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M. Saïd Felix Vályi.

M. Saïd F. Vályi, the Hungarian publicist and statesman, was born in 1885. He won distinction at an early age, and was "crowned" by the University of Paris for an essay he had written, when he was seventeen. The University of Vienna conferred upon him the degree of Ph.D. He embraced Islam at our London Muslim Prayer House in 1918.

M. Vályi has devoted his life to the study of Muslim History, and is well known both as historian and philosopher. His studies in Vienna, Budapest, Berlin, Paris, London, Constantinople and Cairo enabled him to foresee the causes of the downfall of Christianity and to elaborate a programme for the revival of Islam. His object and aim of life is to bring home to the Muslims the absolute necessity of dropping theological and sectarian views, and of reverting straight to the simple truths of Islam, which in a sense embody a study of the natural sciences.

As a philosopher M. Vályi has been strongly influenced by Islam, and such modern thinkers as Spinoza and Bergson, who tried to save the last vestiges of the spiritual aspect of European culture; and in particular by Emile Boutroux, the great French scholar, who was a personal friend of M. Vályi.

M. Vályi is the editor of that remarkable symposium of divergent opinions, *La Revue Politique Internationale*, which constitutes one of the most important historical documents
of the last ten years of world-politics. His book, *Europe in Asia Minor*, which created a sensation throughout Europe and was translated into more than one language, contributed not a little to the change in the Western attitude towards Turkey; and was one of the first impartial attempts to render justice to Turkey.

M. Vályi is still quite a young man, and the fame which he has earned is sufficient to justify the expectation of great things to come from him. He is one of the very few men whom we are certain to find always on the side of Right, without respect for persons or for dignities.

The Khilafat.

We print elsewhere in this issue, two striking articles from the pens respectively of Sir Abbas Ali Baig, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., LL.D., and of M. Saïd F. Vályi, the distinguished International Publicist (both tried friends of Turkey), on the vexed question of the Khilafat, which has of late assumed such sudden and infelicitous prominence. While unable to identify ourselves in all respects with either of the two points of view so ably expounded by these two eminent authorities, we nevertheless welcome their opinions as tending to indicate the lines along which progress may best be made, towards the settlement of a controversy which threatens to become unduly acute. At present we desire to take neither the one view nor the other. We are well aware that news of this kind in the European Press is often highly coloured in its first stage, and, to all intents and purposes, contradicted in its second. It is better, then, to wait and see what is actually the purport of the resolution of the Angora Assembly, before approving or condemning.

In the meantime, while cordially congratulating the New Turkey on the independence that its gallantry has won, we would remind it, in all friendship, that some of the matters with which it is setting itself to deal are beyond and above mere Turkish national interest. We, as brother Muslims, would exhort them (in the American phrase) to “go easy,” when dealing with such matters. It is easier to deface and destroy, than to build and preserve. Young Republics are prone to be rash to the verge of irresponsibility. Let the New Turkey, that has evolved from the wreck of the mighty Ottoman Empire, bethink itself that it is making a new start from the bottom of the political ladder—that its prestige and authority are still to be won, and that high-handed action of any kind is at present out of place.
NOTES

Muslim Mission in China and the Malay Peninsula.

The Anjuman-i-Isha‘at-i-Islam has sent three volunteers (missionaries) to China and the Malay Peninsula to counteract the daily increasing propaganda of the Christian Missions in the Far East. The three missionaries who are to carry the banner of Islam to those distant lands are: Hafiz Muhammad Hussan, B.A., L.L.B., Maulana Ahmad and Mirza W. Ahmad Baig. They have stepped over the kerb of avarice and ambition and are already on the high road of self-sacrifice. We wish them every success in their noble undertaking.

They desire to put out the light of Allah with their mouths, but Allah will perfect His light, though the unbelievers may be averse. He it is who sent His Apostles with the guidance and the true religion, that He may make it overcome the religions, all of them, though the polytheists may be averse.

O you who believe! shall I lead you to a merchandise which may deliver you from a painful chastisement? You shall believe in Allah and His Apostle, and struggle hard in Allah’s way with your property and your lives; that is better for you, did you but know! . . . And yet another (blessing) that you love; help from Allah and a victory near at hand; and give good news to the believers. (The Holy Qur-án, lx. 8–13.)

H.H. the Nawab Sahib of Bahawalpur.

We offer our heartiest congratulations to His Highness the Nawab Sahib of Bahawalpur on attaining his majority, and personally assuming the reins of government of his State (which has during his minority been administered by a Council of Regency).

His Highness has always taken a keen interest in the welfare of his subjects, and his enthronement—the date had to be advanced by a year to meet the earnest appeals of his subjects—was acclaimed by all. With the completion of the Sutlej Canal project, which was undertaken at his initiative, an additional area of 2,000,000 acres will be brought under cultivation; and the consequent addition of a large population—roughly about half a million owning no personal allegiance to the Nawab Sahib—may well supply a somewhat delicate problem to the new Ruler. We pray that Allah may strengthen him to bear the burden of his new responsibilities and the difficulties they must needs bring; and that the blessing of Allah may rest on him and on Bahawalpur.
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H.E.H. the Nizam of Hyderabad.

The claim of His Exalted Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad, for the restoration to his dominions of the vast province of Berar, with its population of some three million souls, will have the sympathy and support of all Muslims.

Of the circumstances under which this province passed from the rule of His Exalted Highness, perhaps the less said the better. It is desirable, now that the claim has been formally made, through the Viceroy, that the fullest publicity may be given to the matter, so that the British public, and the British Parliament, may be fully apprised of all that has gone before, and of all that is now required in the interest of justice and fair dealing.

Lord Curzon's part in negotiating the arrangement which forms the basis of the present protest may perhaps be misunderstood and misjudged by partisans; nevertheless to the unbiased eye it savours strongly of the "bluff," not always over-scrupulous, which is habitually employed in European diplomacy, yet seems not a little out of place in dealing with a sovereign whose State has rendered such long, consistent and brilliant service to the British Empire.

Truth and Belief.

It is possible to be quite certain about a thing, and quite wrong. To err is human, and the whole human race may make the same mistake for centuries before discovering the error. When once an historic lie gets a start, it becomes very difficult to correct it. For countless centuries the Christians were certain that the earth was motionless; for the Lord "hath made the world so sure, that it cannot be moved." And yet, it moves, and still some believe it to be otherwise. When a notion becomes so firm in the human mind, it is very difficult, sometimes impossible, to realize and believe the contrary.

But it is only the timid who cling to time-worn illusions and sickly ideals. They are obsessed by the fear that by dispelling these illusions they will be left destitute. The fearless who strip their minds of such fripperies find before their eyes a new and boundless vision. To them the fetish of "what people will think," a self-forged chain of bondage for such as are incapable of thinking, hardly matters. Truth, they argue, is for the isolated few, lies are for the consumption of the crowd. The majority are afraid of truth in almost every phase, because, according to their conception, truth is unpalatable.
NOTES

Sermon on the Mount Politics.

It is exactly for these reasons that the Sermon on the Mount is held out as the solution for world-peace. In a recent debate in the House of Commons on the Air Defence, Mr. Leach, the Under-Secretary of State for Air, remarked that preparedness is not the best diplomacy; it indicates fear. He could not believe in the ancient military slogan, “Trust in God, but keep your powder dry,” but advocated texts instead of bombs. So far, so good. He continued:

Over two thousand years ago a great reformer laid down the principles for solving this problem of national defence. Most unfortunately, nobody accepted His views on the matter. They were buried with Him. I want to see some new excavation works to raise the lid of the sarcophagus of the New Testament. Perhaps the Churches may yet oblige in this matter, and not leave it wholly to the statesmen of a Labour Government. I believe a new Gospel is needed.

While commending the attitude of the Labour Government to the question of disarmament, we cannot share the sentiments of Mr. Leach. It is most unfortunate that he should try to be two personalities at the same time. The ideals of Christ, as he rightly remarked, were never accepted, and were buried with him, but the Church, withered at its heart, cannot oblige Mr. Leach in this matter. Rear-Admiral Suecer touched the right note when he said that “If we are going to be defended in this Empire by Sermons on the Mount, then God help us.”

Mr. Leach’s Lesson.

A few days after, Mr. Leach had the queer task in the House of Commons of moving the Air Force estimates and justifying a net increase in expenditure of £2,500,000. It seemed that someone had been talking to him since his last speech; for, in spite of his faith in Christian ideals, he found himself in a “strange position.” General Seely’s description of him as an angel of peace putting the olive-branch in his pocket and bringing out a sword, seemed to fit the occasion admirably. So while Mr. Leach continued to preach a modified version of the Sermon on the Mount, he also protested that the Labour Government have never urged the disarmament of Great Britain irrespective of what other countries might do. Perhaps this increase in the expenditure on the Air Force and the decision of the Government to build five new cruisers and two destroyers is
also based on his modified version of the Sermon on the Mount.

And when it is said to them, Do not make mischief in the land they say: We are but peacemakers. Now surely they themselves are the mischief-makers, but they do not perceive. And when it is said to them, Believe as the people believe, they say: Shall we believe as the fools believe? Now surely they themselves are the fools, but they do not know. (The Holy Qur-ân, ii. 11-14.)

The Church and War.

There is, however, one striking feature of these debates, to wit, the fear drives cowardly Governments to arm under pretext of defence. If sermons and ideals could prevent war, then the Christian civilization would not be on the decline. But did Christianity ever stand the test of Armageddon? Throughout history her doctrines fell like a pack of cards; her ideals, scorned and unpractised, have always been savagely set aside. What noble purpose did the Churches achieve or even attempt during the ghastly years of the late war. Sir Douglas (now Earl) Haig fought with his "back against the wall" in March 1918; the Churches prayed, with their backs against the world, to their God, not for peace, but for victory. Did any Christian sect raise its voice in protest? Did any seek solution, or offer consolation? They all joined forces, as they have always done, with their various States; and their ministers expounded their sickly doctrine that war was God’s visitation on the world for its wickedness. They sat on Military Tribunals, and, unctuously rubbing their hands, enjoyed the rejuvenating thrill of sending innocent people to the trenches. In their pulpits they revelled in the orgy of sacrifice, and gained the dictators’ thanks for the efficiency of their intimidation.

Christ’s apostles in Europe conveniently discarded all the teachings of Christ, and were in complete political agreement with the rule of fear. Christianity, so-called, is a miserable mockery of its original conception; and the State and Church have become a miserable partnership. It is time that Christianity cast aside its hypocrisies. Her ministers—whose whole life is wrapped up, enveloped and enmeshed in the narrow social atmosphere surrounding them; whose outlook on life, like that of the God-invoking Kaiser, who was the first to flee his country when defeat was in sight, is cramped and corrupted by false ideals—should give a lead in establishing peace on earth. They can do it, only if they cease to be anti-Christ and give up false ideals and dogmas.
NOTES

They make their oaths a shelter, and thus turn away from Allah’s way; surely evil is that which they do. That is because they believe, then disbelieve, and a seal is set upon their hearts so that they do not understand. And when you see them, their persons will please you, and if they speak, you will listen to their speech; (they are) as if they were big pieces of wood clad with garments: they think every cry to be against them. They are the enemy; therefore beware of them . . . (The Holy Qur-'àn, lxiii. 2-4).

And with those who say, We are Christians, We made a covenant, but they neglected a portion of what they were reminded of; therefore an enmity was excited among them and hatred to the day of resurrection; and Allah will inform them of what they did. (The Holy Qur-'àn, v. 14.)

The Nonconformist Congress.

At the Free Church Council Congress held at Brighton some “star” speakers—Sir Oliver Lodge, Mr. David Lloyd George and Mr. Ramsay MacDonald—drew large audiences. The performance created some excitement, but the members of the Churches who formed the nucleus of the Congress were unable to fathom the reason why these gentlemen were there to address them. For Sir Oliver Lodge is not a Christian. Mr. David Lloyd George may be a Christian of a sort, but it is most probable that he himself does not know which. In a recent debate in the House of Commons he is reported to have said that the Labour Party desires the revision of the Versailles Treaty, “because it is not in accordance with the Sermon on the Mount or the Fourteen Points. Before the Prime Minister has done with his job he will have to do a great many things not consistent with these.”

This cynical expression of despair, and repudiation of the unattainable ideals of Christianity, or refusal even to pay lip-service to them, is quite typical of Mr. Lloyd George. He chooses his own words to suit the occasion; his oratory flows impetuously. If countries could be governed by words, Mr. Lloyd George would be a world dictator.

Piety and Politics.

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, the new Premier—whose religious convictions have always been of a doubtful character; but evidently with his political advancement the Spirit of Christ has overpowered him—overshadowed Mr. Lloyd George’s oration. In these days of “safety first,” he thought it best to deal with social rather than sectarian questions. His Puritan-like and scathing sermon on the abuses of the day—the wild rush for wealth and pleasure; the relegation of religion to Sundays, and the neglect of it throughout the
week; the total disregard of any religious or social ideals by so many; his patriotic praise of the Scotch Sunday; his appeal to the Churches to restore the balance—were very refreshing to all present.

Whether or no the trio agreed with the aims and objects of the Congress is of little moment; for they obviously cared nothing about the religious opinion of the Assembly. They were there to propagate their views, and to influence a section of public opinion and to secure votes. They were invited as good platform assets, and their charity began—and ended—at home. So, the Churches think they are using the politicians; the politicians think they are using the Churches. Superstition imagines it can hoodwink craft, and craft believes it can utilize superstition.

And when they meet those who believe, they say, We believe; and when they are alone with their devils, they say: Surely we are with you, we were only mocking. Allah shall pay them back their mockery, and He leaves them alone in their inordinacy blindly wandering on. (The Holy Qur-án, ii. 14–15.)

IN MEMORIAM

SHAIKH RAHMATULLAH

We record with the deepest sorrow the death of Shaikh Rahmatullah, Vice-President of Anjuman-i-Isha’at-i-Islam, Lahore, who departed this life on the 2nd of March, 1924, at 12.45 p.m.

Shaikh Rahmatullah was among the most devout Muslims of our time, and the story of his career is full of instruction—as illustrating in a singularly striking manner how true religion and unswerving probity may yet go hand in hand with commercial prosperity. Starting with a salary of less than one pound per month, he gradually built up a colossal business, of which the cost of the premises alone ran into many thousands of pounds.

He was the founder of the now famous Bombay House and English Warehouse at Lahore, and of other outstanding industrial activities, and—what is particularly remarkable, and may be commended as a concrete example of the essential truth of the message of the Holy Qur-án—he never took interest, or em-
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ployed usury in any shape or form in any of his dealings. This, with him, was an abiding principle which Allah, in His mercy, amply justified.

Shaikh Rahmatullah visited England on no fewer than eighteen occasions. Not only was he an ardent supporter of the Mission, but it may almost be claimed for him that he should stand side by side with Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, the Mission's saintly founder; and while Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din was doing all the work of the London office of the Islamic Review, from editor to clerk, address-writer and stamp-sticker, Shaikh Rahmatullah was working in a precisely similar manner in the office at Lahore.

Until quite recently he acted as Honorary Treasurer of the Woking Muslim Mission; and it was the burden of advancing years alone that at length compelled him to relinquish that onerous responsibility.

His last words of advice to his sons—we may say to us all—were: "I started 'trading' with God, and He made me successful; and if you also will do the same, He will make you successful."

The outstanding feature in the noble life of Shaikh Rahmatullah was his sincerity. Simple in his habits, his religion and his daily life were one. He died respected by all—loved by all.

COLONEL NAWABZADA OBAIDULLA KHAN

We desire to express our deepest sympathy, and that of all British Muslims, with Her Highness the Begum of Bhopal, on the lamented death of her distinguished son, Nawabzada Obaidulla Khan.

Her Highness's generosity to the Mission is well known. To her we owe the beautiful Mosque which has made Woking famous through the Muslim World, and we may say, without exaggeration, that on this sad occasion the tears of West and East are, in truth, blended.

The deceased Prince was eminent as soldier, statesman and patriot. He was born on November 3,
1878, and was educated at home by private tutors, when he learnt the Holy Qur-án by heart. He performed his pilgrimage to Mecca in 1904. In the same year he joined the Bhopal Victoria Imperial Service Lancers, and was soon afterwards placed in charge of all the military forces of the State. In this command he did much to maintain, and even increase their efficiency. In 1906 he was appointed A.D.C. to the Viceroy, became a captain in the British Army in 1908, and three years after he was promoted major. He took part in the Coronation Durbars of 1903 and 1911, and attended the Coronation ceremony in Westminster Abbey in 1910, being created C.S.I. in 1912.

He had travelled all over Europe, and took a keen interest in education, being trustee of the M.A.O. College at Aligarh, and a generous donor to its funds.

MRS. HAMIDAH A. HAMID

We greatly regret to announce the death of Hamidah, the beloved wife of Uukin A. Hamid, of Jahore, who passed away peacefully on the 16th of February, 1924, leaving an infant son aged two years.

Of her acts of charity, numerous and far-reaching, it is not for us to speak here; to her simple and earnest faith those who knew her best will testify. Her loss is deeply mourned by her husband, her relatives, her friends, and all who knew her. Beloved in life, in death she will ever be remembered for her selflessness, her unfailing kindness and her boundless generosity.

"The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God."

---

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. Qur-án and Arabic Classes—every Sunday at 3.30 p.m.

Service, Sermon, and Lectures every Sunday at the Mosque, Woking, 11.30 a.m.
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WOMAN:
HER SUBJECION, EXPLOITATION, AND EMANCIPATION

By Khwaja Nazir Ahmad

(Continued from p. 104, Vol. XII., No. 3.)

UNDER CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAM.

"Surely the men who submit and the women who submit, and the believing men and the believing women, and the obeying men and the obeying women, and the truthful men and the truthful women, and the patient men and the patient women, and the humble men and the humble women, and the almsgiving men and the almsgiving women, and the fasting men and the fasting women, and the men who guard their private parts and the women who guard, and the men who remember Allah much and the women who remember—Allah has prepared for them forgiveness and a mighty reward."

The Holy Qur-án, xxxiii. 35.

"Heaven lies at the feet of mothers."

Muhammad.

"Woman, [addressing Mary, his mother] what have I to do with thee?"

Jesus.

A NEW view of the Woman Question, a distinctly modern view, is making its appearance throughout the world, tending slowly to displace the old view which has been held so unquestioningly, and so long. The change has not been sought or planned; it is simply coming about as the result—a result which no man may stop or hinder—of the greatly extended knowledge of the modern world.

1 It has often been brought to my notice that the word used in the Greek text for "woman" should be translated "Lady" or "Lady mother," but I prefer to use the Authorised Version of the Bible.

188
ISLAMIC REVIEW

The object of the present series is to set forth as clearly, definitely and comprehensively as possible, candidly and fairly also, this modern view of the problem—what it has been, what it is, the reasons for it, and its results, so far as they can be traced or foreseen.

Let me be more explicit. Perhaps there is no subject of more living or more urgent interest now before the world than that of woman. What is it? Is it such an one as for some centuries Christian nations have believed it to be? Or is it something very different? What has an honest and independent student, presuming that he is also competent—a student who investigates thoroughly so as to find out the facts, and then speaks in the interest, not of any race or country, or any form of theological dogmatism, but of truth—to tell of woman, as to her origin, her growth, the circumstances under which she arose, the causes of her subjection, the changes which she has undergone, her reliability, her transitory, enduring and permanent value, her relation to man and to God?

The following pages are an endeavour to answer all these questions, frankly, without evasion, reverently and with as much detail as the space at command will permit. I approach the subject with much hesitation; for there is probably none which is so difficult to treat with clearness and impartiality, and at the same time without suggesting scandal or offence. The complexity of the problem, arising from the very large place which exceptional institutions or circumstances, and especially the influences of climate and race, have had in the chastity of the nations, and the extreme delicacy of the matters with which this department of ethics is connected, must be palpable to all. The first duty of a writer, however, is to Truth; and it is absolutely impossible to present a true picture of the normal condition of different ages, to form a true estimation of the moral effects of different religions, or of the moral aptitude of different
WOMAN

nations, without adverting to the department of morals which has exhibited most change and has possibly exercised most influence.

It is easier and perhaps more agreeable to denounce the sins of other times and places; my present task is more difficult.

I never before realized it; my courage has nearly failed me many times. One may easily denounce those who hold views opposed to our own, but to use voice or pen in matters the free treatment of which must touch and grieve many whom we hold near and dear is not only a bitter and ungracious task, but also a most delicate one. I set out to please neither the militants of Christ nor the zealous Muslims, who cling to the conception held by their forefathers—the devil shall have his due as well as the angels. I will condemn the celibacy of Rome as well as the “harems” of the Nawabs and the Pashas; nor shall the free-intercourse of the West or the imprisoning veil-system of the East escape my notice.

These opposing considerations, to which I have alluded, and which I propose to discuss at a later stage, are sufficient to exhibit the magnitude and the seriousness of my undertaking.

There are two more points that have to be made clear before I proceed with the subject. To me, Jesus has two personalities—one as apart from the other as the two poles—one, Jesus of Nazareth, a prophet of God, a man; and the other, the mythical Christ of the Bible. However, it will be the latter—Christ and not Jesus, Jeshua and not Jeshu—that I shall always refer to; though I may not infrequently use the word “Jesus.” The other remark that I wish to make is that I may have to employ the term “Christianity” frequently; but a great mistake would be committed if it were assumed that the term has always the same meaning. There is the Christianity of Christ, the Christianity of St. Paul, the Christianity of the first century, the Christianity of Constantine,
of Hildebrand, of Luther, of Calvin, and the modern Christianity. Christianity is different as it appears in different ages and persons. So when I quote a Christian writer, he is a good authority for the doctrine or practice of the Christianity of his own country and age, but more faintly of the Christianity of other countries and ages; notwithstanding this, proper value must be attached to the opinions of the Apostles and early Christian Fathers, who really laid the foundations of the Church and have handed down Christianity, mutilated and transformed, to us.

At the time when Christianity dawned on the world, woman had attained, as I have tried to show in the preceding chapters, great freedom, power and influence in the ancient Greek and Roman Empires. Tradition was in favour of restriction; but by concurrence of circumstances and refined Stoic philosophy, women had been liberated from the enslaving fetters of the old legal forms. They enjoyed absolute freedom of social intercourse, they walked and drove in the public thoroughfares, they studied literature and philosophy, they took part in political movements, they were allowed to defend their own cases in the Law Courts, and they assisted their husbands in the government of provinces and the writing of books.

One would have imagined that Christianity would have favoured the extension of woman's freedom. Unfortunately, Christ did not "come to destroy the law or the prophets . . . but to fulfil." It is in the light of these laws, that were above Christ's ministry, that we must look for a solution and the reason why with the triumph of Christianity the story of women, socially and politically, became a story of retrogression.

To realize the position of woman under Israel of old, we must consider the social conditions then prevailing. Among other factors family life played an important and ever-increasing part. Indeed, the clan and the tribe were regarded by the Hebrews themselves simply as an extension of the family, which thus had
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a special prominence given to it. By it, right and wrong were determined; it made laws, administered justice and maintained divine worship. All public affairs were, up to a certain point, family matters; they were regulated by the "elders"—the heads of the families.

The family took its character from the position of woman. As to this, nothing could be more instructive than the form of speech in which the husband was called ba'al, the wife the be'ulāh: the man was the owner, the wife the chattel. Such, at least, was the custom as far back as history carries us. In accordance with the classification of Robertson Smith, this type of marriage and family was therefore usually spoken of as ba'al marriage. The married woman was completely under the power of her husband; the husband had over her proprietary rights. The husband acquired these rights by purchase. The Mohar paid by the ancient Hebrew, on betrothal, was simply the purchase-money paid to the former proprietor—the father or guardian. With the payment of this purchase-money the marriage became legally valid, and all the rights over the bride passed to the purchaser. To illustrate: on the seduction of a betrothed virgin—that is, one who had already been purchased by her future husband, the compensation to be paid was fixed on the same scale as that for a married woman;¹ that is to say, it made no difference whether the marriage had been consummated or not, the violation of the rights of private property was equally great in both cases. It was regarded as an injury to property. A virgin was valued at a higher rate than a widow or a divorcée. The seducer had to pay to the father, as compensation, the amount of the Mohar, which the father would otherwise have been entitled to receive at her marriage.² The betrothal once effected, the husband could take his wife home and celebrate his nuptials when he pleased. The

¹ Deut. xxii. 28. ² Exod. xxii. 17.
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girl's consent was unnecessary, and the need for it is nowhere suggested in the law.

Originally, as Robertson Smith observes, such a *ba'âl* marriage must have been a marriage by capture. Wives were obtained by plunder from abroad, or as captives in war. Such women were, of course, in the strict sense, the property of the husband, the slaves of their masters. It was in this way, we are told, that those of the tribe of Benjamin who escaped extermination were provided with wives.\(^1\)

Though the wife at marriage passed into the power of her husband, her position was not otherwise changed. The unmarried woman in the house of her parent was under tutelage; she was the property of her guardian or her father. The guardian could make her his own wife, or marry her to his son, without having to pay any *Mohar*. In like manner two fathers could exchange their daughters as wives for their sons.

While thus treated as valuable chattels, women were not originally at all regarded from the point of view of working efficiency. They were rather looked upon, by Israel of old, as potential mothers, destined to give them the most priceless of all gifts—sons. To have a numerous progeny was the desire of everyone in Ancient Israel. "Give me children, or else I die," was the heart's cry of the wife as told in the case of Rachel crying out to Jacob.\(^2\) "Be thou the mother of countless thousands" summed up the good wishes of parents over a departing daughter—as was done in the case of Rebekah.\(^3\) Barrenness was a dire misfortune—nay, a divine judgment;\(^4\) for it was not until she had become mother of a son that the wife attained her full dignity in the household.\(^5\) The desire was for sons; for they alone continued in the family; daughters married to go elsewhere—sons alone kept up the family worship, they alone could inherit.

\(^1\) Judges xxi. 10–17.  \(^2\) Gen. xxx. 1.  \(^3\) Gen. xxiv. 60.  
\(^4\) 1 Sam. i. 5.  \(^5\) Gen. xvi. 4, xxx. 1; 1 Sam. i.6.
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The one-sidedness of the marriage relation comes into prominence especially at three points: polygamy, divorce and inheritance. As the husband was regarded as the owner of the wife, naturally no limit was set to his powers of acquisition. He could own as many wives as his means would allow him to purchase and maintain. He could also acquire secondary wives, and make his female slaves his concubines at his pleasure. A female slave was often her master's concubine; but he was not allowed to take her at once, until she had, after coming into his house, shaved her head, and pared her nails, and bewailed her father and mother for a full month.

The right of divorce was equally one-sided in favour of the man. It was always in his power to forgo his right of property and to send his wife back to her home, if only he was prepared at the same time to send back the Mohar. The wife, on the other hand, had no means of obtaining a separation from her husband or forcing a divorce.

In the case of inheritance, neither married nor unmarried women were capable of inheriting. When a man died, his womankind passed to the heir in the same way as the rest of his property.

In cases of suspected guilt which were involved in uncertainty or were of extreme gravity, means were very generally taken to obtain a direct decision of the deity. This custom was prevalent in England until not very long ago, and was called "the ordeal of jealousy." This ordeal either consisted of being burnt by walking over hot stones, or by thrusting the arms into molten lead; and the common belief that underlay both proceedings was that the deity would preserve the innocent from the injurious effects which would befall the guilty. Generally the ordeal was resorted to when a man was jealous of his wife, but was unable to produce either the witnesses required for an ordinary process at law, or other evidence of her guilt. Another form of ordeal, fre-
quently used in the case of a woman suspected of unfaithfulness, was of receiving injury from noxious potions. This consisted of drinking a specially prepared potion; if the woman were innocent, the potion was then supposed to be harmless; if she were guilty, the potion would cause injury to her thighs and belly—the members instrumental to the act of her sin. This potion consisted of "holy water," i.e. water hallowed from having been standing in the sacred laver, with which was mingled dust from the floor of the tabernacle, and in which were washed the written words of the curse.

Lastly, women were incapable of bearing testimony in a court of justice.

Such was the degradation to which women had been reduced. What did Jesus do for the betterment of this suffering, wretched class?

I need not delay, however, in discussing Christ's verses, or curses, or miracles—for that is all he did do—bearing upon the subject. Moreover, he would be a bold man who would, in the present condition of New Testament criticism, venture to formulate the opinion of Christ on any point. This much is certain—the Christ of the Gospels uttered not one word of clear guidance on this or any other social problem,¹ nor did he protest against the injustice of the Judaic treatment of women.

But it will presently appear that this point is not really relevant to my purpose. It was the teachings of the Fathers that barred the way to the progress of woman's cause in Europe, and this was based on St. Paul and on the Old Testament. The numerous references of St. Paul are familiar. She shall veil her head in the churches, and shall not ask questions there as her husband may. She is subject to her husband. The man was not created for the woman, but the woman for the man.² She shall not teach, for

¹ The only law he did lay down was that of divorce, and the disastrous consequences involved will be explained hereafter.
² 1 Cor. xi. 8.
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she brought ruin on the world, but she will be saved only by child-bearing. But more of this later.

So far as the influence of the Bible is concerned, there is no mistaking its tendency. Everywhere woman is placed in an inferior position to man. In the account of the story of the creation she appears as a side-issue. Her creation led to the downfall of man; she was the origin of evil. Throughout the Bible her inferiority is indicated and her subjection expressed. In the Ten Commandments she is lumped in with her husband’s chattels and property:—

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s wife, nor his servant, nor his maid, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is his.

The Roman Law supposed a woman never to go astray without the seduction and art of men. The Canon and Christian State laws were, and are, formed under the belief that it is the woman that “solicits.” Man, as in the Bible, is the victim of her wiles. Mrs. E. Cady Stanton, reviewing these facts, remarks that the Canon and civil law, Church and State, priests and legislators, all political parties and religious denominations, have alike taught that woman was made after man, of man, and for man, an inferior being subject to man.¹

The new dispensation reaffirmed all the harsh and sophisticate teachings of the old. The Old Testament was retained in the Canon, and the maintenance of the old Hebraic harshness towards woman became inevitable. It could not be otherwise; for Christianity was not a great intellectual movement. It knew and cared nothing of or for social problems. Thus under Christianity, as under Israel of old, the Old Testament, for some time at least, became the sole foundation. And what do we find in it? Women are not allowed to take part in religious ceremonies. Man owns woman as he owns his chattels. Polygamy is allowed, and concubinage is provided for. There we read the

¹ The Woman’s Bible.

141
story of Gideon's seventy sons, David's numerous wives, and Solomon's extensive "harem." Evidence of the buying of the wives is also found in the story of Jacob and Leah, and in the Book of Ruth. The act of divorce is extremely easy and quite one-sided; and rests entirely with the husband—"When a man hath taken a wife, and it comes to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her, then let him write a bill of divorcement, and give it into her hand and send her out of the house." Small wonder that Petruchio, speaking of this woman of the Bible, says:—

I will be master of what is my own. She is my goods, my chattels; she is my house, my household-stuff, my field, my barn, my horse, my ox, my ass, my anything.

The purification ceremony, with its reference to "sin" and atonement, suggests a barbaric taboo; but the Bible directs, by a curious refinement, that the period after the birth of a girl is to be double the length of that needed after the birth of a boy.¹

Generally the ideal of womankind in the Old Testament is a poor one—far inferior to that which meets us in Greek or Latin literature. And it was exactly in proportion as the Pagan ideal was suppressed in favour of the Biblical one, that the social position of woman ranked lower and lower.

The conception of woman disclosed in the New Testament shows no advance—in some directions it shows a retrogression. With the question of celibacy I shall deal more fully later on. It is enough for the present to remark that that is the ideal set forth in the New Testament. Jesus is a celibate. With St. Paul, also, celibacy is the ideal state. There are, indeed, few teachers who have ever proceeded on a lower or coarser view of marriage than St. Paul. "It is better not to marry at all. But still it is better to marry than to burn." Marriage is little more than a concession to the weakness of human nature.

¹ Lev. xii. 2-4;
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There is not the slightest glimpse of the higher aspect
of marriage, and none of its social significance. The
absence of teaching for the family and of pictures of
family life are striking to one who comes to the New
Testament without preconceived ideas. I shall
discuss later the disastrous effects of this on the
whole fabric of Western civilization.

Among the selected disciples of Jesus there were
no women. His reply to the woman of Canaan, who
was begging him to cure her daughter, was: "It is
not meet to take the children's bread and to cast
it to the dogs." His retort to his mother: "Woman,
what have I to do with thee?" is also significant.
He quite endorses the savage conception of the
uncleanness of woman in his greeting to Mary Magda-
lene after the resurrection: "Woman, touch me not."
Thomas, it is true, did feel the wounds in the Master's
side. But, then, Thomas was a man.

(To be continued.)

SINCERITY

By Rudolf Pickthall

A philosopher has said: "It is humbug that greases
the wheels of Humanity." Like most sayings of most
philosophers, and all epigram-merchants, it is but
a half-truth—a more or less graphic presentation of
one side of a question. The other side could be put
just as truly, and infinitely more crisply; but neither
must be blindly accepted as the whole truth.

Thus, in our own day, the minds of those whom
our strictly utilitarian system of State education has
cast upon the world in a condition of intellectual
myopia, are soothed by terse aphorisms in the daily
Press described as "To-day's Great Thought" or
"Motto for the Day"; "Calendars" compounded of
"thoughts" from poets and persons eminent, and
otherwise: "selections" from the world's most
tedious "thinkers"—Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius,
Emerson and Ella Wheeler Wilcox—and absorb, without knowing it, a vast amount of what the Americans term "guff"—that is to say, smug platitudes—half- or even quarter-truths—as though each were in itself a complete Gospel.

Indeed, our conception of Life and its meaning is built up of such broken, higgledy-piggledy fragments of Truth; and it is only by carefully sorting, as it were, the pieces, and making them fit into each other in the manner of a jig-saw puzzle, that we can hope to get at the whole picture, or a just idea of any coherent part of it.

It is a tedious business, and most folk have no time for it, preferring to content themselves with a fragment here and there, and to pretend to the knowledge which they have neglected to seek further.

Humbug may be defined as the process of pretending that something is which is not. In so far as it must necessarily entail falsehood, it is, of course, to be deprecated; but in the practice of life it is everywhere prevalent, and its very prevalence may be taken to furnish, in some sort, its justification.

A certain measure of Humbug is essential, nowadays, in all civilized communities. There is, first, what we may call Ceremonial Humbug—the formal stateliness that has outlived its day, and now survives in a frankly purblind and practical generation, with something of the effect of a fifteenth-century Cathedral in a Garden Suburb. It is magnificent, but it is not Life.

The gracious old-world pageantry that still clings about the Throne and its occupant: Heralds and Pursuivants, Garter King at Arms and Rouge Dragon; State Coaches and Yeomen of the Guard; the dignified fiction whereby we still refer to "His Majesty's Army" and "His Majesty's Navy"; the King addressing his "faithful Commons," knowing full well that 30 per cent. at least have, at one time or another, spoken or written disrespectfully of his
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Crown or person; the crime of High Treason for which a man may be condemned to death with all the solemnity of the Law on one day, and receive a free pardon the next; and, in a lesser degree, the pleasant camouflage of "the honourable member" and "my honourable friend," and the rest (wherewith Parliamentary abuse takes on a semblance of old-time courtesy), by tacitly assuming the presence of such essential qualities as loyalty and breeding, tend to create and preserve an atmosphere in which those qualities—supposing that they already exist—may continue and flourish.

These things are Humbug, no doubt; but it is the presence of such Humbug, and the sense of dignity and decency which it confers, which have so far preserved our Houses of Parliament from the disgraceful scenes with which effervescing democracy has too often disgraced the legislative chambers of Europe.

Then again, Edwin and Angelina on the brink of matrimony, and perusing delightedly the terms of the Marriage Licence, by virtue of which they will shortly be made one, can scarcely restrain a little thrill of gratification when they read that their "Right Reverend Father in God, John" (let us say) "by Divine Permission Lord Bishop of So-and-So," greets them as "his trusty and well-beloved" children; and they study the rest of the document with the greater zest—and, it may be, a truer understanding, for that very reason.

They know well enough that their Right Reverend Father aforesaid is completely unaware of their existence; that the very parchment which causes them such pleasure has perhaps never been within a hundred miles of his Right Reverend gaze; that if they, on the strength of that fatherly interest of his, ventured to call upon his Lordship and crave his blessing, the interview would be an awkward one, involving all sorts of difficult explanations and mutual discomfort; but, in spite of that knowledge,
they yield—however little—subconsciously to the spell of the illusion which gives a semblance of actual, worldly practical reality to the vague awfulness of the most mystical of religions.

So this too is Humbug: yet they are not the worse for it; nay, rather, for a moment, very distinctly the better.

The solemn ceremonial attendant upon Christian matrimony may seem to some persons to be Humbug. The Marriage Service, with its exhortations, explanations, blessings, and its motto, as it were, “Whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder,” may be contrasted unfavourably with the strictly business-like proceedings before the Registrar—especially when we consider the number of those so sacredly and indissolubly united whom man (in the persons of the Judges of the Divorce Division) do annually purport to “put asunder.” Yet I fancy he would be a foolish person, and one destitute of the larger vision, who would deny that the maintenance of that service is of distinct value in bearing witness that man is still striving towards the ideal union, the which is in nowise to be attained without the blessing of God. The Humbug here is, if not a blessing in itself, at least very far from a curse. Nothing which may avail to turn men’s thoughts, even for a moment, towards the things above, is useless—much less is it harmful.

Again, in everyday life, Humbug is the very pivot of comfort, and indeed of social intercourse; and this Humbug of Social Observances may very properly and, almost without reservation, be deemed a blessing, the lack of which no man would lightly dare to contemplate.

Mrs. Brabazon Jones and Mrs. De Courcy Smith, detesting one another with a deep and feminine hatred, are on terms of sisterly affection when they meet by chance in the hospitable drawing-room of Mrs. Eglinton Brown. They are pretending that
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something is, which, in fact, is not. Otherwise, there would be a scene painful to all concerned, and more especially to the unoffending Mrs. Brown.

We hear that the youthful son of a chance acquaintance A, has won a scholarship at Balliol, and, on meeting the proud father in the train to town, we shake him warmly by the hand, congratulating him in the most cordial terms on his son's success. As a matter of fact, we have no real feeling in the matter one way or the other, and A knows it quite well; but he does not, for that reason, resent the little deception, nor does he feel the less kindly towards us in consequence. It has, in fact, done us both good in a way.

I met a friend by chance at Victoria, a friend I had not seen for a long time, and whom I hardly expected ever to come across again. "Hullo!" said he. "Fancy seeing you! How splendid!" I responded suitably. "How are you?" he continued; and I told him that I was well enough, but suffering from a slight cold in the head. "How splendid!" cried he. "And where are you off to?" I told him I was going to Horsham. "Horsham!" he exclaimed ecstatically. "How splendid!" And so, in few words, we parted; but his breezy "How splendid is" had lent a cheery atmosphere to the brief encounter, apart from their humorous aspect; and I could not help feeling grateful to him for a piece of pleasant Humbug.

In our correspondence, too, how useful it is at all times. We address comparative strangers as "My dear Mr. So-and-So," and "remain, with kind regards, very sincerely yours" (or "truly," or "faithfully" or "your obedient servant," as the case may be), and not one of the essential words so used is capable of bearing its own proper significance: while fifty times a day we inquire with solicitude as to each other's health, without the slightest interest in what the answer may be.

The Psalmist said in his haste "All men are liars,"
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but we of this present enlightened generation, though we have been taught in the hard school of business training that the hasty assertion is actually nothing but cold, deliberate facts, yet are led by generations of most gracious Humbug to assume the contrary, thereby falling victims to the Confidence Trick in every shape and form. And the higher our training in the Social Virtues, the more readily are we victimized. I am convinced that there are large numbers of us, who, if we came across the expansive stranger who has just come into a large fortune on condition that he distributes it in charity, would take him at his face value, and feel shame at doubting his confederates—would be caught, to put it bluntly, with our eyes open, simply because we shrink from hurting the feelings of a possibly honest man.

And yet, to assume the best of strangers is, in the abstract, no bad quality.

Again, when a friend reads to us with natural pride and trustfulness his recently completed play, poem, essay, or even novel, we unblushingly acclaim it as a masterpiece—or at the very least as “jolly good”—quite irrespective of its real merits, because we know that our opinion matters in reality to him not a bit, and will only, if stated, produce bad feeling—not a better poem. Here, too, the motive is a worthy one—having for its root harmony, and the conservation of friendship.

Such are a few—a very few—of the aspects of Humbug as it appears in the life of to-day; and in every one of them it will be observed that, though there is falsehood involved, yet the incentive is, in itself, not unworthy; and the result, by tacit consent, makes for the smoother working of the social mechanism. Therefore Humbug, or, to call it by its more polite name, Insincerity, has its uses. It is not an unmixed evil. It is a poison—like certain drugs in the case of man’s body—that, properly used, may be beneficial to the organism of human society. When
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employed 'according to the prescription of Tradition and Right Usage, it is a cure for, or rather a preventive of, an infinite variety of social disorders; and, in the affairs of Man, there can be no sort of objection to its reasonable use, provided that malice, deceit and treachery be absent. But it is, first and last, a human expedient. In the things of God it has no place.

Religion, we are told—and rightly—should be part of our daily life, not something different and remote. The thought of God should not be separated from the thoughts of every day. It should influence them, and make them, and the lives which they are moulding, purer and better. To a certain extent the modern world has followed this precept. The thought of God is not exalted or kept apart; it takes its place in the ranks with our other thoughts. But, instead of raising them, it has become itself degraded. We forget the Awfulness of God. We still, subconsciously, seek to visualize Him as One Whom we can deceive as easily, possibly more easily, than we can our fellow-men.

Put thus bluntly, it sounds a little shocking—so we never put it bluntly to ourselves. We gaily continue the practice of Humbug in His sight, quite forgetting that it is ingenuity wasted. It would be pathetic, were it not humorous (and who will deny that humour and the sense of humour are gifts God-given?), tragic, were it not for the residuum of laughter—bitter though it often be—that lurks in futility. Prelates of Christ's Church, drawing comfortable incomes, and occupying positions of social influence and importance solely by reason of their connection with that Church, coquet with Heresy, shake hands cordially with Agnosticism—appear one day at an Intellectual Conference of Modern Thought, denying the Divinity or even the historical existence of their Master, and on the next administer personally to the devout and humble-minded the most solemn sacrament of His Body and Blood.
Such are flagrant examples, which the lukewarm Christianity of the Western world—and more particularly England—regards with an indulgent eye, and almost as a matter of course. It will be urged—and reasonably enough—that this is all that can be expected from a religion which man’s reason is unable to accept, that, in fact, makes no bid at all for man’s reason in the theological market. It is not to be wondered at that its paid servants should mock at its teaching, while drawing handsome salaries for the propagation of the same; should preach the Gospel with all the theatrical fervour necessary for winning a suitable prominence in the Sunday papers, and at the same time in pamphlet, book, and lecture spare neither pains nor eloquence to convince the world that that Gospel is at best a random collection of untrustworthy gossip—at worst, the clumsiest of clumsy forgeries.

Christians to-day may be pardoned, perhaps, for failing to attain, or rather for being somewhat lax in their efforts to attain, the lofty, if impracticable, standard set them by their Master, if they have reason to suppose that that Master never existed; or, if he did exist at all, was a cross between an amiable lunatic and a well-meaning impostor. It is difficult to see how any ideal, let alone enthusiasm, could be evolved from such a religion in such a state. No wonder that man “reels back into the beast” and Sodom and Gomorrah live again in the capitals of modern Europe. From all these disadvantages Muslims are free.

There is one truth which holds good universally of all religions that lay any claim to vitality, and that is that Faith without works is vain. The Christian may quite reasonably claim that the Church is not to blame if her teaching has been founded, innocently enough, on a basis of lies—and not lies merely, but foolish lies, such as no sane child would swallow. Being a merely mortal institution, and severely handicapped by lies, she has, in the main, as
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most honest critics will admit, striven to do her best. And what, you will say, has that best been after all but Humbug—Humbug in the sight of God? And yet because it is honest Humbug—if the paradox be permitted—it is not unconnected with immortality. Yet in practice it falls far short thereof.

The Western world has become weary, and sceptical of all things in matters religious—and in that weariness and scepticism lies the new opportunity of Islam. But a mere theory of religion will not satisfy it. Theoretical rules of life and conduct it has had before—they have proved impracticable and the world is sick of them. When it shall find a Faith whereof the followers, one and all—be they high or humble—strive honestly to translate its precepts into terms of everyday life, then the Western world will forget its weariness and take heart again. That is the attitude among thinking men and women who seek for Truth, and will not stoop to superstition—looking for the Faith that will not only strengthen the zealot and inspire the slacker, but also spur the indifferent into active belief.

It is not enough to say “I am a Muslim” unless, by being mindful of the Qur-án and the Holy Prophet and so by contrast with the lower standard of things around you, you prove to the world—your own little world at least—that you cannot be anything else; unless you show by your life and conduct, that yours must be the Faith for which it is waiting—that it is actually a religion more active and vital than that of the average Christian or the average Jew. No taint of Humbug—well-meaning or otherwise—must come near the Muslim where his religion is in question—no breath or suspicion of insincerity—and the waiting West will not have waited in vain.

“And say, Work; so shall Allah see your work, and His Apostle and the believers; and you shall be brought back to the Knower of the unseen and the seen; then He will inform you of what you did.”
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THE KHILAFAT

By Sir Abbas Ali Baig, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., LL.D.

The iconoclasm of Angora in bringing to a pathetic end the glories of the House of Osman by dethroning the Sultan Wahid-ud-Din in November 1922, and, less than sixteen months after his flight, in deposing the Khalif Abdul Mejid, has produced widespread repercussions in the world of Islam and a disconcerting effect on the Khilafat movement in India. The embarrassment of devout Muslims all over the world has been enhanced by the collateral action of the Grand National Assembly in suppressing the Commissariats of Religious Affairs and Pious Foundations. The confiscatory proceedings in regard to the palaces and jewels of the Ottoman princes and princesses are calculated to arouse misgivings that the secularists of Angora are not immune from the communistic influences radiating from Moscow. These misgivings will be deepened by the disclosure that the moving spirit and chairman of the committee, which drafted the Bill deposing the Khalif, abolishing the Khilafat and confiscating the belongings of the innocent descendants of the founder of Turkish greatness, whose name, Osmanli, still differentiates the Turkish Nationalists from other cognate races, was the pro-Bolshevik extremist Younous Nadi.

The argument advanced by the leaders of the Peoples' Party, which holds an overwhelming majority of seats in the Grand National Assembly, that the theocratic conception of the Khilafat is merged in the democratic idea of the new Republic, is too sophistical to find acceptance. It is being rejected everywhere outside the narrow limits of Nationalist Turkey.

It will, however, be recognized by progressive Muslims all over the world that the views of the Ghazi President of the Republic and his supporters that an unreasoning adherence to the traditions of an unrevivable past, in disregard of the evolution of
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new forms of government, are well founded. His condemnation of the Turkish judicial system, which needs emancipation from the hampering chains imposed upon it by unprogressive canonists, should be welcome both to the Muslim and non-Muslim subjects of the Republic. It is undoubtedly an overdue reform. The measures for unifying and modernizing the educational organizations, and for placing religious instruction on a sound foundation in the light of positive knowledge, are calculated to accelerate national progress and to have a far-reaching effect in other Muslim countries. But however much the Muslim world may welcome these and some other reforms foreshadowed in the speech of Ghazi Mustapha Kemal in opening the epoch-making fifth session of the National Assembly, it will find it difficult to reconcile the measure for "freeing religion from political ties" with the historical combination of religious and political power in a single organ which functioned so successfully in building up a great civilization in the haleyon days of the Omiyads of Damascus and Cordova, the Abbasids of Baghdad and the Fatimites of Egypt—a civilization which, according to the testimony of European historians, was unsurpassed in its brilliance and grandeur, and was much superior to what contemporary Europe could show. This magnificent edifice of culture and elegance sank under the pressure of events which had no connection with the exercise of temporal power by the religious head of Muslims, in conformity with the example of the Prophet himself and his immediate successors.

The Muslim world is alive to the fact that the traditional combination of an irresponsible super-sovereign and a super-Imam in the person of the Commander of the Faithful must adjust itself to the changed and changing conditions of the Islamic world, especially of Turkey; and that the Khilafat, in view of the increasing strength of democracy, must
be subject to such limitations as would make it compatible with the concept of the sovereignty of the people—a conception which is in accord with the principles of Islam. It was hoped that the genius of Ghazi Mustapha Kemal Pasha would seek a solution of this complex problem in conformity with Islamic doctrines and traditions. The solution which Angora has found in the abolition of the Khilafat has come with a bewildering effect upon the world of Islam. It was not expected that new Turkey would deprive itself of an august institution associated with its pre-eminence among Muslim countries, and sink to the level of a Balkan State.

The motive underlying this amazing action is traceable, first to the dread of an internal upheaval which might shake the foundations of the nascent Republic, and secondly to a desire to relieve the strain on the exiguous resources of Angora, which is faced with recurring heavy deficits in its budget, by the confiscation of the possessions of the Khalifal family.

This unjust action, which savours of the methods of Moscow, has outraged Muslim sentiment all over the world. It has evoked the condemnation of the strongest supporters of Angora among the Muslims of India. Ismet Pasha’s statement that the sympathy and support of the Muslim world were ascribable to the strength of the Turkish Nationalists and not to the Ottoman Khilafat of Constantinople, has met with an emphatic repudiation everywhere. The Khilafat is declared to be unabolishable by an Assembly of secularists representing only a small fraction of the 250,000,000 Muslims in the world. India, with her 70,000,000 Muslims, rightly claims a correspondingly preponderant voice in the settlement of this momentous question. As the Muslims of India have no axe of their own to grind in this matter and are free from racial or political bias, their views must carry great weight.
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The Ulema of Egypt, true to the traditions of El Azher, have issued an admirable and opportune manifesto denouncing the invalid action of Angora and urging that the Muslims of all countries should without delay organize a representative Congress for settling the question. In the unparalleled circumstances of the situation this weighty manifesto suggests the most acceptable method of dealing with it. In the midst of the rival ambitions and the racial and political considerations which have been stirred in different parts of Asia and Africa by an unforeseen and perplexing event, it will not be an easy matter to give effect to the sound proposal of the Egyptian Ulema, especially as there are no responsible organizations for convening a gathering representative of the Islamic world.

If the Muslims of India accept the Egyptian proposal and bend their energies to the work of carrying it through, a more satisfactory solution of the Khilafat question might be reached than by sending a delegation to Angora, which has adopted an uncompromising attitude and has expressed its determination in advance to reject the counsel of even its friends and well-wishers. Angora will probably not stultify its decision by sending any representatives to a General Conference of Muslims. The attitude of the pro-Khilafat Turks will depend on the power of Angora to bend them to its will and purpose.

Should the election of a generally acceptable Khalif not materialize, the Khilafat may possibly divide itself into a number of territorial Khalifs or super-Imams like those of Morocco and Sana, or the recently proclaimed Khalif of the Hejaz. In any case the apprehension that the Angora coup may be fraught with disastrous consequences to Islam is unjustified. Islamic history records the extinction of four dynasties of Khalifs. Abdul Majid is the twenty-fourth Khalif to be deposed. Despite the vicissitudes of the Khilafat and the political misfor-
tunes of Muslim nations which have led to the disintegration and decline of their ancient empires, Islam as a world-religion has not only maintained its vitality against the onslaughts of other creeds, but is still a spreading faith, and its followers are on the increase in places where the influence of the Khilafat is not felt. But this fact does not do away with the necessity of the institution both as a religious factor and as a supreme unifying force in the world of Islam, constituting a rallying centre and a nucleus of Muslim culture.

A satisfactory settlement of the question which now faces the world of Islam bristles with almost insuperable difficulties. If Mustapha Kemal Pasha assumes the Khilafat as President of the New Republic, Muslim India may acquiesce, though recent happenings have brought about a revulsion of feeling against him. The pathos which marked the dethronement of Abdul Majid—a man of high character, talents, and refined tastes, who filled his exalted office with dignity and in conformity with the tenets of Islam—and his message to the Muslim world after his expulsion have aroused universal sympathy for him. His words invoking the blessing of God on his oppressors “for the good of his country” have touched every Muslim heart. But the great achievements of the Ghazi are still fresh in the memory of his co-religionists, and his election would cause the least dislocation in present conditions, especially as the combination of temporal power with religious function in the person of the Khalif would appeal to Muslim sentiment.

The melodrama of King Hussein’s acceptance of the Khilafat offered to him by his two sons and his and their adherents will leave the main currents of Muslim thought unruffled. The Holy Cities of Mecca and Medina are an important asset in his possession. His Hashimite descent may have some value in the estimation of Arabs. But no sanctity attaches to
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the Koreish, who were the bitterest persecutors of the Prophet. Racial inequalities are repugnant to the spirit of Islam, which inculcates that all Muslims are "equal like the teeth of a comb," and that personal merit alone is a factor that counts.

King Fuad of Egypt is the head of the leading Arab nation of the world. His election may be more acceptable to the Muslim world than that of King Hussein. He is a more cultured and enlightened potentate, still in the prime of manhood.

Aman-ullah Khan, Amir of Afghanistan, is a monarch whose antecedents and status are in some respects better than those of other aspirants. He is progressive and enlightened, and is imbued with a desire to strengthen Islam and to advance its renaissance. Above all, he is absolutely independent of any non-Muslim control or influence. But his capital is remote from the centres of Muslim culture and from the Holy Places of Islam.

In India the names of the Nizam of Hyderabad, the foremost Indian prince, the Begum of Bhopal and other Muslim potentates, may replace the name of the Khalif in the congregational prayers on Fridays, if the election of a generally acceptable Khalif presents insurmountable difficulties.

Whatever the fate of the Khalifate may be, there can be no set-back to Islam as a great world-religion.

THE EVOLUTION OF ISLAM AND THE TURK

By SA'ID FÉLIX VÁLYI

"Whoever sees, sees to his own profit: whoever is blind, is so at his own expense."—THE HOLY QUR'ÁN.

When the Editor of the Islamic Review did me the very great honour of calling upon me to explain, at one of the gravest moments of the World's History, the real significance of the Angora Decision, I at
once felt the immense responsibility of pronouncing clearly on so vexed a problem. The moral unity of Islam depends at this moment on what happens on the confines of Asia and Europe, in Western Asia especially, which, so often and so dramatically, has influenced the evolution of mankind. The passions let loose and the appetites at stake prevent most of us from seeing plainly into this imbroglio. Human thought appears to lose its rights in face of blind passions and prejudices; but, in spite of an appearance to the contrary, ideas continue to govern the world behind those collective emotions. Let me recall here some of the ideas, by the light of which we shall be enabled to understand the bearing and profound significance of the events which are taking place before our eyes in Asia Minor. We are not here concerned with racial or party policy; my part is only to state one of the greatest problems of world politics on a ground which seems to me in keeping with the teaching of the Holy Prophet and of the history of ideas in the Islamic World, as well as with the lessons to be learnt from the Philosophy of Human History in general.

I.

The recent decision of the Grand Assembly of Angora to expel the Turkish Imperial Family has just reopened the fundamental problem which interests all Muslims. Since the fight for independence started by a handful of Turks in 1919, on the morrow of the Greek landing at Smyrna, Islam has been in ferment. The occupation of the seat of the Khilafat, the complete foreign grasp on the Holy Places of Islam, have powerfully contributed to that ferment, of which the beginning dates back to the first Balkan War, in which the Muslims discovered, for the first time, what they called Europe's betrayal of them. It was then that a Muslim delegation from India came to Europe, under the leadership of Muhammad Ali and Sayed
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Wazir Hasan, to protest to Sir Edward Grey, then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, against the abandonment of the Turks by England. When, in December 1912, Muhammad Ali appeared for the first time in London as the delegate of the Indian Muslims, a certain number of Peers and Members of the House of Commons surrounded him in the hall of the Hotel Cecil, which was decked with Turkish flags, where he made his famous speech proclaiming the solidarity of Indian Muslims with Turkey. I remember being profoundly impressed, when, under the chairmanship of the late Hon. Aubrey Herbert, M.P., the official delegates of the Indian Muslims began their political banquet with a prayer for the Sultan Khalifa. However, the loyalty of the Muslims of India to the English was from of old a favourite subject of discourse for many writers, and the creator of the Imperial Crown in India, Lord Beaconsfield, himself considered Islam as the pillar of the Anglo-Indian system. This suddenly discovered solidarity between Bombay and Stamboul, proclaimed in London in 1912, surprised the English greatly, but remains uncomprehended till to-day; although Muhammad Ali returned to the charge in 1920, going so far as to demand an audience of the Pope (who received him very well), and to try to get in touch with the Sorbonne, in order to make the best of Europe understand the motive which impelled him to espouse the cause of Turkey.

The surprise of the world was no less when, in these last days, the grand Assembly of Angora proclaimed, on March 3rd, the final downfall of the House of Osman, suppressing, by one stroke of the pen, the old conception of the Personal Khilafat. What? For years the Muslim leaders of India reproach the British rulers with undermining the position of the Sultan-Khalif, with making common cause with the Sultan’s enemies; a member of the English Cabinet, Mr. Montagu, was led by a solemn
telegram from the Viceroy of India to raise his voice in favour of the Khilafat, and fell as the result of an indiscretion in March 1922; and after, the Turks themselves get rid of an institution which has existed for six centuries, and which was for so long the rallying point of Orthodox Islam. The Powers who tried to get possession of the moral control of the Sultanate of Stamboul, by opposing it to the Angora Nationalists, are perplexed before this phenomenon of Muslim psychology, and scent in it a new chance of regaining the sympathies of the partisans of a temporal Khilafat.

II.

For centuries, European unanimity in favour of the Christians of the East, and against the Turkish Muslims in particular, seemed assured, first by religious solidarity, and next by the hypothesis, more or less gratuitously propagated by superficial or too passionate observers of Islamic life and doctrine, that Islam is the enemy of human progress, and that there is nothing to be hoped from the Turks, nor from Muslims in general, from the point of view of modern science. According to that theory, every attempt to replace the Muslim States by formations either Christian or controlled by Christians ought to be welcomed. Those who, for reasons of toleration, forgave the Muslims their religion, concentrated their disdainful judgment on the Turks, who ought, in their opinion, to disappear as a nation, to make room for a State less refractory to exterior ambitions. It was in the name of modern ideas, so-called, that the Turks, probably the most maligned and most hated race in history, were thus condemned.

I have no room here to retrace the historical genesis of that ferocious sentiment of Turcophobia which is revealed in most Anglo-Saxon speeches, whether it is a question of Mr. Lloyd George, or of the head of an Anglican or Baptist Church. In the
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eyes of those who know the East, the massacres do not suffice to explain it; for irrefragable witnesses have proved that the Christians of the Levant have borne a very active part in these massacres. Besides, the history of every people abounds in such regrettable incidents, which remind us how erroneous is the amiable theory of philosophers and poets deifying humanity—that mere phenomenon of political zoology! Certainly passions, evil as well as sublime, played their part in the events in the East, but the history of the real moral responsibility for the racial and religious strife of the last century has not yet been written in an impartial manner.

Here I may indicate some of the factors which have helped to bring about the dangerous antagonism which sets the West and the East by the ears. Among such factors, the theologians of the two hemispheres are in the foreground, while economic appetites, more or less avowed, are wrapped up in beautiful humanitarian theories for the benefit of simpletons. The theologians who have got hold of the Eastern question seem to me the victims of a politico-religious literature little calculated to advance the hour when the moral union of mankind would permit of the noblest aspirations to be realized. This special literature, based, on behalf of the East, on artificial theological explanations of the original teaching of the Holy Prophet, has nothing to do with the true spirit of the first Muslim centuries, when Democracy and Freedom of Thought and of Discussion were considered the very basis of Islam.

III.

If anything ought to reassure the world, it is precisely the downfall of Eastern Autocracy, and the proclamation of the Turkish National Sovereignty. After the fall of the Hapsburgs, of the Hohenzollerns, of the Romanoffs, that of the Sultans is historically logical. It is the end of an old and obsolete formula
of Oriental absolutism. It is a great impulse to the future reforms, which must be elaborated in the calm after peace has been restored in the Near East. But it is important from now onward that the world should remain neutral and objective in this fight of the new Muslim forces against the old formulas. It is important that nobody should lend aid to the Muslim reaction against the Turks, who, this time, truly represent a sincere effort to adapt their institutions to new principles. The Grand Assembly of Angora, that renovation of the old government form of the Kourgultai, is certainly not the last stage of Turkish evolution. It must not be judged by isolated gestures, but as an original attempt to restore the vote to the people in a country which, in half a century, has seen a tyrant, a weak-minded man and a traitor succeed one another in the seat of Muhammad the Conqueror and Suleyman the Magnificent. An immense revolutionary process has been opened in Islam, and we see only the beginning of it. Let us wait and watch.

What we know for certain is that the teaching of Islam is not opposed to what is happening. The eternal conflict between the principle of Freedom of Thought and the principle of Theological Bondage recommences; some Muslims of the old school are to cry out Atheism and accuse the Turks of impiety. However, the elective principle is at the very foundation of the Islamic policy, of which the faculty of adaptation is contained in the institution of Idjma, the consent of the majority of Muslims to each new proposal. The principle of Idjma contains in germ the faculty for Islam to move and evolve freely. It offers a timely corrective to the tyranny of the dead letter and of personal authority. It has proved, at least in the past, the principal factor in Islam's capacity for adaptation. What might not its continuous application in the future bring to pass?

Driven to choose between the principle of Idjma
and the stereotyped theological authority, between the reformation of Islam by the new spirit of the Muslim nation, and the maintenance of an institution fallen captive to the foreigner, the Turks have overthrown an artificial tradition which has never had the pure Islamic doctrine on its side. The old and dramatic dilemma, which so long by conflicts paralysed the evolution of Islam, is once more stated. Is it the moment for Muslims to weaken the Turks who have at last given, of their own initiative and without foreign pressure, the great impulse of Islamic reformation?

From the point of view of pure Islamic doctrine, all new ideas are perfectly compatible with the teaching of the Holy Prophet Muhammad if they have the approval of the *Idjma*. The principle of *Idjma* signifies “that which is accepted by the whole Muslim community as true and right should pass as such. All that has the general approval of the followers of Islam is right and claims to be recognized obligatorily, and it is right only under the form which general approval, the consensus of opinion, gives to it.”¹ The only valid doctrinal authorities are the men and writings recognized as such by the general sentiment of the community, and that, not in Synods and Councils, but by an almost unconscious *vox populi*, which in its collectivity is held to be infallible. The Khilafat ought to be conferred upon the most worthy by the general votes of the community.

We see now what are the principles which the Turks can invoke to justify their action which has opened the problem of the transmission of the *Imamat*. Certainly, Angora claims to find the solution of the problem in its own sphere of influence. It is on that point that the discussion in the Muslim World, which demands to be heard, will be concentrated. Already voices are making themselves heard

¹ Goldziher: *The Dogma and the Laws of Islam.*
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from all the horizons of Islam acknowledging Angora’s moral right to govern this immense debate, after having beaten the Byzantine enemy.

IV.

It is important that we should comprehend the problem which confronts us. Islam, which was, at its origin, a small religious community at Mecca, and a primitive political organization at Medina, became a world-empire, and after the crumbling of the great Muslim States became consolidated upon a very elevated sentiment, which makes of the Muslims the greatest human Confraternity in the world. That which unites the human races in the eyes of the Holy Prophet Muhammad is the sense of the dependence of them all on the One God. Listen to the Holy Qur-án:—

Do not separate; remember the benefit of God towards you. For, aforetime, you were enemies, but now He has bound your hearts so that you become brothers.

These noble exhortations were long counteracted by the ancestral customs of the peoples who followed the Holy Prophet; and Islam became a religion of feudalism, like Christianity in the Middle Ages, simply because feudalism then prevailed in the East as in Europe, and the seigneurs of the territories of Islam adapted the religion to the requirements of their cause. The principles of Cæsaro-Papism were imposed on Islam by Zoroastrian influences, at the accession of the Abbasides to the Khilafat, after the fall of the Ommeyades, accused of too worldly conduct.

To liberate Islam from the tyranny of the formalist theological mind, to lead it to knowledge and education, that is the task I would assign to the reformers of the East. Not to encourage the opposition of the bigots, nor to play the game of the die-hard religious party, that is the wish I form for those who are responsible for the Muslim attitude.
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Islam has hardly passed the theological phase of its development, and a host of social and economic conditions are still needed to make of it, or rather make of it again, a Religion of Equality of all men by the evolution of Islamic institutions in accordance with the real spirit of the Holy Prophet's teaching.

V.

The Turkish standpoint as to the Khilafat Problem is nothing more than a new proposal which should be discussed and should serve as an impetus to the revival of Mussulman Thought. The downfall of the Turkish Imperial Family is nothing more than an historical and political incident which, instead of exciting blind prejudices and passions, should induce the Muslim World to reconsider calmly the fundamentals of Islam, and to put away any theological bias based on preconceived judgments.

Mustapha Kemal Pasha rendered the greatest services to the cause of the East: the man who defeated the Anglo-French Army at the Dardanelles, and the Greek Army of Mr. Lloyd George in Asia Minor; who organized and directed the greatest movement which ever succeeded in the East since the partition of Muslim territories among Western Powers; who rules the only independent and modern Muslim State now existing; the man who seems to be the only genius in the present day's World Politics, should have a fair hearing before you judge him from the point of view of the future of Islam.

His opinions should have more weight than opinions of more or less short-sighted theologians, who had opponents even in their day; who, moreover, knew nothing about the needs and sufferings of present-day Islam, having, of course, died long ago. Sectarians who lived in past centuries and had opponents even in their own time, cannot suppress the elementary right of every Muslim of examining afresh the fundamentals of the essential interests of the living
generation of Islam. For Islam is fundamentally and essentially the Religion of Human Freedom: Muslims are only bound to Allah, and they need no intermediary between them and the Almighty. I consider the Turkish point of view as inspiring an attempt to return to the original teaching of the Holy Prophet.

The Holy Qur-án tells us: "You who believe, you have to obey Allah, and those among you who command." One of the greatest scholars of the Sunni world, Mawerdi, defined the qualification of the Khalif by the following fundamental duties: the Khalif has to mobilize the Mussulmans for the defence of Islam; he has to protect the Holy Places of Islam; and he has to administer justice to Muslims. Now, the Grand Assembly of Angora consider themselves as the highest expression of popular sovereignty. The Turkish Republic was proclaimed with a view to administering Justice to the Turkish Nation. Two of the essential duties of the Khilafat are consequently in the hands of those who represent the Turkish people. As regards the principal duty, the mobilization of the Muslim Army and the protection of the Holy Places, the Turkish point of view is that it would be a mystification to let the Muslim World believe that Turkey would be in the near future in a position to repair the terrible wrong done by such Muslims as joined Turkey’s enemies in the late War.

Turkey is determined to work for her own salvation first; to develop a strong and conscious Turkish nation on modern scientific lines; and Mustapha Kemal Pasha’s opinion is, as it appears from his speech of March 1st, that the Khilafat is now vested in the Turkish Republic as a whole, in the fundamental principle of National Sovereignty. The Turkish Army, however, cannot be mobilized for any other purpose than the defence of that Sovereignty.

The Muslims outside Turkey should work first for their own salvation, instead of quarrelling about the
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interpretation of old sectarian texts, which contain matter of contestation.

VI.

Sectarian interpretations of the Khilafat Problem may be the source of grave dangers for the moral unity of Islam. The only standpoint from which Muslims should consider the political position of the Muslim World is the standpoint of the supreme interests of the living generation of Islam. The Holy Prophet never considered himself infallible; he admitted his own errors; why should a true Muslim accept some theologian of the past centuries as a supreme and infallible authority? Why refuse to the greatest living man in the Muslim World, to Mustapha Kemal Pasha, the right to give a new interpretation of the Ikthilaf, the science of Controversy? Why should I consider the brain of those who talked or wrote for Islam as a higher source of authority than the brain of Mustapha Kemal, who conceived and executed the tremendous action which saved the dignity of Islam in the last five years? For Mustapha Kemal and the Grand Assembly of Angora, with the peasantry of Asia Minor, are the savours of the dignity of Islam to-day. Why should I consider the former an infallible source of authority and refuse to take into consideration the point of view of a nation who suffered and died for the dignity of Islam? For the Turks suffered and died, while others talked and talked again. Why should a great historical action like the Turkish Movement have less authority to interpret the original teaching of Islam than any other private individuals?

I will go further: The whole world is in a chaotic state. Tremendous events await the Muslim World in the next ten or twenty years. Islam shall play its great rôle once more. Western and Central Asia, a good part of India and North Africa, are under the spiritual rule of Islam. A great genius is wanted for
the sake of the next generation; a genius who understands the causes of the present weakness of Muslim nations, as well as the real significance of what is happening in the whole world; a genius who is prepared to give an example to Asia as to how she should adapt herself to the new condition of world economies, to modern science and technical knowledge. If Mustapha Kemal and the Turkish Nation agree to take up this great duty, and to transform their people into the commonwealth of a newly modelled Muslim State, based on the original principles of Islam, in accordance with the science of our time, every enlightened Muslim thinker should help them, instead of favouring the reactionary forces which inspire the dogmatists, who are, unfortunately, playing the game of Foreign Powers without knowing the danger of their action.

The continuance of the anti-Turkish propaganda signifies that the world persists in meddling in a moral question vital to Islam, in putting spokes in the wheel of Islamic Evolution. If enlightened Muslims in their great majority will continue to consider the Turks as champions of Islam, and if Mustapha Kemal Pasha would be accepted as the real leader of Mussulman thought, which he aroused from a long torpor; if deep in the Muslim soul, the *Idjma*, the agreement is already made to confer upon Angora the right to direct the Reformation of Mussulmans and to interpret the Khilafat in accordance with the new political and social aspirations of the Muslim nations, let us bow before the choice of the Muslim *élite*, and not play the game of ignorant crowds. Let us rather work with the Turkish *élite* for the revival of the true Islamic traditions, instead of fighting against them in the name of superannuated prejudices. Equilibrium for the world and repose for mankind, the very object of Islam, depend on it.

One word more: The fundamental quality for the
RAMADÃN

Eastern Soul as it appears in Eastern History has always been to accept the great genius. If Mustapha Kemal proves to be a constructive genius, no Muslim should block his way.

RAMADÃN

I.
Rest from thy worldliness a space!
Rest from thy joys awhile!
Lo, Ramadân, the month of grace,
Hath might of cleansing to efface
The stain that doth thy soul defile!

II.
Up from thy couch of silken ease!
Up! for the living light
Of Ramadân is in the breeze,
With ray to smite the dull disease,
That so long wrapp’d thy soul in night!

III.
Time is for thee to cleanse thine eye;
Time is to clear thy mind;
Time is to straight the bent awry;
To rule thy raging passions high,
That else will heav’nly reason blind.

IV.
Fair gardens still must tillèd be:
Work only hath reward:
Fast, and thy life shall fillèd be
With a divine accord.
Subdue thyself! not starve thyself!
And thou shalt surely find,
With heav’nly pow’r thy life shall flow’r,
As ALLAH hath design’d!

BASHIR PICKARD.
ISLAMIC REVIEW

CAUSTIC CAMEO


The West has always looked upon Islam with indifference and as a field for commercial exploitation. Now that Muslims are awaking from a torpor, the West must need change its attitude too. There is almost an epidemic of more or less pretentious books on Islam, of which hardly one will survive for long. One Stoddard comes forward with his Rising Tide of Colour, and the Revolt Against Civilization; others advocate their own theories. The latest contribution is from M. Servier. I confess the effrontery of the author amazes me. I respect a critic, value an opponent, honour an honest historian, but have no sympathy for an opportunist who distorts facts for his own ends. I should be obliged to consider his treatment of the subject disingenuous, if I did not think it merely confused. M. Servier is, in fact, beset by hopeless inaccuracies from beginning to end; nay, his glaring ignorance is exhibited through the book. His memory appears to be undisciplined, and he often forgets on one page what he has written on another, or, indeed, on the same page. He assures us that in Arabia "the possession of wealth confers no title to public esteem" (p. 24), but a little later he describes the inhabitants of that country as "a community where power and wealth alone received consideration" (p. 45). In one place he styles the inhabitants of Mecca: "robbers and camel-drivers, shepherds and husbandmen" who live from hand to mouth and lead a struggling life for their daily bread (p. 33); and two pages after declares Mecca to be an "important social centre" to which commerce brought "great prosperity" (p. 35).

M. Servier takes delight in alluding to the Holy Prophet as "a degenerate Bedouin," and describes
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him as a man “devoid of imagination,” and at the same time of a “contemplative temperament . . . desirous of playing a rôle” (p. 49). Well may the bewildered reader exclaim, “How can a ‘degenerate’ person who is ‘devoid of imagination’ be desirous of playing a rôle?” Truth will out, and on the following page M. Servier mentions that though Muhammad’s efforts were “received with laughter and low jokes,” yet “he was not discouraged”; and that by the use of “his energy and intelligence” he became successful. He takes delight in abusing the Holy Prophet as “a renegade . . . an enemy of religion; an abominable blasphemer . . . an outlaw,” who, in spite of being ridiculed, persecuted, tempted and entreated to “divert from his ridiculous project . . . refused to renounce what he regarded as the true faith.” Why? M. Servier has a ready answer.

He (Muhammad) thought of the injustice of his barbarous society, where the weak were the victims of the strong. He thought of the abomination of the inter-tribal conflicts, and, above all, of that unhappy battle where he had gone through all the apprehension of fright and where he had incurred the disgrace of flight under the eyes of his fellow-citizens. Possibly he may have recalled to memory some of the ideas dear to the Fadhoul: the reconciliation of the tribes by the unity of beliefs and the pursuit of a common object; possibly also he may have thought of the propaganda of the Jews of Yathreb in favour of one God. One God! that would mean the suppression of the idols of the Kaaba, it would be a blow dealt to the authority of Mecca. This ideal pleased him, as it gratified his spirit; and from the spirit of opposition, he was prepared to cherish any projects whose realization would injure the purse-proud Meccans . . . (p. 49).

Such is the fanciful theory of M. Servier; though he is forced to admit “the moral ascendancy of the Prophet” (p. 78). His statements throughout the book are full of obvious blunders; and his references and authorities have been selected at random rather than with the care of a serious writer, and prove him the merest amateur. The forms of the proper names show him to be a dilettante.
In short, with a great appearance of scholarship, M. Servier is a very untrustworthy guide. I will go further, and assert that he hardly knows his object. In his anxiety to prove his theories he sometimes states the contrary. He ignores all historical facts, and logical conclusions carry no weight with him. He exhibits himself in the true colours of an ultramontane, and has always some base motive up his sleeve. The book abounds in them; I give but a few:—

He (Muhammad) served her (Khadija) with devotion and gratitude; for he was grateful to her for having rescued him from misery (p. 46).

Khadija accepted the new faith, . . . a wife could not think differently from her husband: besides, Khadija was fifty-five, and she loved Mahomet (p. 50).

The second disciple of the new prophet was Zaid, his slave; but a slave is certainly obliged to obey his master (p. 50).

Mahomet gave women the right to inherit, and often insisted in their favour. . . . He knew that if a woman is a slave by day, by night she is a queen and her influence is at all times worthy of consideration (p. 69).

He (Muhammad) tried to win over the slaves by making their enfranchisement easier and by recommending it as a meritorious action (p. 69).

M. Servier, in the words of M. Louis Bertrand, who introduces the book, and who asserts that it impresses him as excellent, sets out to “render the greatest service to the French cause throughout Northern Africa, and at the same time to enlighten the natives themselves as to their own past history.” The North African Muslims must in this case be like that rare type of flies that are caught with gall and wormwood instead of honey; for a fiercer assault on Islam and all its works has never been made before.

M. Servier, in his self-imposed task, sets out to know and understand the psychology of the Musulman. To know and understand, he tells us, we must understand Islam and the Bedouin, know and understand the Arab—that is the psychology of M. Servier. One would, perhaps, search in vain to find another
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writer who abominates the Arabs more. He endeavours in vain to make a case against them, and seems to be at his best in exhausting all the vocabulary of abuse.

Briefly his thesis is that an historic lie has got a start—a lie which credits the Arabs with a civilization which they never possessed. The Arabs who have passed for inventors and initiators were in reality nothing but copyists. There is not, nor was, an Arab civilization. The conquering Arab remained always a barbarian; but worse still, he stifled civilization in the conquered countries. The conquered Syrians, Persians, Berbers, Spaniards and others retained their mentality and traditions intact. They continued to think and act as they had always been used to do. Arabic being the official language, they expressed themselves in Arabic; but they continued to think in Greek, in Latin, in Persian, in Aramaic, or in Spanish. After a century of Arab domination there came a complete annihilation of all intellectual culture.

The Arabs, says M. Servier, are the sons of the desert-wandering Bedouin; theirs is the lawless rule of the strongest. Loot is ever their inspiration and arid sensuality when it lies within reach. They are devoid of all imagination; realists who notice what they see and record it in their memories; but are incapable of imagining or conceiving anything beyond what they can directly perceive. The Arabs are a gigantic fraud. They have originated nothing, for they are totally incapable of originality. They have cribbed the romantic literature of India, the philosophy and science of Greece and Egypt, the jurisprudence of Rome, the architecture of the Byzantine and Persian Empires. Even their religion is largely borrowed from the Jews and Christians. Islam, according to M. Servier, is a "politico-religious conception of fanaticism and xenophobia ... nothing but a secretion of the Arab brain ... a doctrine of
death” which has never been an element of civilization, but, on the contrary, has acted as an extinguisher upon its flickering lights.

I have not the space nor the time at my command to enumerate at length the services rendered by the Arabs to the advancement of Science and Art. To begin with, the early Caliphs of Islam received with distinction the learned men whom the fanatical persecutions of Justinian’s successors drove for refuge into foreign lands. The academies of science and philosophy founded by the Nestorians at Edessa and Nisibis had been broken up; its professors and students were refugees in Persia and Arabia. The Muslim Caliphs patronized them and appreciated them.

I do not deny that Greek, Egyptian and Indian philosophers had all made speculations in science and philosophy, but the Muslim scholars not only preserved but built a huge structure on these foundations. To take a specific example, great men like Pythagoras, Heraclitus, Aristotle and Zosimus, as well as many others, had all written on chemistry. But “the educated Greek had a marked distaste for experimental work, which did not appeal to his natural genius.” ¹ The art of experiment, and the correlation of it with theory, was practically unknown in Greece. The establishment of this scientific method was the great achievement of the chemists of Islam.² M. Servier’s statement that a hundred years of Arab domination stifled culture and annihilated civilization is groundless; for the Arabs conquered Syria and Mesopotamia in the seventh century, and it was not until the latter half of the eighth century that Islamic scientific knowledge really began to develop. Again, for centuries Greek and Latin philosophers had been known to the Jews and Christians of Persia and Arabia, to the Spaniards and Berbers; the Nestorians had spread themselves in the dominion of the

¹ Professor Holmyard, Inorganic Chemistry. ² Ibid.
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Khosroes of Persia since the beginning of Justinian’s reign. How was it, then, that there was no further advance? Why did not Greek science and culture exercise any real effect on the intellectual development of Western Asia, North Africa and Spain? How is it that not until the middle of the eighth century do we find any literary or scientific activity of these people commenced in earnest—not until all the varied elements had been made into an organic whole by Islam?

According to M. Servier’s theory, a still worse retrogression ought to have taken place, but, on the contrary, there was an impetuosity in the great intellectual movement which had just been commenced. I will just mention a few achievements of Muslim scientists. In astronomy, they not only made catalogues and tables which are a parallel of their own and one of the chief sources of astronomical knowledge, but maps of the stars visible in their skies, giving to those of the larger magnitudes the Arabic names they still bear on the celestial globe. On the shores of the Red Sea, and again at Kufa, by the aid of an astrolabe, the elevation of the pole above the horizon was determined at two stations on the same meridian, exactly one degree apart. They, then, were able to ascertain the length of a degree within one-third of a mile of its true value—this at a time when Christian Europe was asserting the flatness of the globe. They introduced the sine and co-sine instead of the chord in astronomical and trigonometrical calculation. They, also, introduced the use of the tangent and secant. They improved on the Indian numerical system and introduced the decimal system. They improved various notations, such, for example, as the introduction of a line to separate the numerator from the denominator of a fraction; the rule of “casting out the nines” to test the correctness of the result of addition and multiplication. They solved quadratic equations, and
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recognized the existence of two roots, which was never done by the Greek. Their discoveries in spherical trigonometry, the obliquity of the ecliptic, the motion of the sun's apogee and other astral bodies (absolutely unknown to Greeks), the latest scientific account of atmospheric refraction (which corrected the Greek misconception as to the natural vision), the introduction of conic sections, the invention of the pendulum, and the measurement of time by its oscillations, are but a few of the wonders achieved by the activity of the Muslim mind.

Muslims discovered some of the most important reagents of chemistry—sulphuric acid, nitric acid, alcohol. The science of medicine, which had already attained a high degree of excellence among the Greeks, was carried far beyond the stage in which it had been left by them. They invented chemical pharmacy and were the first founders of those institutions which are now called dispensaries. In mechanics they determined the laws of falling bodies, and had ideas, by no means distant, of the nature of gravity. They prepared the first tables of the specific gravities of bodies, and wrote treatises on the flotation and sinking of bodies in water. They applied with benefit the principle of Archimedes in reservoirs. They built the first observatory in Europe. The fate of Giralda, the tower of Seville, was not a little characteristic. It was turned by the Spaniards, who expelled the Moors, into a belfry; little did they know what else to do with it.

The effects of this scientific activity are plainly perceived in the great improvements that took place in many of the industrial arts. The Mashad silk, the Egyptian cotton, the armour of Damascus, the Cordova paper, the Morocco leather, the Seville casting, the Toledo blades—one and all unfold the glories of the golden age of Islam, which, to the everlasting shame of Muslims of to-day, remains only

1 Professor Ball, History of Mathematics, p. 157.
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a past history. For now the majority of Muslims, instead of being rulers of the world, are the chattels of a handful of Europeans.

To revert to M. Servier: even if we agree that those men who did great things in science and art were Greeks, Persians, Syrians, Berbers or Spaniards, the fact would still remain that they were more prolific under Muslims than under Christians. The Greeks under the Byzantine Empire, or the Spaniards under the Romans, did not accomplish an iota of what was achieved under the banner of Islam; and no sooner was it withdrawn from countries like Spain than they again fell into an abyss from which Christianity has failed to uplift them.

In conclusion, I cannot help pointing out that if, instead of consulting M. Bertrand, M. Servier had gone to a French student of Islam, he would have been advised to suppress the work. M. Servier in his very first sentence asserts that France holds twenty million Muslims in tutelage; and by the time he has got to p. 265 the number is reduced to “fourteen or fifteen millions.” If the invective of this volume could reduce the number of Muslim subjects under France by 25 per cent. before publication, its publication ought to effect their total disappearance. However, as the English version is already available, I would very strongly urge all English-speaking Muslims to read this book from cover to cover in order to appreciate and understand the Western mind with which they have to cope.

Khwaja Nazir Ahmad.

PRECIOUS GEMS

Acquire knowledge, because he who acquires it in the way of Allah performs an act of piety; who speaks of it, praises Him; who seeks it, adores Him; who dispenses instructions in it, bestows alms; and who imparts it to its fitting objects, performs an act of devotion to God. Knowledge enables its possessors to distinguish what is forbidden from what is not; it lights the way to Heaven; it is our friend in the desert, our society in
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solitude, our companion when bereft of friends; it guides us to happiness; it sustains us in misery; it is our ornament in the company of friends; it serves as an armour against our enemies. With knowledge, the servant of Allah rises to the heights of goodness and to a noble position, associates with sovereigns in this world, and attains to the perfection of happiness in the next.

* * * * *

To listen to the instructions of the learned for one hour is more meritorious than standing up in prayers for a thousand nights.

* * * * *

The ink of the scholar is more holy than the blood of a martyr.

* * * * *

He who leaves his home in search of knowledge, walks in the path of God.

* * * * *

He who travels in search of knowledge, to him God shows the way to paradise.

* * * * *

The acquisition of knowledge is a duty incumbent on every male and female.

* * * * *

Seek knowledge even unto China. 

MUHAMMAD.

UNITY OF ISLAM AND THE KHILAFAT

By The Maulvi Muhammad Ali, M.A., LL.B.

[We print verbatim a short article from the pen of the Maulvi Muhammad Ali, President Anjuman-i-Isha’at-i-Islam, Lahore, which appeared in the Light of Lahore. The advice of the Maulvi Muhammad Ali should be considered well by Muslims all over the world; for its message—Islam, the unity of Islam should take precedence over all, even the Khilafat—is the only solution for the present upheaval in the Muslim world.—Ed.]

The decision of the Angora Assembly has come as a surprise to the Muslim world, and great excitement prevails among Muslims, especially in India. Of all the important Muslim peoples of the world, the Indian Muslims are in the best position to arrive at a solution of the difficulty. Besides having taken a deep interest in that question for the last five years, they have no personal end to gain as is the case with the Arabs and some other Muslim countries, which by
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advancing their own claims, are only making the situation more difficult and complicated. The Indian Muslims are therefore in a position to lead the opinion of the Muslim world, but they too must realize their great responsibility and cease to make excited speeches, calculated only to make matters worse. The importance of the question demands the coolest consideration, with due deference to what is laid down in the Holy Qur-án, and sayings of the Holy Prophet.

The most important point to be borne in mind is that the unity of Islam must not suffer in the discussion of this question. The greatest service that the Khilafat can render to the cause of Islam is to strengthen the ties of the Muslim world, which, in fact, is of utmost importance to Islam. If in our enthusiasm for the Khilafat we deal a death-blow to the Union of the Muslim world, we defeat the very purpose for which the Khilafat ought to exist. To call the Turks apostates, or enemies of Islam—the very Turks whom till yesterday we believed to be the greatest champions of the temporal power of Islam—is a disservice to the cause of the Khilafat. Even if the decision of the Angora Assembly is tantamount to the absolute abolition of the Khilafat, all that can be said against them is that they do not believe in the Khilafat as beneficial to the cause of Islam. But the ties of Islam are broader and rest on deeper foundations than that of the Khilafat. I do not minimize the importance of the Khilafat, but I do not think that the Union of the Muslim world rests solely on the institution of the Khilafat. If it rests on any one thing, it rests on the principles of Islam, regarding which all Muslims are as one compact body. To overstate a case is as great an error as to understatement. If we recognize the Khilafat as the very essence of Islam, then we shall have to exclude the Shia world in the first place from the pale of Islam, and some other sects would follow suit. And under the present circumstances the Turks as a nation
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will also have to be excluded, while the exclusion of the Arabs is a foregone conclusion. Our first duty is to bear with all differences of opinion so long as there is an agreement on the principles of Islam. To look upon the Turks as enemies of Islam because they have abolished the office of the Khilafat, is the greatest of errors which would shatter the very foundations of the Unity of Islam.

I do not propose to discuss the question of the Khilafat in this brief statement. I intend to give expression to my views in a pamphlet to be issued as soon as possible, but I may add a few words here. The Khilafat means successorship to the Holy Prophet, and during the whole history of Islam, only that power has assumed the title of Khilafat which ruled over the Arabian Peninsula in which the Holy Cities of Mecca and Medina are situated. Essentially, therefore, the Khilafat was lost to the Turks with their loss of Arabia, which was the result of the unfaithfulness of the Sharif, and the machinations of the European Powers. I do not mean to say that they were not entitled to assume the designation of the Khilafat after the perfidious action of the so-called King of Hejaz. The Khilafat was still theirs by right, and if they had waited patiently they might have come to their own in the course of time. But all the same what has now happened is not, to my mind, the abolition of the institution of Khilafat, but the giving up of a word which, under the circumstances, carried no significance for the Turks. I do not justify their action; I think they would have been better advised to keep what was theirs by right, until God should have brought about circumstances that might have restored them to their former position in the world. But in spite of what they have done they are the best friends of Islam and the supporters of its cause. It is now for the Muslim world to solve the question of how to re-establish the Khilafat, which it can only do with patience and
O THOU ETERNAL ONE

coolness. There is no cause for disappointment, as
the Khilafat has been subjected to severer trials than
this, and has reappeared with greater glory. The
action of the so-called King of Hejaz in assuming a
title which he does not deserve, thus making the
situation more critical, must, however, be condemned
in the strongest terms.

O THOU ETERNAL ONE

[This sublime ode to the Supreme Being was written by the
celebrated Russian poet Derzhavin. It is rendered into English
by Sir John Bowring.—Ed.]

O Thou Eternal One! whose presence bright
All space doth occupy—all motion guide:
Unchanged through Time's all-everlasting flight,
Thou only God; there is no God beside.
Being above all Beings! Mighty One!
Whom none can comprehend, and none explore;
Embracing all—supporting—ruling o'er,
Being whom we call God—and know no more!

In its sublime research, philosophy
May measure out the ocean deep—may count
The sands, or the sun's rays; but God! for Thee
There is no weight or measure; none can mount
Up to Thy mysteries; reason's brightest spark,
Though kindled by Thy light, in vain would try
To trace Thy counsels, infinite and dark;
And thought is lost ere thought can soar so high,
Even like past moments in eternity.

Thou, from primeval nothingness did call,
First chaos, then existence. Lord, on Thee
Eternity had its foundation; all
Spring forth from Thee; all light, joy, harmony,
Sole origin—all life, all beauty, Thine;
Thy word created all, and doth create;
Thy splendour fills all space with rays divine;
Thou art, and wert, and shall be! glorious! great!
Life-giving, life-sustaining Potentate!

Thy chains th' immeasured universe surround;
Upheld by Thee, by Thee inspired with breath!
Thou the beginning with the end hast bound,
And beautifully mingled life and death!
As sparks mount upwards from the fiery blaze,
So suns are born—so worlds spring forth from Thee!
And as the spangles on the sunny rays
Shine round the silver snow, the pageantry
Of Heaven's bright army glitters in Thy praise.
A million torches, lighted by Thy hand,
Wander unwearyed through the blue abyss;
They own Thy power, accomplish Thy command,
All gay with life, all eloquent with bliss.
What shall we call them? Piles of crystal light?
A glorious company of golden streams?
Lamps of celestial ether burning bright?
Suns lighting systems with their joyous beams?
But Thou to these art as the moon to night.

Yes, as a drop of water in the sea,
All this magnificence in Thee is lost.
What are ten thousand worlds compared to Thee?
What am I then? Heaven's unnumbered host,
Though multiplied by myriads, and arrayed
In all the glory of sublimest thought,
Is but an atom in the balance weighed
Against Thy greatness—is a cypher brought
Against infinity! What am I then? Naught!
Naught! But the effluence of Thy light divine,
Pervading worlds, hath reached my bosom, too!
Yes, in my spirit doth Thy Spirit shine,
As shines the sunbeam in a drop of dew.
Naught! But I live, and on Hope's pinions fly
Eager towards Thy presence; for in Thee
I live and breathe and dwell; I lift my eye
Even to the throne of Thy divinity;
I am, O God, and surely Thou must be!

Thou art! directing, guiding all. Thou art!
Direct my understanding, then, to Thee;
Control my spirit, guide my wandering heart;
Though but an atom 'midst immensity,
Still I am something fashioned by Thy hand:
I hold a middle rank 'twixt heaven and earth,
On the last verge of mortal being stand,
Close to the realms where angels have their birth,
Just on the bound'ries of the spirit-land.

The chain of being is complete in me;
In me is matter's last gradation lost;
And the next step is Spirit—Deity.
I can command the lightning and am dust!
A monarch and a slave; a worm, a god!
Whence came I here, and how? so marvellous!
Constructed and conceived? Unknown this clod
Lives surely through some higher energy;
For from itself alone it could not be.

Creator! Yes—Thy wisdom and Thy word
Created me! Thou source of life and good!
Thou Spirit of my spirit, and my Lord;
Thy light, Thy love, in their bright plenitude
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Filled me with an immortal soul, to spring
O'er the abyss of death, and bade it wear
The garments of eternal day, and wing
Its heavenly flight beyond this little sphere,
Even to its Source—to Thee—its Author there.

O thought ineffable! O visions blest!
Though worthless are conceptions all of Thee—
Yet shall Thy shadowed image fill our breast,
And waft its homage to Thy Deity.

God! thus alone my lowly thoughts can soar,
Thus seek Thy presence—Being wise and good—
'Midst Thy vast works admire, obey, adore!
And when the tongue is eloquent no more,
The soul shall speak in tears of gratitude.

DERZHAZIN.

CORRESPONDENCE

Sir,—Being at heart an ardent student of Islam, I venture to take the liberty of writing to you with a view to obtaining your advice.

The beauty and profound understanding of the Koran is undoubtedly something which cannot fail to draw the admiration of any man who cares to study it. A most remarkable fact about the Koran is that it has not suffered at the hands of the translators as other books have done. All Moslems of the East, both far and near, understand, love and respect the Koran as it was written, and feel that it is the word of God. Another remarkable fact about the Koran is that there has not been and there is not one who can write anything to equal its beauty, philosophy and simplicity; and that, in spite of its being so voluminous, one can find quite small boys who know it by heart; whereas a much smaller book could never be so learnt, simply because it would not appeal to them as does the Koran.

It is almost impossible for a Mohammedan to forsake the study of his Koran when once he has begun it; because it is so beautiful and inspiring, and contains nothing but what is true.

Another outstanding point about Islam is that its fundamental principles are so simple; there are no complications; the latter are absolutely conspicuous by their absence.

What calls for admiration more than anything is the respect Moslems have for other religions and other prophets. I have studied the lives of some Moslems, and have found them to be perfect types of really good living Man. Their customs and habits, while differing from those of the followers of other faiths, are undoubtedly those of God-fearing men.

Unfortunately, Moslems are generally looked down upon as a people without virtue, especially as regards the treatment of their women. From what I have seen and learnt, there is no man so
capable of taking proper care of his wife as the real Moslem. The Moslem laws in this respect are extremely severe. While on the subject of law, I cannot help admiring the wonderfully complete sets of laws which the Koran contains. These were once the only laws the Arabs had to follow, who, guarded by their disciplinary and socialistic principles, rose from being the weakest nation to the greatest, and achieved mighty conquests.

As regards the first and most important principle of the Mohammedan religion—i.e. "There is no God but one, and Mohamed is the Prophet of God"—I accept and believe this. I do not believe that Christ was the son of God, but I believe that he held the same place as Mohamed, i.e. a Prophet of God, as also was Moses, etc.

I hope you will understand from the above that, although it is hardly a preface to the Mohammedan religion, I am a Moslem at heart; my difficulty is how to be acknowledged as such.

It is on the question of conversion that I am anxious to consult you. I am very keen to become a Moslem, and I should be very happy if you would honour me with a reply, during your leisure, in order to enlighten me. I remain, yours etc.,

J. H. D.
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This comprehensive work, in a much-needed field of study, is recommended to those who are interested in all that pertains to the Semites, particularly the Arab section, in things historical, linguistic and religious. The learned author traces the history of the Semitic languages from the earliest times, as, for example, the Phœnician, Babylonian and Berber idioms, and indicates the links of resemblance and the forms of speech handed on from race to race since the earliest Semitic Arabs, devoting detail and attention, moreover, to the forms of dialect existing in the Arab speech of to-day. The book is exceedingly well compiled, and cannot fail to be of interest to Muslims and all students of Arabic.
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
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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.
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