard Christianity he can only misrepresent Islam and the East. He has the audacity to say :—

The Orientals are as much entitled to look upon marriage through the glass of their customs as we are to view it in the light of our own. For them, woman remains the slave that she was in the days of Haroun al Raschid. Hers to obey ; to submit her will to the man's ; to be sheltered only as long as her presence is welcome ; to be turned adrift the moment her lord and master is weary of her.

Here is yet another. Mr. Awen Precelly, writing in the *Daily Dispatch* of September 17th :—

A woman of the West consenting to become the wife of a man of the East must be willing to occupy a position far inferior to that of her sister whose husband is a Westerner. There is nothing approaching an equality of the sexes among the disciples of Islam. Woman is an inferior creation. Man is, by divine right, her lord and master.

Thinking of the increasing part played by woman of the West in education, art, literature, politics, sport, and other departments of society, we can imagine what a total withdrawal from society would mean to her. Yet such a withdrawal is obligatory on the woman that marries an Easterner. Of this the veil is the symbol.

A gentleman of the West looks upon his wife as his companion and helpmeet. The gentleman of the East looks upon her as an exalted servant, a beautiful creature that attends to his needs, fulfils his wishes, and satisfies his desires.

Marriage in the East does not elevate woman. The Egyptian who is faithful to Islam must not take to himself more than four wives. The Frenchwoman who is married to him must allow her faithful husband to share his affections more or less equally between her and three others of any nationality.

And the last straw is gently placed by a correspondent of the *Evening News*, who tells us that a Muslim marriage, unlike a Christian marriage, in accordance with the orthodox Muslim law, is automatically dissolved after a year ; for the lord and

ISLAMIC REVIEW

master of this helpless wife is permitted to get rid of her after that time.

Strange! I was always given to understand by our Western *teachers*, who, of course, know Islam far better than we poor Muslims will ever do, that a Muslim husband could always divorce his wife at will; and yet here is a learned English scholar of Muslim theology who is going to deprive us of our very birthright, which has always been graciously conferred upon us by our Western superiors. I wonder what the world is coming to.

Try as one may, the British Press seems to be ever indifferent to the susceptibilities of the Easterns, and is ever loud in lauding the claims of the West.

The West has a peculiarity of its own. To illustrate, I give below an extract from a letter of the Rev. B. T. Wilden Hart, which appeared in a recent issue of the *Church Times*. Referring to the recent Japanese disaster, he writes that

by the merciful dispensation of Providence this terrible visitation of earthquake and fire has taken place at a season of the year when most of the white people would have left such towns as Tokyo and Yokohama.

The deaths of hundreds of thousands of Japanese does not matter so long as the *Whites* are safe. A religion or civilization which can lead a man to write in that way is unfit for men and women with any pretence to decency or humanity.

To a student of history all this nonsense about Christian civilization is sheer humbug. I do not wish to hurt the feelings of those who believe in the Western civilization. I will, therefore, beg leave to make my position clear at the very outset. It is not for me to run down the European civilization. To show its real worth I will not refer to the filth that was brought out at the inquest of the late Miss Billie Carlton. I will not venture to bring home to my reader the disgusting and revolting facts unearthed in the ex-Member of Parliament for East

THE CHARACTER OF MUHAMMAD

Herts, Mr. Pemberton Billing's, libel action. To belittle the virtues and blessings of this Western civilization I will not mention the details of the recent Russell and Rutherford cases. I will not even at any time mention the now famous Fahmy trial, in which it was a case of six of one and half a dozen of the other.

Nor will I advocate intermarriages. Little will I do or say to justify them. I can but deplore them.

In a series of articles I shall venture to show from history the position occupied by the fair sex—or, if you like, from a Western point of view, the weaker sex—how she has been degraded, ill-treated and doomed to perdition. I shall try to show how various civilizations—Greek, Roman, Jewish, Christian, Muslim and others—have affected woman.

To the treatment meted out to women by the Jews I will turn later, when dealing with Christianity. The Hindu civilization I am leaving out, for it is too remote and we know very little of it. Confucianism is antiquated, and may well be omitted. It would be waste of time to talk of Buddhism. We know that Buddha could not achieve the *Nirvana*—salvation—while in company with his wife. To save his own soul he had to damn others. He therefore set out after this *Nirvana*, leaving his wife and child to the mercy of others.

(To be continued.)

THE CHARACTER OF MUHAMMAD

By MASUD ALI VARESI

XV

MODESTY

MODESTY is the medium of nature to bridle human passions and brute force. It checks numerous evils. Modern civilization has restricted it to the fair sex only. But it is the crowning jewel of faith and honesty.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Let a person possess all the virtues, then divest him of modesty, and experience will show you that he has lost one great indispensable and most precious gift, without which life cannot be properly maintained. It is a safeguard against innumerable vices. The misuse or breach of this faculty might lead one to a road trammelled with ruin and disastrous to morals.

There are various stages of modesty. At the outset a man may feel ashamed to do or say something not warranted by morality. This is quite a minor stage, but it helps a man to give up his numerous superficial evils. A further development of this stage makes him modest in the society of his relations and friends. This state removes certain evils that creep into the four walls of a house and are committed in solitude. But the highest stage of modesty is in its fullest development when a man is ashamed of his own person, when he is protected by the perpetual consciousness that God sees all things, and the commission of evil, or even the entertainment of an evil idea, is bound to be detected by Him. With this ever-present thought a man will not only keep aloof from vice and evil, but will protect himself from the slightest suspicion that may be entertained against him by others: he will leave no stone unturned in rejecting any immodest idea that might find a place in a corner of his heart: he will never be alone in the most sequestered or private spot, the realization of the Omnipresent Allah being always with him: he will not even dare afford an asylum to the conception of sin in the darkest recess of his mind or the most intact portion of his heart. It is for this reason that the Prophet has said that the chief characteristic of Islam is modesty (Mishkaat, p. 368).

It is not surprising to notice modesty in the Prophet in its most accomplished stage, seeing that he was an embodiment of all imaginable virtues. But it excites our curiosity to see it most gracefully

THE CHARACTER OF MUHAMMAD

represented in an age when the world was submerged in darkness, steeped in ignorance and clouded with evil. The Prophet lived among a nation which was proud and conceited of its traditional superiority. This Arab nation counted nakedness as nothing. They used to walk round the Kaaba quite stripped of their clothes, perfectly naked. The morals of a people and their modesty is worth observation when they cared nothing for the disgraceful exposure of their private parts. How wonderful are the acts of the Omnipotent! Amidst these people Muhammad (peace be on him) was sent by God. He was born among a people conspicuous for its notorious customs and practices. His wife, Hazrat Ayesha (may God shower His eternal blessings on her) says that she also never saw him naked. What better proof of his highest modesty can be available? (Shama-el-e Tarandi, p. 28). This is only a leaf of the sweet and comprehensive character of the Prophet. Abu Saeed says: "The Prophet was more modest than unmarried girls in Purdah leading a life of seclusion. If anything incurred his displeasure, we found it out from his demeanour. If he did not like anything said or done by any person, he would, kindly, give an indirect warning in order that such person might not feel the sting of shame and reproach" (Bokhari, p. 901, and Shafa, p. 52). This considerate and affectionate attitude of the Prophet was restricted to things that had a direct personal concern with him, or which he personally did not approve of. In matters concerned with the commandments of God and religious ordinances, his voice always lost its tolerating meekness, and his attitude changed altogether. The absence of this change, in fact, would have meant a veritable misuse of modesty. But there was nothing in the Prophet on these occasions either, which transgressed the limits of decorum and propriety. Certainly his behaviour was a perfect model of sweet nature in wonderful harmony with divine law.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

One day it happened that a man called on the Prophet, with a saffron or like-coloured yellow mark on his person. The Prophet never tolerated the male members of his following to decorate themselves in any way tending to effeminacy, but he said nothing to his visitor on the subject. However, when he went away, the Prophet addressed the audience thus : " If you had asked this man to wash it out, it would have been better " (Abu Daūd, p. 576, and Shamael Tarandi, p. 27).

It was an acknowledged fact, a fact in reality, that the Prophet's modesty had developed into such noble proportions that he felt shy even at seeing anybody ashamed and feeling the disgrace of an unpleasant or unlawful act, social, moral or religious.

Hazrat Ayesha (the choicest blessings of God be hers) narrates : " If some one's act or speech looked unpleasant to the Prophet, the latter would never call such a person by name, in particular, but would generalize his speech thus : ' What sort of people are they who do such things ? ' " (Shafa, p. 52). The guilty man was thus indirectly reprimanded without feeling the sting of shame or disgrace in the presence of others, and those present took a lesson in realizing the imprudence, mischief or impropriety of a certain act.

Such was the fineness, delicacy and extreme worth of the Prophet's modesty, that the Almighty God felt it incumbent to teach the people through him the morals and etiquette of a call or visit. It is this, that whenever anybody called on some one, it was not becoming on his part to chat with other people to the annoyance of the gentleman visited. Whenever the companions of the Prophet called on him, they used to converse with one another for a long time, but the Prophet concealed his inconvenience and preferred it to causing any unpleasantness to them. He never told them anything on the subject. Accordingly God, in a dream, commanded

IS ENGLISH CHRISTIANITY DYING ?

them thus : " Certainly the Prophet is troubled with this conduct of yours, and he feels shy with you " (i.e. in telling you not to make prolonged visits and chat among yourselves exclusively with the object of chatting and whiling away time). " And God cares for nobody in telling a truth."

The fact is worth consideration that the Prophet observed reticence so long as it concerned his personal annoyance or inconvenience, and felt shy in explaining it to others for their warning. But in matters of the propagation of faith and in the carrying out of the Heavenly Commandments he never allowed personal inclinations or toleration to interfere. And this is the true and right use of modesty, which God may grant to all His creatures.

(To be continued.)

IS ENGLISH CHRISTIANITY DYING ? ¹

" IN this country Christianity is fighting for its existence and losing ground steadily. The churches no longer influence the modern Englishman ; and, with the spread of education, they are being deserted by the women." Such is the view which I heard recently expressed, and it is widely shared. Is it true ? And, in so far as it is true, what is the cause ?

Let us look first at the dark side of the picture. The Victorian religious tradition has largely broken down. Science has destroyed a number of beliefs which were tacked on to religious faith. Scholarship and antiquarian research have led to a new way of regarding the Bible. Because there has been change, the old sense of religious security has gone. Everyone knows that the defenders of Christianity, one or two generations ago, tried to maintain impossible positions. Because they were worsted, it is

¹ Canon Barnes of Westminster in the *Evening News*.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

widely assumed that the Christian religion has been undermined. I am convinced that the assumption is untrue.

But to create a new religious tradition is a slow process. In the meantime men have largely ceased to go to church. Few new churches are being built ; and, notwithstanding the increase of population, those that exist are for the most part not well filled. This is true, not merely of the Established Church, but of practically all religious communions.

Even more serious is the fact that young men of the best type are not coming forward in sufficient numbers to staff the churches. The average capable man is not prepared to listen to puerile sermons. So he plays golf, reads a newspaper or magazine, and, in the end, "lets religion slide." As a natural result, in his work or business or profession he adopts the standards of his fellows, and is not directly influenced by Christian principles. It is much the same with his womenfolk. The more able read and think for themselves. So they tend to become critical of the clergy and aloof from organized religion. And the more able members of the community set an example which is generally followed.

* * * * *

What is the brighter side of the picture ? Well, there is singularly little hostility to religion. The bitterness of a generation ago has almost entirely died away. The average man now regards Christianity with a sort of benevolent tolerance. He recognizes that it does produce sincere and high-minded men and women ; and he feels somewhat sorry that, as he imagines, it is not true. Recently I gave some lectures to industrial audiences in the Midlands and North of England. My subject was Westminster Abbey, and after talking of kings, and queens I apologized for speaking next of religious leaders, because, as I explained, religion seemed to me the most valuable element in a nation's life.

IS ENGLISH CHRISTIANITY DYING ?

To my surprise, my first audience applauded vigorously. So I deliberately tested subsequent audiences, always with the same result. Shortly afterwards I met Dr. Albert Mansbridge, to whose inspired enthusiasm for adult education the nation is greatly indebted. I told him of my experience. It was, he told me, entirely confirmed by his own wide knowledge.

The old English religious tradition is not dead. On the contrary, it is very much alive. Somewhat stern and inarticulate, reverent without the appearance of piety, entwined with the sanctities of family life, it continues to give strength to the English character.

We must not, especially after a period of intellectual unrest, measure the decay of religion by the emptiness of the churches. At the moment, as the Archbishop of York said boldly, "The Church repels, religion attracts." The Spirit of religion is among us, and though I would like it to fill the churches, I would rather have it free than caged.

Shortly after the Armistice a friend of mine met an Australian soldier in South Ireland. They discussed the fact that the whole population went to Mass. "Yes," said the Australian, "they've got religion in the neck. But it don't seem to work much good."

The Englishman is said by foreigners to be cold and reserved. In religion his reserve makes him almost secretive. Because of this we are led to judge English life by the actions of a luxurious, largely parasitic, group of people mainly to be found in London. Active religious benevolence lies half-hidden beneath this scum. Yet, every now and again, there comes an illuminating flash of light. A year ago I was talking with a man who had made a tour in Austria and adjacent regions. He warmly praised our relief work, and then said with a humorous smile : " You know, the people think we English are

ISLAMIC REVIEW

all Quakers, and have an unbounded admiration for our national religious zeal." It was good hearing.

* * * * *

So far as I can see, the appearance of religious decay in England will not go much farther. The war came at an unfortunate time. It produced anxiety, bitterness, every form of emotional disturbance, when we needed a period of tranquillity during which Christianity might adjust itself naturally to the framework made by modern knowledge. Thus, whereas war always harms the finer types of religion, the late war was doubly harmful. Yet among us there remains an instinctive regard for the Christian valuation of human life. The thoughtful man or woman in each generation puts the questions: Why was I created? Why am I here? What is my duty and destiny? Then he, or she, reflects. As man, during a million years or so, has slowly emerged from the animal, he has made human civilization. It is clear that civilization can only be perfect as men make the ideals of the Gospel their aim. But to explain the existence and value of Christian standards you must accept the Christian view of the universe. That is to say, you must believe in God, freedom, and human immortality. If war has been produced by the blind action of physico-chemical forces, the universe is an unintelligible jest. "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

But we all really believe that there is a meaning in human life. We discover the meaning as we realize that man has been produced by a Spiritual Being for spiritual ends. Thus we come back to the old truth that each one of us has, or ought to have, his value in the eternal scheme of things. But, as men ponder over the facts of evolution, they will abandon the good-fellow idea of God. If He is loving, He is also stern. Men reap what they sow, here and hereafter. "How can you believe in Hell?" was the question put to a young man in a University

HUMANITY AND DIVINITY OF JESUS

discussion recently. "Well," was the reply, "I spent a few months in Flanders' trenches."

Out of serious thinking a new religious certainty is thus being made. It finds no comfort in ambiguous and soporific religious phrases. It has nothing in common with ecclesiasticism. It is the renewal, in a form suited to twentieth-century thinking, of the old, virile religious tradition of England.

THE HUMANITY AND DIVINITY OF JESUS

By KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN

(Continued from p. 361.)

CONDITIONS OF ACTUALITY.

No one can deny that every potentiality requires certain conditions to become an actuality, and a moral preached, and perhaps potentially possessed by one cannot be claimed as owned by him unless he brings it into practical shape under given conditions. It is through the splendid meekness with which he bears all the derision of the Israelites and his marvellous patience in the face of the hardest trials of life which he suffered as a martyr to the truth, that meekness, forbearance and patience become enviable possessions of Jesus; otherwise he would have been a mere tale-teller of passive morality. It is a real misfortune of the highest magnitude that the ministry of Jesus was curtailed by circumstances which he could not control, and the world lost the chance of seeing a practical manifestation of various divine moral qualities which possibly he possessed. Even the much-praised morals in Christian literature, like Forgiveness, could not see their complete development at his hands. That moral quality also, like others, requires given conditions, and unless they are present one cannot be fairly accredited with it.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Three essential conditions must be fulfilled before you can claim to possess this noble attribute. In the first place, you must be persecuted ruthlessly by your enemies. Secondly, your enemies must fall, and change of circumstances render them at your mercy; and, last of all, though not the least in importance, in spite of your possessing the means to give them the punishment they justly deserve, your noble nature gets the better of you and you forgive them. Mercy, like forgiveness, can only be shown by one who finds others at his mercy, and unless one attains that high position the preachings of mercy are words which lack reality. Besides, it is our everyday experience that people in power generally regard forgiveness as an insult rather than as a kindness, when it comes to them from a helpless victim of their persecution. It is deprecated and treated with contempt. Of course Jesus on the Cross prayed for forgiveness for his tormentors; and it shows that he was in that mood at the time, but sentiments and feelings expressed by him while praying for his enemies on that occasion have also been given vent to by other great men under similar trials of life, and he is not unique in this respect. The moral quality of Forgiveness, however, could not see its realization in the lifetime of Jesus: one finds only the first of the three conditions precedent for the manifestation of forgiveness, in his life; the other two are lacking. It remained in embryo for some six hundred years more, and found its right use and occasion at the hand of the Prophet in Arabia, when the "Lord on high with His 10,000 Saints" reached the gates of the "ancient House" in the person of Muhammad. The old writings were fulfilled, and Mecca was conquered, without a single drop of human blood being shed, an event unparalleled in the whole history of the world. The enemies of the prophet in Mecca, had subjected him and his followers for thirteen years to a long course of trials and hardships, which surpassed in intensity and

HUMANITY AND DIVINITY OF JESUS

quantity the hardest trials in "others' " lives. Then his enemies fell and found themselves at the absolute mercy of their persecuted victim. They deserved every imaginable punishment that could be devised by human ingenuity, and to bring them to it was simply to meet the ends of Justice and Equity. Muhammad would have been quite justified if he had punished them as severely as Joshua, Ramchandra, and Krishna did when victorious over their enemies. The great Divine moral attribute of Forgiveness which "the Son of God himself" could not reveal in himself, being hampered in his ministry by circumstances beyond his control, received its full revelation, which otherwise would have remained in abeyance, perhaps for ever. God raised various prophets from time to time, and His various characters were revealed in them. Muhammad was the last of the race, and all those Divine moral attributes which were still undeveloped in man, and had had no occasion for proper manifestation in the lifetime of previous prophets, found their proper revelation in him—a subject which I have fully dealt with elsewhere.¹ Forgiveness being one of them, had its own occasion as well as its use. The three conditions precedent to complete its expression appeared in the days of Muhammad; but Jesus, though persecuted by the enemies, could not see them at his feet for mercy; others like Ramchandra and Krishna had the occasion, but they did not utilize it. Muhammad had the rare opportunity and did not fail to use it. His enemies, when utterly fallen, entreated him to treat them as a noble-minded person would do. The appeal was most opportune and made to the right man, and was readily accepted.

TENDERNESS AND STRENGTH.

This is what can be fairly said about the tender passive moral qualities which are chiefly claimed for Jesus; but there are stern moral qualities besides,

¹ *The Ideal Prophet*, by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

which are also Divine, but which, I am afraid, found no revelation in the Son of the Holy Virgin. Therefore, he could not reproduce the Divine mind in perfection, as Dr. Rashdall would have us think. These stern moral qualities, when properly balanced, secure happiness to human society: anger, hatred, and to them I may add vengeance. They are all necessary to keep life and property secure. They cannot be branded as lower and bestial passions, which really they are in their crude form. They have their right use, and it is only through their degenerate use that they become evil. Do we not observe them in the working of dumb nature, which, in my opinion, is the best index of the Divine character? We read of them as attributes of God in the Biblical record. Besides, to say that they are undesirable, is simply to find fault with the Supreme Wisdom who supplied man with these passions. Are not hatred and anger realities? Do they not affect the trend of human affairs? And if man is born after the image of God, and consequently all the moral qualities observable in him must be those of God, all these stern and active moral qualities are Divine moral attributes in man, and cannot be dispensed with. They no doubt require regulation and training, and it is in the life of a perfect man in whom God is claimed to have been revealed, that we look for the right use of such passions. Is not a morality preached and taught in the Sermon on the Mount sufficient, if adopted, to destroy those stern moral qualities which I call, and are, Divine; and to render our life and property insecure? The morality, I am afraid, is too idealistic to be practised; and will, I believe, remain so till the day of Judgment. But can the teacher of that Sermon under these conditions, claim to be a perfect model of humanity and a complete representative of Divine character, and is his claim justified? I have purposely referred

HUMANITY AND DIVINITY OF JESUS

to these two passions, as they cannot exist if the Sermon is put into practice, though even its Teacher could not restrain himself from making use of them sometimes ; but there are innumerable moral attributes besides, human and Divine, which, to take the most favourable view of the case, remained in abeyance and did not see their revelation in the Nazarene prophet ; and I see no reason therefore to say in the words of Renan that " religion cannot be said to have made a bad choice in pitching on this Man (Jesus) as the ideal representative and guide of humanity." Renan, with all his rationalistic attainments, was not proof against his early predilections, otherwise he could not have deliberately made such a remark. He should have known that there were various walks of life most necessary for the superstructure of human society on Divine lines, in which Jesus could not be a guide. A king on the throne, a Judge on the bench, a statesman in his Cabinet, and a general in the field, are as necessary factors of human society as a teacher of morality, and God was also not unwise in raising patriarchs like David, Solomon, Joseph, and Joshua, who acted respectively as a king, a judge, a minister of State, and a general. They were human beings, and possibly committed errors, nay, sins, as Christians believe, in the performance of such duties. But if God had to come as the " ideal representative and guide to humanity," He would have been more useful to human society if He had appeared as a king or a statesman. He could have left better rules for the guidance of Christian kings and statesmen in Europe, and the world would have seen a millennium, when relieved of their ambition and self-assertion. The monarchs and statesmen of Europe needed a mediator and peace-maker to counsel moderation and humanity, to enable them to prevent precipitation into the colossal catastrophe of the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Great War, which has thrown back progress perhaps for more than a generation.

THE SECOND ADVENT.

We are told that the Lord is to appear in the last days as King, to do justice to the oppressed, and to set all iniquities right; but if the world is to end at the time of his second advent, our need of an "ideal representative and guide to humanity" will also come to an end. It may be said perhaps that his Kingdom was not the Kingdom of this world, nor did he allow "his servants to fight," that he "should not be delivered to the Jews." (St. John xviii. 36.) But if the civic and economic policy of the world necessitates the existence of some kind of kingdom, and the enforcement of mutual rights and obligations between man and man, which is the only basis of a commonwealth, and which renders some sort of rule indispensable; and if no sooner man emerges out of the primitive state of nature than at once knowledge of individual property rushes to his mind, and its security, together with the safety of his own life, brings home to him the necessity of some sovereign political authority, though in a rudimentary form; and, last of all, if the policy of England converted the old Witenagemot into the modern Parliament, should we look to the Mount of Olives for an "Ideal representative and Guide of humanity," as Renan says, or to the Mount of Faran (Mecca) to find a king, a statesman, a lawyer, and a general in the Person of the Prophet?

A calm and unprejudiced consideration of three facts given in these pages will, I am sure, convince a student of Renan that his remark was not free from short-sightedness. Jesus, as he himself confessed, is no example in the higher walks of human life, his Kingdom being not of this world; but will he be of help to us in our ordinary life? Is not our domestic life an essential and important part of our

HUMANITY AND DIVINITY OF JESUS

programme in life? Are not many houses in these days of ours, scenes of unpleasantness, misery and discord? And does not this deplorable plight result from the want of those sweet relations between husband and wife which make the matrimonial bond a heavenly tie? Is not the very word "home" a treasure of dearest and happiest associations, which are becoming extinct day by day; was not woman created to be a "helpmeet" to man, and are they not meant to be husband and wife, on the happy or unpleasant mutual relations between whom it depends whether a home becomes a heaven or a hell? If these are realities, and to a great extent responsible for our happiness or misery, are we not in urgent need of a Guide to regulate our domestic daily life? It is a great misfortune that the Divine element in Jesus, as the Christians think, did not allow him to have an earthly connexion with some woman as husband and wife, and we are again constrained to turn our eyes to some other quarter for a "guide of humanity." Jesus, of course, had a mother, but his Divinity perhaps again comes in the way, and a son in a Christian house has nothing to learn from him in home morals. The Holy Virgin could with complacency of mind hear her Divine Son call her "woman" because she saw some thing in him different from her, but an ordinary English woman would like to see her son behave differently.

IS THE MORALITY OF JESUS PRACTICAL?

The deeper we go into the question, the more doubtful we become as to the correctness of Renan's remark. The morality taught by Jesus in his famous Sermon on the Mount never found favour even with his immediate followers. Even now it is taken as the best specimen of morality taught in the world; but the world has become two thousand years older since then, and still cannot see the way to put it into practice. Even the devout members of the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Church and the most zealous workers in modern evangelical campaigns, find themselves unfit for the task, and unable to work out these high principles of ethics; and are looking for the second advent of the Lord when the Kingdom of Heaven shall come to restore peace, amity, and love, and man, becoming circumcised of all stern but otherwise manly passions, will be of a more suitable disposition to act upon them. Some old Rishi even now in the Himalayan icebergs in the East may appreciate them, but certainly no one in the West.

The whole difficulty lies in realizing his ministry and his real mission as a teacher of these rigid principles of morality. In my opinion, if Jesus be given his true position, it will be that which he himself professes and claims, shorn of all the graceful Pauline coverings of ecclesiastical dogma. He stands redeemed of his paradoxical situation, and the unpracticable nature of his teaching is explained. Here he seems to be in his right place. He was a prophet raised to reform the house of Israel, and to bring together its scattered sheep into one fold. He came to improve the morals of the Israelites and expose the hollowness of the knowledge of the Pharisees, who posed as the only expounders of Mosaic law. The law was the law of retribution and vengeance. It was abused, and he came to explain it. He shows its proper application, and thus to fulfil it and not to destroy it.

To make myself more explicit in establishing the true position of the Prophet Jesus, I must first refer to the circumstances which were responsible for bringing the Law of Moses into existence. The children of bondage required emancipation, physically as well as morally. Through the bondage of many generations they had lost all manly morals and had become mean, dejected, and cowardly. Crossing the Red Sea could liberate them from the yoke of

HUMANITY AND DIVINITY OF JESUS

Egyptian kings, but it could not free them from the thralldom of servile habits. The law of retribution, therefore, came to their rescue ; “ an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,” was the only code of life suited to redeem their enervated spirits. The said law accordingly worked well, and succeeded in turning the children of bondage into a martial race of rulers and conquerors. Then came abuse. They forgot the spirit and began to worship the letter. They left the kernel and went after the husk. They insisted scrupulously on the literal observance of the law of vengeance, and in course of time they became a personification of vengeance. They had manifested slavish timidity once, but now they became anger incarnate. Their hatred when aroused knew no bounds. Thus they fell morally, and with it came their worldly downfall. They were again humbled under a foreign yoke, and began to pray for salvation. They needed a Redeemer, for whom they approached Jehovah through their patriarchs, and a Saviour was promised. The promised Messiah came, in the person of Jesus, and brought them the true key of salvation, but they failed to understand his mission. Their previous history was a good lesson. They should have known that if their emancipation was in the law, the subsequent salvation should also follow the law. If the law of vengeance came to regenerate them when they were slaves to unmanly habits, and was a necessary preliminary to making them rulers and conquerors, the law of mercy was indispensable as well to redeem them from being victims of anger and hatred, before they could be restored to their lost supremacy. The Redeemer of the house of Israel not only diagnosed the real disease which had contaminated their national fabric, but also came with a panacea when he said “ Ye have heard that it hath been said ‘ an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,’ but I say unto you that ye resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy

ISLAMIC REVIEW

right cheek turn to him thy other also. And if any man will sue thee and take away thy coat let him have thy cloak, and whosoever shall compel thee to go with him one mile, go with him twain."

A NEW GOSPEL.

It may be impracticable as the world thinks, it may not be consonant with its polity and commonweal, but it brought a new Gospel to, and could, save those who had been slaves to hatred and anger. This law of mercy which was evolved on the Mount of Olives, was the New Dispensation, and not what has been dogmatically preached afterwards. Strong faith in it, and its practical observance, were sure to bring salvation to the scattered house, and not the blood of the teacher who became a martyr for it. But "to hate thine enemy" was the watchword, and one who taught them, "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you," could not be accepted by them as heir to the throne of David and restorer of their lost supremacy.

Jesus has been unfortunate in having foes as well as friends. No one could understand the Covenant he renewed. Both wanted a kingdom. The former when disappointed became his enemies and could not leave him till they brought "him to the Cross"; the latter, more hopeful, looked to the last times for the moment when their sons shall have an exalted position with him on the throne, but no one appreciated his teaching. He himself was a great believer in law and its observance. He believed that the world and its kingdoms must go to those who possessed high morals and knew how to control their passions. He knew that it is much more by the cultivation and possession of certain characteristics that a nation can find supremacy over others, than in the possession of military training and weapons of war. He knew that faith in and observance of certain laws only

HUMANITY AND DIVINITY OF JESUS

could create the character and morals desired. He knew the weak points of the Israelites, whom he came to raise, and the Law revealed to him was the one evolved in his Sermon on the Mount. This was the New Dispensation, this was the New Covenant to redeem the lost house, to establish which he came to the Cross, and his martyrdom, as believed. In the renewed law lay their salvation. But his race rejected it, and fell, to rise no more.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS.

Unfortunately, as I remarked before, the position of Jesus and the nature of his teaching, though clear to one free from prepossession and not subject to any predilection, has always been a mystery even to his followers. Take him as a Prophet, a Teacher and a Holy Messenger of God raised to bring scattered sheep together and restore the house "under the wrath of God" to its lost supremacy, and therefore to teach them morals to meet the contingency of the time and place which he was in, and the whole mystery is solved—he commands all the respect and reverence which a human mind can feel for one of the greatest teachers of, and martyrs to, truth. But take him as a God, and you are beset with difficulties never to be surmounted. Read his teachings in the light of the facts explained above, and an impracticability becomes a possibility, or rather a necessity suited to the requirements of the time and the people addressed. But to find in them some germs of Divinity, simply because they cannot be practised by an average human being, and because the modern mind is too sordid to take them seriously, is simply to betray one's ignorance of an ordinary theory of legislation and its progress and evolution.

DIVINITY OF JESUS.

Of his two characters in representing Humanity and Divinity, I think I have now discussed the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

human side within necessary bounds, but much more is still to be said under the other heading. The world was not without its idea of God and His attributes before the advent of Jesus. It came either through Divine revelation or His work as revealed in Nature ; and these indices of Divine character induced man to believe Him an Almighty God, Omnipotent, All-powerful ; Conqueror and not to be conquered ; Destroyer of the wicked, and Vanquisher of, and not to be vanquished by, his enemies. But it is a great shock to find in the Son of Mary something damaging to our deeply-rooted, sublime notion of Divine dignity. A God in man, but caught and bound by the Jews, Lord of the Universe and evincing fear and anxiety to save his life, which it is believed he came voluntarily to sacrifice ; he is smitten and abused ; he is scurrilously subjected to coarse jokes and inhuman derisions, compelled reluctantly to drink the mortal “cup.” Did he not try to hide himself when he heard of the Jewish conspiracy against his life ? It was perhaps owing to the human element in him, as may be said by way of apology, but after the event called the Resurrection, he had overcome death and had got a “celestial life” ; he had no reason to evince fear and hide himself again, but he did. This is what an Eastern mind unfortunately cannot conceive of God.

We read of God as a King, in all the sacred books claimed to be revealed from Him by the adherences of various religions in the world. We read the following of His Kingdom in the Qur-án :

Allah is He besides whom there is no god, the Everliving, the Self-subsisting by whom all subsist ; slumber does not overtake Him nor sleep ; whatever is in the heavens and whatever is in the earth is His ; who is he that can intercede with Him but by His permission ? He knows what is before them and what is behind them, and they cannot comprehend any thing out of His knowledge except what He pleases ; His knowledge extends over the heavens and the earth, and the preservation of them both tires Him not, and He is the Most High, the Great.—Ch. II, verse 255.

HUMANITY AND DIVINITY OF JESUS

And they say : Allah has taken to Himself a son. Glory be to Him ; rather, whatever is in the heavens and the earth is His ; all are obedient to Him.—Ch. II, verse 116.

Wonderful Originator of the heavens and the earth, and when He decrees an affair, He only says to it, Be, so there it is.—Ch. II, verse 117.

Whatever is in the heavens and whatever is in the earth is Allah's ; and whether you manifest what is in your minds or hide it, Allah will call you to account according to it ; then He will forgive whom He pleases and chastise whom He pleases, and Allah has power over all things.—Ch. II, verse 284.

The Qur-án teems with verses like these relating transcendental grandeur of Divine Glory, and a Muslim mind may only be excused if it is unable to see anything of God in Jesus.

EXPLANATION OF JESUS' CHARACTER.

There is, however, an explanation of what may be styled the passive side of Jesus' character, as inconsistent with Divine Glory. Patience is a Divine moral quality, and required manifestation, and got its full epiphany in the Lord. I admit that God is patient. We see Divine meekness in allowing wickedness to take the uppermost hand ; sin to become rampant, and evil to prevail sometimes, but we see God vindicated in the final destruction of iniquity and unrighteousness. It is in the Light of this Divine victory that the former passiveness becomes a providential Patience and radiates with its full lustre, otherwise the suffering of every helpless creature who brought troubles to him by his own inordinacy, is a Divine manifestation. This is what we read in the sacred literature of all the nations on the surface of the earth. Dumb nature even bears witness to the truth, where unhealthy matter sometimes finds luxuriant growth simply to be annihilated by the self-assertive cosmic energy. God showed His forbearance and patience, but was His indestructible nature and power of destroying others vindicated in the life of Christ ? The world has seen many martyrs for the right cause besides Jesus. They

suffered like him and evinced similar patience. Was God revealed in them all? There ought to be some line of demarcation between a man as a man, and God as a man. It is rather in the destruction of His enemies by His own than in His self-destruction, and that also expedited by wicked enemies, that God is glorified. Had His enemies seen their own destruction at the hand of Jesus, the Glory of God would have seen redemption. Their subsequent annihilation, if any, proves nothing. The enemies of every martyr to truth, besides Jesus, met the same fate. They could not survive for a long lifetime, and truth gained its supremacy in their discomfiture in almost every case. The Hindu philosopher who, like Christians, believes in Divine Incarnation in man, has conceived a more dignified and sublimer idea of Deity than the theologian in the West. If God took a human birth in the manger once, He was born more than half a dozen times in the Brahmanical soil, but under environments more befitting His Divine grandeur. It is the prevalence of sin, no doubt, which causes His appearance in every case; but He comes to destroy the wicked and the unrighteous, and establish His Kingdom in the Land of Bharat Vartha (India), while in the street of Galilee He falls a helpless victim to them. Naturally, the first of the two is preferable and more consonant with His exalted position, but His possession of tender passive morality cannot be ignored. To my mind, both His appearances, in India and in Bethlehem, are not free from defect. His complete epiphany would be in a case which combines all His moral attributes. He should appear at a time when sin is at its climax: He should come in a humble position like Jesus, He should fight in the cause of truth like Krishna, and he should finally ride victorious like Ramchandra, but show His mercy in awarding forgiveness to all the enemies who wanted to annihilate His cause. This is what is required of a God in man, and if it

ALLAH O AKBAR

be possible that God reveals Himself in man, it is Muhammad, and not any other member of the noble race of prophets, however worthy, who satisfies all these requirements.

ALLAH O AKBAR

I HAVE seen it stated that the Mecca pilgrimage is made use of by political propagandists to further their own ends. Nothing is further from truth, and were politicians of any kind to air their views in Mecca, they would find themselves in about the most uncongenial atmosphere possible.

The first thing that struck me on arriving here from Jeddah was the complete elevation of the mind above earthly matters. All the tens of thousands of pilgrims, and indeed all the people in the place, are so much bent on serving God that they have no room in their minds for other considerations.

The most impressive sight of all is the service at the big courtyard surrounding the Kaaba. At the appointed times, five times a day, the *Muazzin* calls to prayer, and the whole huge area is filled with earnest worshippers. *In unison* they bow and prostrate. The ladies occupy a large area specially set aside for them, and they take part just like the men in every portion of the service.

It must be remembered that this huge congregation consists of representatives from all parts of the world. A Chinese may be worshipping next to a South African; a Punjabi may be next to a Malay, and so forth. There is only one thing that draws them all together, and that is the unanimous worship of the One and only God. All day long one hears "*Allah-o-Akbar! Allah-o-Akbar! La illah ill-Allah wallah-o-Akbar lillahilhamad.*" Everywhere the intense desire to thank God for His goodness and implore His direction in the right path is so strongly manifested that there is no room for worldly

REVIEW

considerations. Unlike certain other faiths, there is no bid for temporal power. There are no priests by whose aid alone heaven can be reached; there are no wild, fanatical statements that the followers of other religions are all doomed to damnation. Every true Muslim would like to see that happiness he himself knows spread to his brethren all over the world; but he is forbidden to use any compulsion.

I believe that the future state is of such infinitely greater importance to the Muslim than any worldly consideration that he will never presume to condemn others for not being able to see with his eyes.

As far as I can see all the people in Mecca are so earnestly engaged with the religious observances connected with the pilgrimage, that there is actually very little time for outside considerations, political or otherwise.

EL FAROOQ (HEADLEY)

MECCA, *July* 21, 1923.

REVIEW

In *The Inadequacy of the World's Religions* (St. Catherine's Press, London) Mr. Gilbert Sadler disposes rapidly of the claims to human consideration of Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam respectively, and ventures to propound a new Faith, with an Eternal Mind-Ether for Centre. Mr. Sadler's case against Islam is hardly strengthened by his misapplication of isolated texts from the Holy Qur-án, while he accuses the "Working folks" (by which is intended the translation of the Qur-án by Maulvi Muhammad Ali) of an effort, apparently disloyal and against the weight of established Muslim authority, to prove that "hell is only for a time." From this Muslims may estimate the value and cogency of his strictures on our Faith.

WHAT IS ISLAM ?

WHAT IS ISLAM ?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ISLAMIC REVIEW

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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