

The Islamic Review

Edited by AL-HAJ KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN.

XIII.]

[No. 2

SHA'BAN, 1343 A.H.

Subscription, 10s.

FEBRUARY 1925.

Single Copies, 1

CONTENTS.

A Fraternal Muslim Group to Welcome the Earl of Craven and the Countess of Cathcart ..	<i>Frontispiece</i>
Notes.. .. .	PAGE 41
Al-Haj Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din — Universal Brotherhood in Islam—"The Moslem Menace" —"Poisoning Islam"—A Muslim Centre in London.	
The Religion of Peace and Love. By Al-Haj Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din	46
"The Moslem Menace"	52
The Fire-Worshippers. By Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din ..	59
The Five Pillars of Islam. By F. H. A.	66
European Biographies of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. By Maulvi Abdul Majid	67
The Tolerance of Islam. By A. W. Azzam	72
Spiritual and Political Revolutions in Islam. By R. G. P.	75
Correspondence	77
What is Islam?	79

THE HOLY QUR-ÂN

With English Translation and Commentary, printed on high-class India paper, and bound in green flexible leather, price £2 10s. ; Pluvinsin, £2 ; cloth, £1 10s. Postage and packing for all qualities: United Kingdom, 2s. ; abroad, 4s. Prospectus and sample pages sent free on application. Apply to "Islamic Review," The Mosque, Woking, England, or to Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Ahmadiyya Buildings, Lahore, or to "Islamic Review" Office, Azeez Manzil, Lahore, India.

PUBLISHED AT
THE MOSQUE, WOKING, ENGLAND

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
وَنُصَلِّ عَلَى رَسُولِهِ الْكَرِيمِ

THE ISLAMIC REVIEW

SHA'BAN, 1343 A.H.

VOL. XIII.

FEBRUARY 1925.

No. 2

NOTES

Al-Haj Khwaja Kamal-ul-Din.

The Striche Hall of the University of Aligarh was crowded in every part on the afternoon of the 21st November last, when Al-Haj Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din arrived to give the first of a series of lectures to the students of the Muslim University.

The lecture had been arranged by Sahibzada Aftab Ahmad Khan Sahib, Vice-Chancellor of the University; Mian Muhammad Sharif Sahib, Provost of the University, presided, and among those present were the Vice-Chancellor and very many of the leading Muslim citizens of Aligarh. The Lecturer was introduced to the audience by the Provost, who dwelt at length on the services of Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din in Europe and elsewhere. The lecture, which was a miracle of learning and eloquence, lasted nearly an hour and a half, but there was no sign of anything but eager interest throughout, among all the vast audience. Speaking on "The Present Needs of the Muslims in India," Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din explained the urgent need of self-exertion, the fatal perils of sloth and indifference, and pointed out how, by following and seeking, as far as in us lies, to emulate humbly and reverently the attributes of Allah, as revealed in the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Holy Qur-án, we may, in truth and in deed, "rise on stepping-stones of our dead selves to higher things."

Universal Brotherhood in Islam.

On the same day, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din was invited by the students of the Intermediate College, Aligarh, to open the Students' Theological Society at the Minto Circle. Here again the hall was thronged, and the Principal of the Section of Theology of the Muslim University, who presided, warmly congratulated the students on their good fortune in having among them on that, to them, historical occasion, a personality so holy as that of Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din; who had devoted practically the whole of his life to the service of Islam. In his lecture, which had for its subject "Universal Brotherhood in Islam," Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din aptly contrasted the so-called "sects" of Islam with the numberless and violently opposed divisions of Christendom, pointing out that while, throughout Islam, fundamental principles remained fixed, and immutably the same in all the "sects," the differences being a very trifling matter, the sects, both of Christianity and Hinduism, were at hopeless variance one with another on matters fundamental.

In a third lecture, based on the Saying of the Holy Prophet "Die before actual death," Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, after a very lucid exposition of the Principles of Islam, laid strong and eloquent emphasis on the essential importance of our subordinating our selfish desires to higher ideals and to a noble Cause. To achieve success in the fullest and truest sense, we must annihilate ourselves for others.

Subsequent lectures had for their themes "The Existence of God" and "Islam in England with Christianity on the Wane," and all were largely attended and followed with rapt attention.

"The Moslem Menace."

At a gathering held recently at Woking, in connection with the Church Missionary Society, the

NOTES

Vicar of Christ Church (the Rev. R. B. Jolly), in winding up the proceedings, concluded a breezy address with a reference to the "Moslem religion," and a remark to the effect that "its menace had even reached Woking."

Public opinion seems to have become alarmed as to what this menace might be, and a correspondence (which we give in full elsewhere) straightway ensued in the columns of the *Woking News and Mail*, under the title of "The Moslem Menace," in the course of which, after it had been ascertained that the "menace" in question was none other than the Mosque, a Mr. Morris Roberts aptly suggested that the Vicar, having this same menace at his front door, so to say, should gird on his armour, step outside and grapple with it, by sending a challenge to the adversary to meet him in public debate. The matter had by this time been brought to the notice of the Imam (Khwaja Nazir Ahmad), who lost no time in issuing such a challenge to the Vicar, who, in his turn, while declining to engage in what he was pleased to term "wordy warfare," nevertheless deigned to explain that his reference to the Mosque at Woking was merely intended—more by way of compliment, it would appear, than otherwise—to illustrate the capacity for growth inherent in the Faith of Islam; and to add that he was sending the correspondence to a friend "who had made a study of the matter," and would deal with it in due course.

Of the significance of the incident, of the merits of the respective cases and of the views expressed by the various correspondents, our readers may judge for themselves by turning to the pages in which these things are set forth; but of the attitude of mind which sets up a bogey and runs away from it; which declines to face the issue itself has raised; which shrinks from attempting to make good its words in open debate with its assumed adversary (for Islam is a "menace" to none, save only to the evildoer),

ISLAMIC REVIEW

and finally, which hands over the task of clearing things up to "a friend who has made a study of the matter," there can be no two opinions.

It is entirely typical of the mentality of official Christianity, not only in this country, but the world over, that it will not, or cannot, or dare not, "come out into the open," as it were, and justify its alleged faith at the bar of public opinion and common sense. We are not surprised at the action of the Vicar of Christ Church ; but discretion, when carried to excess, tends to sever altogether its relationship with valour.

"Poisoning Islam."

Under the above title Dr. E. H. Griffin, D.S.O., M.C., the author of *Adventures in Tripoli*, draws attention to a new and shocking outrage which has recently been added to the many which have consistently characterized the conduct of the futile Spanish campaign in Morocco. "It was disgusting," writes Dr. Griffin, "after two days spent in the peaceful atmosphere of Christmastide, to read in the newspapers the terrible news from Tangier that in the zone where the Spaniards are operating against the Moors 'asphyxiating gas bombs have been used and the terror-stricken population is fleeing in all directions.' " We can most of us remember the outcry of horror which greeted the first employment of this devilish method of warfare by the Germans ; and though, in self-defence, the Allies were forced to adopt it, and invent gases more deadly, nobody has had the temerity seriously to defend its use, or to deny that the morality thereof stands to-day precisely where it did at Ypres on that ghastly February morning.

That it should be used against women and children, against the aged, the weak and the helpless, is a crime against humanity, for which Spain—the home of cruelty from time immemorial—should be called sternly to account. But will this be done !

NOTES

And if so, by whom and how? It would almost seem as if here at last was an occasion on which the League of Nations might, without risk, do something to realize the hopes that have been centred in it, and to justify the expense of that new Council Hall at Geneva. But nothing will happen. It is in vain that we seek the Prince of Peace in Christendom. There is, however, another aspect of the matter.

"The questions now arise," writes Dr. Griffin, "Where were the bombs used in Morocco made? Who constructed the aeroplanes that dropped them? Who taught the pilots their duties?" And he goes on to express an anxious hope that the answer to any of these questions does not involve the honour of England. In that hope we share most heartily; but we have our doubts.

A Muslim Centre in London.

The ideal of a Muslim Mosque in London, so nobly and unselfishly abandoned in 1912, on the very eve of fruition, is one towards which all Muslims must strive their utmost, though its realization seems to-day farther off than ever. We have repeatedly dealt with the subject in these columns, and, with the vision before us of the stately building now nearing completion in Paris, asked again and again why the capital of the world's greatest and, we may add, wealthiest Muslim Power should lag behind. The question is asked again by Captain R. Gordon-Canning in a recent issue of the *Westminster Gazette*. "What is the French Mohammedan Power in numbers, wealth and race compared to Great Britain?" he writes. "A third, perhaps. . . . If the British Government would give a grant of £50,000, and a site, there would be a ready response among her Muslim citizens, which would realize the amount necessary for a Mosque and University." The "If" may be a large one, but it should not be impossibly large; and there can be no doubt at all that such

a "gesture" on the part of any Government could not fail to prove of immense value in restoring that goodwill between the Eastern and Western portions of the Empire, which events subsequent to the Great War have tended so grievously to impair.

THE RELIGION OF PEACE AND LOVE

[Being a Lecture delivered by AL-HAJ KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN at the Cowasji Jehangir Hall, Bombay, on Monday, October 18th.]

(Continued from Vol. XIII, No. 1, p. 12.)

WHEN RELIGIOUS WAR IS JUSTIFIED.

You have often heard of "Jihad," the Muslim institution of defending life, property and religion. The Qur-án makes mention of only three objects which justify the religious war; and all these three in defence. Firstly, to defend the person and property against the offender. Secondly, to protect places of worship, to whatever religion they may belong. Thirdly, to establish freedom of conscience and religion. A Muslim belongs to the forces of Allah. Let no one stand between man and his God. "No compulsion in religion," as the Qur-án says. Let every person have his own religion, and the policeman of God, as a Muslim is supposed to be, should come forward to fight with one who forces his religion on another by some form of compulsion. These words of mine may sound strange to you, as the propagandists against Islam, especially in the Western lands, have been giving you all such silly stories of our "Jihad." Read the Qur-án in the light of the actions of our Prophet, because his morals were those of the Qur-án, and you will endorse my views. Let me begin with the first and second object of the Muslim war. The Book says:—

Permission (to fight) is given to those upon whom war is made because they are oppressed, and most surely Allah is well able to assist them.¹

¹ The Holy Qur-án, xxii. 39.

THE RELIGION OF PEACE AND LOVE

Those who have been expelled from their homes without a just cause except that they say : Our Lord is Allah. And had there not been Allah repelling some people by others, certainly there would have been pulled down cloisters and churches and synagogues and mosques in which Allah's name is much remembered ; and surely Allah will help him who helps His cause ; most surely Allah is strong, mighty.¹

This is the first permission to fight given to the followers of the Prophet, who, as the Qur-án itself describes, were those upon whom war had been already made by their enemies, and who were oppressed, and who had been expelled from their homes. And again the Book says :—

Drive them out from whence they drove you out . . . but if they *desist*, then there should be no hostility.

Who could impeach this permission ?

The wars of the prophets were for the same object. It hardly needs any long discourse to substantiate it. The locality of the first three battlefields will decide it. The Prophet left Mecca to save his life under Divine Order, where he and his companions had been victimized by thirteen years' continuous torture and persecution ; but his enemies would not have him even in Medina, which was at a distance of 150 miles from Mecca. The first battle was fought at Badr, 120 miles distant from Mecca, the enemies' headquarters, and thirty miles from Medina. Uhad was the scene of the second battle, only twelve miles from Medina. The third was an attack on Medina itself. Ten thousand people from Mecca came to besiege the town of the Prophet. Do not the localities of the actions prove conclusively that self-defence was the only motive that led him to come into the battlefield ? After this, the state of war began which brought defence and offence on both sides. But you cannot refer to a single instance where any person was forced to embrace Islam in the days of the Prophet and his Caliphs, at the point of the sword.

¹ The Holy Qur-án, xxii. 40.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

The second object of a Muslim war is to protect convents, churches, synagogues and mosques. And where is there a religion on the surface of the earth which has not an institution like convents, excepting Islam? Christians, Buddhists and Hindus have their convents and cloisters, and a Muslim must protect them. Do not forget that the monasteries and convents and cloisters of Christians belong to that sect of Christianity—the only sect in the days of the Prophet—that puts images of Jesus, Mary and other saints before them when they are in their worship. They do the same thing as some of the Hindus do. But let me interpret the holy verse of the Qur-án in the actions and doings of the Holy Prophet and his followers.

GRANT OF CHARTER TO CHRISTIANS.

The Christians of Nijran came to our Prophet for some concessions, and the following charter was granted to them:—

To the Christians of Nijran and the neighbouring territories, the security of God and the pledge of His Prophet are extended for their lives, their religion and their property to the present as well as the absent and others besides: there shall be no interference with (the practice of) their faith or their observances; nor any change in their rights or privileges; no bishop shall be removed from his bishopric, nor any monk from his monastery, nor any priest from his priesthood, and they shall continue to enjoy everything great and small as heretofore; *no image or cross shall be destroyed*; they shall not oppress or be oppressed; they shall not practise the rights of blood-vengeance as in the Days of Ignorance; no tithes shall be levied from them, nor shall they be required to furnish provisions for the troops.¹

This comes from a king to his subjects, and not as a peace, or treaty made with an enemy, under the pressure of the moment.

After the Prophet come the days of Caliph Abu-Bakr. Khalid bin Walid was the Muslim commander. In his proclamation to the Christians, which guar-

¹ *India in the Balance*, p. 132.

THE RELIGION OF PEACE AND LOVE

antees them their lives, liberty, and property, he declares :—

They shall not be prevented from beating their Nakus and taking out their Crosses on occasional festivals.

This declaration was approved of and sanctioned by the Caliph and his Council.

Beating of Nakus and taking out of Crosses. Where comes the difference if a Nakus is beaten by a Hindu or a Christian ? Where lies the distinction or disparity if a Hindu carries Arti, or a Christian takes out a Cross ?

In the injunction given by Abu-Bakr to his armies, I read the following :—

Do not disturb the quiet of the monks and the hermits, and destroy not their abode.¹

Even in the din of war, a Muslim soldier may not disturb the quiet of a hermit ; how can a Muslim pass the religious places of others, beating drums, seeing that he should not disturb the quiet of the hermits ? I leave my Hindu brethren to their own religious sense. I assure them that in our mosque we revere and remember the name of Allah—"their God and our God," as the Qur-án says. He is one and the same. I fail to understand how religious consciousness feels elevated, if by the beating of drums, the quiet of the Muslims in prayer in the mosque becomes disturbed.

Now I come to the time of the second Caliph. He scrupulously preserved intact the property dedicated to the Christian Churches in Egypt, and continued the allowance made by the former Government for the support of the priests. The Great Caliph, when he entered Jerusalem as a conqueror, visited the Resurrection Church. The time for the saying of the Asar prayer came while he was in the church. The head-patriarch of the Church asked him to say his prayer then and there. But the Great Caliph

¹ *The Sources of Christianity*, p. 182.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

said, if he said his prayer there, the very place would become converted into a mosque by the coming generation; he would do better to go out and say his prayer at a distance from the church. And so it proved. I saw the mosque when I visited Jerusalem. It stands at a distance of several hundred yards from the Resurrection Church, in the memory of the Caliph saying his prayer there. The Christians received the same treatment in the reign of the third Caliph, and the Christian Patriarch of Mery bears testimony to it in the following words :—

The Arabs who have been given by God the Kingdom (of the earth) do not attack the Christian faith; on the contrary, they help us in our religion; they respect our God and our saints, and bestow gifts on our churches and monasteries.¹

RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE.

I do not wish to tax your patience by relating to you the examples of tolerance shown by the Muslim rule, to non-Muslims everywhere. I come to India. Let a propagandist say what he likes. I would ask some Hindu friend to accompany me to Benares. I would ask the custodians of several temples in Benares, that enjoy subsidies and estates for the upkeep of the Hindu temples, to show us their title-deeds. And to the great surprise of my Hindu friend, he will find that those estates are a grant from Aurangzeb. I have got a photo of those title-deeds. And is it not a wonder of wonders that the great tolerant monarch should be blackguarded by those who are interested, in these days, in the division of Hindus and Muslims? You often revere the memory of Akbar the Great. Did he do anything in addition to that which the Qur-án demands from every Muslim to do as regards the religion of others? Go to Kashmir, and you find the same thing. Many of the Hindu holy places enjoy jagirs and estates granted, not by the present Hindu ruler, but by the

¹ *India in the Balance*, p. 133.

THE RELIGION OF PEACE AND LOVE

Great Moguls with Aurangzeb among them. But why have the jagirs of the Muslim mosques and other holy places there been confiscated, and why has the big stone mosque in Sirinagar become closed against Muslims ? That is a matter for consideration by my Hindu brethren.

Hindu brethren, how can you explain your outnumbering us in India if the successful Muslim reign of one thousand years in India, had the Qur-án in one hand and the sword in the other ? And do not forget that the larger number of the Muslims here in India are not the Hindu converts, but the descendants of those who came from outside and settled in India.

From Kashmir I come to Deccan. Does not a big portion of the State revenue in Hyderabad go to support devals, Parsee temples, churches and mosques ? Has not the religion of toleration and peace been acted upon there ? Unfortunately these days of ours have seen desecration and demolition of the temples of God, whether mosques or devals. But the Muslim Monarch of Deccan comes forward, under the dictates of his religion, for the reparation of the demolished temples—a lesson which should be followed by other Indian rulers, Bharatpur among them. And now I give you another example of toleration the like of which you will not find in the history of the world.

Some of the Christian fathers in the days of the Prophet came to the Prophet to discuss with him the merits of the true religion. Muslim hospitality located them in houses surrounding the mosque of the Prophet. They remained guests of the Prophet for several days, and then came Sunday—the day of the Lord, with the Christians. For a Muslim, the whole of the earth is his mosque ; but the Christian guests had to find a church in which to pray to their God ; and where would they find one ? - But the Prophet of Love and Toleration comes to their rescue. He offers them the very mosque to be used by them as

ISLAMIC REVIEW

their church, and what a matter of surprise! The very House of Allah, where God, Who is neither begotten nor begetter, was worshipped, became the worshipping place of those who believe in the begetter and the begotten son of God.

APPEAL TO MUSLIMS.

Muslims, I have to say to you a word more. Yours is the religion of proselytization. Win others to your faith as your forefathers did. Win them for your cause by your actions, by the love you should bear to all, by the peace you are bound to make with others, as "Asalam Alaikum" is your watchword, and by the tolerant spirit which should characterize your thought, your word and your action. Your religion is Islam. It means peace. Transmute your religion into your actions, as a tree is seen by its fruits. God be with you.

"THE MOSLEM MENACE"

[We print below the correspondence to which reference has been made in the Editorial Notes.—ED. *I.R.*]

To the Editor.

SIR,—I have read in your last issue a statement by the Vicar of Christ Church that the Moslem menace had even reached Woking. Does the reverend gentleman allude to the hundreds of Moslem soldiers who are buried at Brookwood and at Horsell? Is this the menace he refers to—men who gave their life to prevent that Christian country, Germany, from ruling Great Britain? I wish the Vicar of Christ Church would state the menace referred to. I understand the Moslem faith is similar to the Jewish religion, the only difference being that the Jews do not want converts, and Moslems hold that all are the children of one God, that Jesus was not God, but a teacher, also no paid teachers, no intoxicating drink allowed. I fail to see any menace to any country in these doctrines.—Yours truly,

November 21, 1924.

MORRIS ROBERTS.

To the Editor.

SIR,—Referring to the so-called Moslem menace in Woking, an attempt was made several years ago to drive this menace out of the district. An Oriental student was brought from

" THE MOSLEM MENACE "

Scotland to do this. The poor fellow, whose parents were converts to Christianity, admitted at one of the lectures at the Mosque that the missionaries did not teach the doctrine of the Trinity abroad. In fact, I do not think he had had the Holy Mystery explained to him before the lecturer at the Mosque did so. The result was he was quickly dropped by his sponsors.—Yours, etc.,

Little House, Mayford, Woking,
November 29, 1924.

G. VICKERS.

To the Editor.

DEAR SIR,—As a member of the Mothers' Union, I am more than surprised at the attitude adopted by our Vicar. Surely a little time can be given in the cause of truth, and an answer to the inquiry letter in your correspondence column from Morris Roberts and others. Also, it would help to remove some of the suspicions that have been formed amongst us for a considerable time, when we are preached at about this menace, and by getting us to be impressed by the so-called dangers of Socialism.—Yours truly,

Woking.

J. B.

To the Editor.

SIR,—I have been informed by older residents in the district that the phrase used by the Rev. Jolly ("Moslem menace") was intended to refer to those who carry on the work at the local Mosque.

The Vicar of Christ Church, I notice from reading the *Woking News and Mail*, is a sportsman, and I think it is up to him to put on his armour and go out to meet this menace by challenging the Mohammedans in Woking to a public debate. I am sure it would be food for thought, and the profits could go to the local hospital fund.—Yours truly,

Horsell.

MORRIS ROBERTS.

To the Editor.

DEAR SIR,—The spiritual problem menace of the Moslems appears to me to be analogous to our great railway services. They all converge into our great city of London, and it does not matter by which route one travels, as they all land us into the desired city. There may be a difference in the comfort of carriages or in the politeness of its officials. We have heard of the heathen man in his spiritual reverence bowing down to wood and stone, etc. (he has risen to the "call," "Return unto Me"). We have also heard of the Protestant Christian who most of all worships the golden calf, but not all. Who has not seen this picture?—Yours faithfully,

Goldsworth Road.

W. S.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

[The following letter from the Imam of the Mosque, Woking, was not printed in the *Woking News and Mail*, having been sent to the Vicar of Christ Church for his approval, which the Imam still awaits.—ED. I.R.]

THE MOSQUE, WOKING.

DEAR MR. JOLLY,—With reference to the correspondence which, as you are doubtless aware, has been going on in the *Woking News and Mail*, wherein the Institution (of which I am the head) has been prominent, I write to ask you whether you would have any objection to the publication of the enclosed letter.

If you could let me know some time before Tuesday next, I should be very greatly obliged.—Believe me to be, very truly yours,

KHWAJA NAZIR AHMAD,
Imam of the Mosque, Woking.

THE MOSQUE, WOKING.

To the Editor.

SIR,—It has just been brought to my notice that a very interesting correspondence has been in progress in your columns for the last few weeks, in which our organization here has been made to play a prominent part. I will not protest against the remarkable assertions of the Vicar of Christ Church.

The attitude taken by Mr. Morris Roberts is, I think, in the highest degree commendable; and I have pleasure in challenging Mr. Jolly to a public debate on the "Divinity of Christ." As the Qur-án is no criterion of truth for the Vicar of Woking, I suggest that the arguments on both sides should be supported from the Bible only. I may state that I believe the Bible, for what in its present form it is worth, to be a Book of God.

I am prepared to pay half the expenses incurred, or to contribute £10 towards them, and the proceeds of the debate should go to any local charity that Mr. Jolly may name.

I suggest the following as a suitable *modus operandi* :—

1. The debate should be written, and there should be no discussion—thinking people will thus form their own opinions.
2. A Committee whereon both sides as well as other shades of opinions will be equally represented should be appointed to make the necessary arrangements.
3. The price of tickets of admission should not be excessive—say 2s. 6d.
4. The *Woking News and Mail* should publish *verbatim* both the papers.—Yours, etc.,

KHWAJA NAZIR AHMAD,
Imam of the Mosque, Woking.

“ THE MOSLEM MENACE ”

CHRIST CHURCH VICARAGE, WOKING.

DEAR SIR,—I have received your letter of the 13th inst. and enclosure, and thank you very much for the courtesy you have shown me in the matter.

It will surprise you to know that I knew nothing of this correspondence until Saturday last, and have not seen the correspondence which is referred to as having appeared in a previous issue or issues of the *News and Mail*.

I have been seriously ill during the last three weeks, which, of course, accounts for my ignorance of the subject ; and, strange to say, no one has drawn my attention to it.

I should be very glad if you would kindly delay your letter, at any rate for a week or so, that I may have time to study the earlier correspondence and consider the matter, especially in view of the pressure of work at the Christmas and New Year season.

I thank you again for your courtesy.—Yours sincerely,

REGINALD B. JOLLY.

The Imam of the Mosque, Woking.

THE MOSQUE, WOKING.

DEAR SIR,—I thank you for your letter of the 15th inst. I regret that my absence from Woking prevented me from replying earlier.

I enclose herewith, for your information, a copy of a letter which I have sent to the editor of the *Woking News and Mail*. In compliance with your wishes, I am withholding the details of, as stated in, my last letter to you.

I hope that you will favour me with a definite reply to my last letter at your earliest convenience.—Yours sincerely,

KHWAJA NAZIR AHMAD,

Imam of the Mosque, Woking.

To the Rev. R. B. Jolly.

To the Editor.

SIR,—With reference to Mr. Morris Roberts' suggestion for a public debate between myself and the Vicar of Christ Church, Woking (for which I am quite prepared), I desire to inform you that I have invited Mr. Jolly thereto. I am, therefore, unable to take any further steps until I have some definite reply from him.

I would, however, point out that the faiths of Christianity and Islam differ only in their respective attitude towards the divinity of Jesus. If to hold such a point of view can fairly be considered a menace, there will be some justification in those remarks of Mr. Jolly, to which I take exception.—Yours, etc.,

KHWAJA NAZIR AHMAD,

Imam of the Mosque, Woking.

December 15th.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

CHRIST CHURCH VICARAGE, WOKING,

December 19, 1924.

DEAR SIR,—I thank you for your letter of to-day's date, and in reply refer you to the enclosed copy of my letter to the *Woking News and Mail* where I deal with the word "menace" in the way in which it was used.

I have been prevented by arrears after illness from going into the general matter, and so I have sent the correspondence to a friend who has made some study of this subject, and he will deal with it in a letter shortly.—Yours sincerely,

REGINALD B. JOLLY.

To the Imam, the Mosque, Woking.

To the Editor.

DEAR SIR,—Owing to serious illness I have been prevented from reading your paper for the last three weeks, and was surprised to find that my name figured in the last three weeks' issues in the correspondence columns, under the title "Moslem Menace." Apparently this correspondence has been going on for a little time, and no one had drawn my attention to it, nor had I seen or heard about it.

I have no desire or intention to be drawn into a wordy warfare on this subject, but feel a word of explanation is required.

The meeting referred to was one addressed by the Rev. G. T. Manley, M.A., secretary for Africa of the C.M.S. It was in the nature of an "At home," for which invitations were sent out in my name to members of the Church generally.

Mr. Manley referred to the amazing opportunities before the Church in Africa, chiefly through the intense desire of the natives in such places as Nigeria, for education. I, in a few words at the close, urged our people to make full use of these opportunities, and stated that in many places it was a case of the native embracing either Christianity or Mohammedanism, for the pagan African is fast breaking away from his old pagan beliefs.

Owing to the increased opportunities of travel, the Moslem trader in Africa is constantly moving about, and, as is well known, wherever the trader goes he tends to propagate his religion. This quite obviously constitutes a challenge to Christianity, and becomes a menace to the progress of our religion. Where, however, Christianity and Islam are on equal terms, the Christian has no fear of it, e.g. Uganda.

My reference to the Mosque at Woking was merely used to illustrate its capacity for growth. On the main question I am sending the correspondence to a friend who has made some study of the matter, and he will deal with it in a letter shortly.—Yours,

REGINALD B. JOLLY.

Christ Church Vicarage, Woking.

“ THE MOSLEM MENACE ”

To the Editor.

SIR,—The Vicar of Christ Church, Woking, has drawn my attention to a correspondence in your columns on the so-called “Moslem menace.” Having had some acquaintance with the origins of the movement as represented in Woking, I send a few lines.

Personally, I think that the phrase “Moslem menace” is ill-chosen, and that for two reasons. It suggests that Moslem propaganda, in Woking or elsewhere, is viewed by Christians with alarm. The very reverse is the case. If, for instance, we ask: What is the difference between the teaching of the Woking Mosque Mission and that of traditional orthodox Islam, we find our friends here putting forward the Fatherhood of God and the universal Brotherhood of Man; all-round religious tolerance; monogamy as the ideal of marriage; the spiritual nature of the joys of paradise. These and the like are Christian ideals, rejected by traditional Islam and imported into a modern presentation of it. Having adopted so much, may we not hope that our friends will assimilate yet more?

The term “menace” may also suggest that one regards the Moslem as a truculent adversary whose downfall is the chief thing that we desire. This is not the Christian attitude. We are far too conscious of our own need of help in reaching towards the great ideal set before us to regard any brother man otherwise than as a fellow-traveller, with whom we would fain share the best that we have found to help us on the journey. But this does not prevent us from feeling grave concern when the attempt is made to turn men from the allegiance to Christ to another as supreme, and the contrast is not felt among Christians only. Not long ago a Hindu gentleman of culture and standing remarked to a friend of mine in India, “We often say of a Christian: If only he were more like Christ; but who would ever think of saying to a Moslem: I wish you were more like Mohammed?” It would, indeed, be a grave loss to humanity if the first of these ideals were displaced by the second.

As regards the proposal of Khwaja Nazir Ahmad to convene a meeting at which prepared papers should be read on both sides, I gathered that his father (the head of the Mission) did not much approve of this method as practised in the recent Conference of Religions. Moreover, printed matter is already available in plenty. *The Ahmadiya Movement*, by Waller (Milford), gives a careful and detailed account of the sect that works in Woking. A briefer up-to-date sketch is to appear in the *Moslem World* quarterly for January (Missionary Literature Supply, Church House, S.W.). The Religious Tract Society (65, St. Paul's Churchyard) has a selection of books on the subject, including a tract, “What is Islam?” The Vicar of Christ Church will, I am sure, gladly answer inquiries as to other publications.

H. U. WEITBRECHT STANTON, D.D.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

THE MOSQUE, WOKING.

To the Editor.

DEAR SIR,—May I crave the hospitality of your columns once again, and I hope for the last time, as far as this topic is concerned? From the letter of the Rev. R. B. Jolly, which was printed in your issue of the 19th ultimo, it would appear that whereas he was “willing to wound” he is “afraid to strike.” If he could not tolerate the continuance of this “menace,” would it not have been better to check its progress? Will he venture? I think not. In any case I think it regrettable that he should have taken shelter behind a “friend who has made some study in the matter.”

Dr. Stanton has, in my opinion, added nothing to the controversy. He finds that “Christian” and “cautious” are synonymous words, and to do nothing seems to be the only policy approved by his experience. Apart from certain groundless assertions, he has said nothing. He mentions four features of Christianity as borrowed by Islam, to wit :—

1. *The Fatherhood of God and the Universal Brotherhood of Man.*—In reply, I quote a Christian authority: “The brotherhood in the Faith of Islam, as in Israel of old, is not, as unfortunately it has come to be in the Christian world, a mere empty phrase, but a very real force” (*Ency. Biblica*, vol. iv, col. 4658).

2. *All-round Religious Tolerance.*—My answer to this is a reference to such exclusively Christian phenomena as the Crusades, or the Holy Inquisition.

3. *Monogamy.*—The ideal of life of Jesus, as well as of St. Paul, was celibacy; but the advice of St. Paul to the bishops has a deep significance for those who think.

4. *The Spiritual Nature of the Joys of Paradise.*—The Muslim conception of Paradise is that it begins in this world, is our own creation, and continues in the next. The Christian conception, however, in the opinion of the Church militant here on earth, deprives the major portion of humanity, the non-Christian, of the enjoyment of any such bliss.

In answer to my suggestion for a written debate, Dr. Stanton cites an imaginary objection of my father, and in so doing evades the issue entirely, though I am glad to note that Dr. Stanton does take my father as an ideal and is prepared, when convenient, to follow his example.

I will not abuse your hospitality by attempting to gain free advertisement for our publications in your columns.—I remain, yours, etc.,

KHWAJA NAZIR AHMAD,
Imam of the Mosque, Woking.

January 6, 1925.

THE FIRE-WORSHIPPERS

THE FIRE-WORSHIPPERS

By KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN

IN my recent sojourn in Bombay I chanced to visit some of the tombs of the Muslim saints ; and among the pilgrims there, representing as they did almost all the creeds and classes in Bombay, I saw a large number of Parsees. The Parsees, as a community, have always appeared to me as a class of decent people, with beautiful ideals of life before them. Their humble and reverent attitude toward the Muslim denizens of the tombs, the spirit of homage which characterized their deportment, induced me to renew my study of the Zoroastrian faith—the religion of the so-called Fire-worshippers, who, monotheist as they claim to be—and they could not be otherwise in the judgment of anyone who studies their philosophy and ethics with the analytic and synthetic eye—could not but pay homage to, and worship, fire—the true and, as they believe, the most perfect manifestation of the Creator, the most living of the four elements, that with “its coalescing tendency,” “soars up” and “purifies all that it touches.”

Man, of all creatures in the universe, happens to have the spirit of worship most deeply ingrained. Nature has saddled him with various behests and cravings ; creating in him divers thirsts and hungers. The varied passions that, on account of these appetites, arise in his breast—desire and anger chief among them—nay, the roots and parents of all other passions—create in him the emotions of hope and fear. These two chiefly accentuate in him the spirit of homage and adoration for those who seem to satisfy the demands of his various desires. He begins to worship those who can bring him the object of his hope, and bows down, out of fear, before those who, in his judgment, can deprive him of things he needs. He cannot distinguish between *the immediate* and *the*

ISLAMIC REVIEW

ultimate cause of all that appears in his surroundings. He jumps to the surface and ignores the bottom; especially if the true consciousness of religion has not dawned upon his nascent mind. Animism, spiritualism, and then element-worship, have each played a great rôle in this connection in ancient days; afterwards becoming merged in Star-worship or Sun-worship. "This great luminary is, to the superficial eye, the primeval source of all life, the origin of all manifestation in the universe, the vivifier and resuscitator of dead matter, the upbringer of all vegetation, the mover of all activities, and, in short, the best bestower of all blessings. Would it be a matter of surprise if the ancient world, with a mind not sufficiently developed to appreciate the true Deity, bowed to the Luminary,"¹ and became its votary? Would it be a matter of wonderment if fire, the direct descendant—nay, "the first begotten son" of that Deity of Light, the only element among the whole world of manifestations in the universe, that keeps its distinctive features, to wit, heat and light, intact in it—became his vicegerent on the earth to receive homage from the worshippers of the Sun? Pure monotheism would go to the real Fountain Head of all light, but the polytheistic tendency, innate in an undeveloped mind, would blight his judgment and benight his reasoning. Man would take the agent for the principal, the husk for the kernel, the effect for the cause, and the immediate for the ultimate. This psychology creates polytheism. All forms of "isms," ranging from *fetishism* to *Man-worship*, thrive under it.

Messengers from God came from time to time to kill such propensities. They brought one and the same message from the Above, that there was no object of adoration but one God, and that all our homage and worship should go to Him, and Him

¹ *The Sources of Christianity*, p. 53. By Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din. The Basheer Muslim Library, the Mosque, Woking.

THE FIRE-WORSHIPPERS

alone. They came to wean the human mind from the Immediate and to transport him to the Ultimate. The Queen of Sheba, as the Qur-án says, was also a Sun-worshipper. She came to Solomon. The wise prophet sought to bring home to her that the sun was not the first source, but a many-grades-removed-creation and agent of the First Primeval Cause, that gave emanation to all we see in the universe; and that it was to Him that all our adoration should be turned. Solomon built a tank and filled it with water. He covered its surface with crystal glass with such exactitude as to leave no chance for the naked eye to distinguish between the water and the glass. The Queen had to traverse the tank before she could reach the place of her interview with Solomon. She naturally mistook the crystal for the water. She uncovered her feet and legs, to cross that which seemed to be water; but the very touch of the crystal, at her first step, undeceived her; and the great truth dawned upon her mind that there was some other Light that was working behind the Sun; that the Luminary was only a Crystal through which His face was showing to the universe; and that her worship, therefore, should go to Him, and not to the great Luminary.

Zoroaster, the prophet and messenger of God, who came to inspire Persia with the true monotheistic verities, had a similar task before him. Those were the days when Sun-worship prevailed in all the countries in the vicinity of Persia. Mithra, Baal, Attis, Adonis, Baccus, Horus, etc., were various conceptions of the Sun-Deity, that received worship respectively from Persia, Babylon, Syria, Palestine and Greece, in the time of Zoroaster and thereafter. The Persians also worshipped another son of Ahura Mazda—Fire. No wonder if, in the frigid mountainous zones of Persia, fire was given precedence even to the Sun. The Sun has his ascension as well as his declination. He falls within the clutches of

ISLAMIC REVIEW

the Demon of Darkness after the autumnal Equinox. For full six months he cannot show his face for so long a period as man would wish him to show it. The night becomes longer and longer. Would not these circumstances, accentuated by the rigour of the climate, bring all human adoration in those regions to this Son of Mazda, the fire, which brings real blessings to do away the evil influence of the Deity of Darkness? Would not Fire bring a constant happiness and inextinguishable light if it be "provided with proper incense," "with proper nourishment," and "with proper upkeep"? Would not the hoary-headed reverend priest in grateful mood exclaim: "Mayest thou be maintained by one of full age! Mayest thou be maintained by one wise (in religion), O Fire, son of Ahura Mazda!"¹

The great prophet of Persia wanted to divert the attention of his people from the Immediate to the Ultimate; and to him—and I may say to every thinking mind of Sufistic tendencies—fire was a true manifestation of the great Author of the Universe. Fire, most certainly, is one of the elements which lead us to contemplate the features of the Great Mind. We know very little of God; we know nothing of His essence; the little we know of Him is our knowledge of His attributes, and that knowledge even has come to us either through His revelation to His messengers or through our contemplation of the various components of His work—the Universe around. The latter, I think, must needs be a true and practical illustration of the former. The great prophets, when speaking of the Almighty and His ways, were compelled to have recourse to the great Book of Nature. The final Word of God, the Qur-án, when speaking of the most Beneficent and Merciful Lord, had to refer to His work in order to substantiate and inculcate the great truth in the following words:—

¹ *Atashnyaish Avesta: VIII; The Nyaishes.* By Manekji N. Dhalia.

THE FIRE-WORSHIPPERS

And your God is one God. There is no god but He. He is Rahman and Rahim, i.e. He who anticipates your need and looks to it beforehand, and His kindness rewards munificently all your works—most surely in the creation of the heaven and the earth and the alternation of the night and the day, and the ships that run in the sea with that which profits man, and the water that Allah sends from the clouds, these give life with it to the earth after its death and spreads in it (all kinds of) animals, and the changing of the winds and the clouds made subservient between the heaven and the earth, these are signs for a people who understand.

We should thank the most Beneficent Lord, and adore Him for all these blessings so necessary for our existence; and should not take these manifestations of His compassion as in themselves objects of worship. Al-Qur-án enumerates all such components of the Universe as have been taken by ancient peoples as gods. It draws the attention of men of understanding to One who created the so-called man-made gods for the service and benefit of man who is the lord, and should not be the worshipper, of Nature.

Men of understanding are those who remember Allah . . . and reflect on the creation of the heaven and the earth—and the things in them—the sun, the moon, the stars, the water, the fire, the trees, and the various other things taken as gods by people—and say: Our Lord, Who looks to our sustenance and maintenance, Thou hast not created all this in vain. Glory be to Thee.¹

In short, all the great thinkers and all the prophets of God, in order to wean the people from the worship of created things, made the very object of their adoration an efficacious means to bring them to the Great Creator. Zoroaster also belonged to the same blessed race. He would follow the same course in elucidating the great truth; it would befit his gracious lips to say the following when addressing “the offspring of the renowned ancestors” :—

I will now tell you, who are assembled here, the wise sayings of the Mazda, the praises of Ahura and hymns, and the hymns of the good spirits, the sublime truth which I see arising out of these sacred flames.

¹ Al-Qur-án, iii. 190.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

You shall therefore hearken to the soul of Nature ; contemplate the beams of fire with a most pious mind. ¹

The last prophet of the world arose at a time when the people of the world all over had become a prey to the worst type of Polytheism. Everything in Nature was a god, to the people on the earth—the sun, the moon, the stars, the clouds, the earth, the water, the fire, the air, the trees and man—in short, each combination of elements and each prominent organism was enthroned on the pedestal of Divinity. No wonder that the pure pages of the Qur-án make mention of all these man-made gods, and declare that they are the creation of the Lord, Who has made them subservient to mankind ; that man is not their minister, but their lord. If Muhammad invites men of understanding to contemplate these things, and thus to reach the sublime truth of worshipping one Great God, Zoroaster did the same when the great master demanded : “ Contemplate the beams of fire with the most pious mind.” The mind, with purity of heart and with untainted nature obeying the above exhortation, cannot but see in the beams of fire the Hand of the Lord Who is on High, to which its flames *soar*, the Hand that is *pure, living*, and all the time, by His *ceaseless movements*, *coalesces* the jarring elements of Nature into one harmonious whole.

Zoroaster has always appeared to me a great guide and teacher from the Lord, and not a mythical conception of Sun-worship, as portrayed by some of his followers in the days of Mythology ; and I have my reasons. Of all the peoples of the Mythological age—from Persia to Ireland, including Egypt—the Parsees have cut quite a distinct figure. Under the Sun-worship cult, the worst of human nature seemed in process of development to its full extent. Their festivals presented horrid scenes of all that may be summed up in the term “ bacchanalian orgies.” Bestial-

¹ *Gatha Ahunaviati* (Yas. xxx. 1, 2).

THE FIRE-WORSHIPPERS

ity, licentiousness and lewdness of character had their free vent behind the scenes in the sacred precincts of the various temples of Sun-gods in Syria, Phrygia, Egypt, Greece and Rome. And the worst of all was, that all these undesirable and unbecoming festivities were given the colour of sanctity by the use of the name of the Deity. To atone for sin, they offered sacrifice, but in some cases it never came short of human sacrifice: only smoke arising out of human gore could please the divine nostrils. I do not wish to perturb the mind of my readers by going into details. Suffice it to say that Satan with all his hosts had usurped God in the heart of men, under the dictates of the Sky-Scriptures of the ancient world. Could Zoroaster be placed on the same pedestal with the other conceptions of the Sun-god, as has mistakenly been done by certain Western writers? To me it smacks of profanity. The history of the Parsees is not the history of the other peoples of the Sun-worshippers. They have observed purity of mind and heart. The Mazdayasnian creed could not have read thus in an expanded form:—

“ . . . seek ye the purity of a saint by casting off Dushmata, Duzhukhata, Duzhvarshta, and holding fasts—Humata, Hukhta, Hvarshta,” (i.e. good thought, good word, good deed).

The charity, the philanthropy, the fair way of dealing of the so-called Worshippers of Fire, could not be inspired by element-worship. The good and noble in man cannot come to the surface except under the light that descends directly from heaven upon the mind of a person whose heart furnishes an exclusive throne for the Lord Almighty, Who is the Fountain-Head of all grace, and the mainspring of all blessings—and among them Fire. Zoroaster was such an one. He came with the same religion as other prophets of the Lord brought to humanity. His teachings could not remain immune from human interpolation like other old creeds under the vicis-

ISLAMIC REVIEW

situdes of time. His teachings, when freed from accretion and additions, will reveal precisely the same truths as were inculcated by the other prophets. To show this, is the only justification for the subsequent pages.

(To be continued.)

THE FIVE PILLARS OF ISLAM

The Faith.

O ecstasy ! To know Thee God and Lord !
The One Existence : be Thy Name adored,
Most Glorious, Merciful, The Truth, The Light,
The Great, The Beautiful ; no mortal sight
Can bear Thy Radiance ; for by Faith alone
Thy Clemency and Majesty are known.
That Thou art God, there is no God but Thee,
Our lips confess, with joy and certainty.
And Muhammad Thy Prophet, too, we own,
Who knew and taught that Thou art God alone.

Prayer.

Constant in prayer, Thy people seek Thy Grace,
And turn unto Thy Holy House their face.

Fasting.

To make the flesh subservient, keep the Fast
As all the faithful have, in ages past.

Almsgiving.

As Allah is all-generous to thee,
Help thou thy brethren in adversity.

Pilgrimage.

To the inviolate Temple take thy way—
Abraham's shrine, still standing in our day—
Learn there God's faithfulness without an end
To him who was His prophet and His friend.

F. H. A.

BIOGRAPHIES OF THE HOLY PROPHET

EUROPEAN BIOGRAPHIES OF THE HOLY PROPHET MUHAMMAD ¹

By MAULVI ABDUL MAJID

EUROPE launched an anti-Islamic propaganda the moment the Muslims—the Arabs—began to achieve victories over the Christian nations. When in the reign of Omar the Great, i.e. in 637, Jerusalem passed into the hands of the Muslims, the Christian Powers, feeling themselves weaker, saw no means by which they might obviate the influence of the Muslim civilization and culture, save those of false propaganda, by direct and indirect means. Since those days Islam has always been depicted in Europe in the blackest of colours. Its promulgator—Muhammad—was branded as a teacher of idolatry. His beautiful name—Muhammad—literally “The Praised”—was distorted to give rise to an English word, *maumetry*,² meaning idolatry. The Crusades gave an impetus to this movement, and went to strengthen all the false notions already existing in the popular mind. Pictures of Muhammad with the Qur-án in one hand and the sword in the other were invented and are a matter of common experience—although not in the form of picture post-cards, nevertheless in ideas—in these modern days of progress and enlightenment. Islam was, and is, regarded as identical with the sword! Thanks to the sporadic efforts of the European

¹ This essay has for its basis the book *Sirat-un-Nabi*, by Schibli Numānī, 2nd edition, Azamgarh (India), 1914.

² Cf. *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, edited by Sir J. A. H. Murray, vol. vi. p. 249, Oxford, 1908. It is painful, and interesting at the same time, to go through the pages dealing with the word “Mohammed” and “Mahomet.” The English language possesses another interesting word due to the kind hands of false propaganda, i.e. *dunce*, meaning “a block-head,” derived from the name of the famous scholastic theologian, John Duns Scotus, d. 1308. Cf. vol. iii. of *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, edited by Sir J. A. H. Murray, 1897.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Orientalists, the false notion has been, in some degree, dispelled.¹

The false propaganda was carried on indirectly when Pope Alexander VII (1655-67) forbade the printing and translation of the Qur-án; and even the Protestants themselves did not venture to publish any rendering of the Book, without appending a detailed and complete refutation thereof, from the Christian standpoint. An unbiassed appreciation only became manifest when an English translation of the Qur-án appeared in 1734.² So great were, and are, the prejudices which an historian had to face!

It was after the lapse of centuries, i.e. in the middle of the seventeenth century—the period of the Renaissance—that we first notice a change. Hearsay was replaced by research to some extent. But now and then men were still not averse to making use of the old prevailing ideas. During this period Europe shook itself free from religious bondage, and at once politics and religion became, as it were, two different provinces. The period of the Renaissance was marked by the appearance of the European Orientalists on the stage of Europe. First-hand knowledge supplanted second-hand knowledge, for it was these Orientalists who afforded Europe an opportunity to listen from the tongue of Islam itself. They translated books from Arabic into the various European languages. But it is noteworthy to learn that all the histories translated by these early Orientalists came from the pens of Christian writers,³ who were inhabitants of Muslim countries.

¹ Cf. *Islam Studien* (Leipzig, 1924), by Professor Becker, p. 332, where he says: "... the acceptance of the Islamic religion was throughout voluntary; nay, it was rather sometimes discouraged. . . . To talk of the spread of Islam through the sword can only be said to have occurred in very, very rare and limited cases." Cf. also T. W. Arnold, *The Preaching of Islam* (London, 1913, pp. 5-6, 421-3, 174, etc.).

² Harder, *Der Koran* (Leipzig).

³ Here are a few of the names: Said-bin-Bitriq Otikos, d. 939, the patriarch of Alexandria; Ibn-ul-Amid Almakín (better

BIOGRAPHIES OF THE HOLY PROPHET

About the end of the eighteenth century European nations had acquired possessions in the East, as a result of which the study of Oriental languages was regarded as necessary. Chairs of Oriental Study were established in the Universities; Oriental Libraries and Asiatic Societies were founded.¹ But the evil seeds which had been sown broadcast could not be eradicated by the few well-meaning Orientalists within a period of a few years. To form a rough idea of the ghastly picture of Islam prevailing in the popular mind in those days, I may refer the reader to the *Rise and Progress of Mahometanism* by Dr. H. Stubbs, M.A., of Christ Church, Oxford, from a manuscript copied by Charles Hornby, of the Pipe Office, in 1705, edited by H. M. Khan Shairani (Luzac & Co., London, 1911), and to the book of Henri de Castries, *L'Islam, impressions et études* (Paris, 1897), which has been translated into Arabic. These books would indicate sufficiently through what sort of spectacles Europe was first enabled to visualize Islam and the Muslims.

All this would, however, be excusable, were allowance made for the period, which was intellectually backward and Church-ridden. But it is certainly surprising to notice that even in the twentieth century writers are found who dare come forward with childish and strange ideas—perhaps to please and delight the public mind! I refer to a certain book, *Islam and the Psychology of the Musulman*, by André Servier (London, 1924), which has been translated from the French. The days are gone when one could say a thing in some corner of the world, and nobody would raise a voice of protest. To-day the

known under the name of Almacinus in the early books of Europe), d. 1278, and translated by Erperius in Latin language; Abul Farj-bin-Anbari, d. 1286, the writer of *Tarikh-ud-Duwal*.

¹ Holland was foremost in founding a Society in the East Indies in 1778. The English followed suit by establishing the Bengal Asiatic Society in 1788 in Calcutta. France started in 1795 a college for the teaching of Arabic, Persian and Turkish.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

world is one ear. It would have been just in the fitness of things had this book seen the light of day five hundred years ago !¹

All the Arabic books dealing with the biographies and the battles of the Prophet were published in Europe one after another, within the period extending from the end of the eighteenth century to the end of the nineteenth century. Rieske, d. 1774, translator of *Abul Fida* in the Latin language ; A. M. Mathews, translator of *Mishkat-ul-Masabih* and its publisher from Calcutta in 1809 ; von Kremer, editor of the *Kitab-ul-Maghazi*, Calcutta, 1856 ; Wuestenfeld, editor of the *Sirat-ur-Rasul*, Göttingen, 1816 ; Professor Th. Noeldeke and de Geoeje, editors of *Tabari* ; Professor E. Sachau, editor of *Tabaqat-ibn-i-Sad*, are some of the more notable names.

The result of all these efforts was that the prejudice against Islam abated, and that a spirit of free research was awakened.

Although the religions can count the names of not a few prominent personages—Buddha, Confucius, Moses, Jesus and Muhammad—yet it is only Muhammad who can claim to be an *historical personality*. When I say “*historical personality*” I mean, that in the whole of the religious world, if we were to inquire which personality it was whose every movement, whose every gesture, whose gait and whose speech, whose likes and dislikes, whose way of talking and mode of eating, whose social manners, whose going and walking, whose sleeping and waking, whose sitting and standing ; in fine, every phase of whose life has been preserved in writing, and has been handed down to posterity, there can only be one answer, and that answer—Muhammad. Jesus Christ’s biographies can only supply us with accounts of three years out of thirty-three years of his life ; in order to gain glimpses into the life of the Prophet

¹ See the review of this book published in the *Islamic Review*, Vol. xii, Nos. 4 and 5, p. 170, by Khwaja Nazir Ahmad.

BIOGRAPHIES OF THE HOLY PROPHET

Moses, we have no other means at our disposal than those of Torah, which was written 300 years after the death of Moses; the holy personalities of India are lost in the clouds of legend and story; while through *Shanama*¹ the religious reformers of Persia are introduced to us.

But in the case of the Prophet Muhammad, in order to examine and scrutinize his deeds and words, the statements of about 13,000 persons who had spoken with him and seen him have been written and handed down to us. And, remember, this was done in days when the art of compiling and writing books was in its infancy! To quote but a few—*Tabaqat-ibn-i-Sad*, *Usd-ul-Ghaba*, *Kitab-us-Sahaba li-ibn-is-Sakan*, *Kitab-li-Abdullah-bin-Ali-bin-Jarud*, *Kitab-ul-Uqaili-fi-Sahaba*, *Kitab-ibn-Hatim-ir-Razi*, *Kitab-ul-Baghawi*, *Tabaqat-ibn-ul-Maqla*, *Istiah*, *Isaba fi-ahwal-is-Sahaba*—in all these are contained the accounts regarding those personages who saw and spoke with the Prophet. Can the world produce the names of so many companions of one single personality? ²

But in spite of all the efforts of the Muslims it is the personality of Muhammad which has been the target of all sorts of European calumnies and abuse for centuries. One who studies the European biographies of Muhammad, and then happens to read one from an Oriental Muslim historian, is astonished at the diametrically opposed points of view. And his astonishment knows no bounds when he glances

¹ An epos "Book of Kings" by Firdausi, circa A.D. 1004.

² To this effect says Dr. Sprenger, a famous German Orientalist, in his preface (p. 1) to *Isaba-fi-Tamyiz-al-Sahaba*, by Ibn-i-Hajr of Ascalon, d. 1449, i.e. the lives of the companions of the Prophet, Calcutta, 1856-73: "There is no nation, nor has there been any, which, like them, during twelve centuries recorded the life of every man of letters. If the bibliographical records of the Mussalmans be collected, we should probably have accounts of the lives of half a million of distinguished persons, and it would be found that there is not a decennium of their history nor a place of importance which has not its representatives."

ISLAMIC REVIEW

at the footnotes and references quoted by European authors in their books ; for usually such footnotes and references are taken from Arabic books. In this brief article I propose to trace the causes of this strange anomaly. I quote the views of the late Professor Schibli, d. 1914, who, in my opinion, seems to have hit the nail on the head.¹

(*To be continued.*)

THE TOLERANCE OF ISLAM

THE historian of to-day cannot find in any period of the world's history or in any part of the earth such a tolerant religion as Islam.

Islam has shown, in the darkest ages and among the most fanatical of nations, the purest tolerance both in theory and practice. According to the former, Islam has consistently taught its followers those ideas that give freedom of thought and liberty of action. The Holy Qur-án declares in more than one place that the differences between peoples and nations are natural and that it is God's will that they should be so.

And if your Lord had pleased, He would certainly have made people, a single nation, and they shall continue to differ, except only those on whom your Lord has mercy ; and for this did He create them.²

And again :

And if your Lord had pleased, surely all those who are in the earth would have believed, all of them ; will you then force men till they become believers ?³

Next a Muslim should turn to the different faiths and examine them and reflect that they too are God's will ; so shall he become more forbearing—more tolerant.

¹ Cf. *Sirat-un-nabi*, vol. i, 2nd edition, pp. 90-94, Azamgarh, India.

² The Holy Qur-án, xi. 118, 119.

³ x. 99.

THE TOLERANCE OF ISLAM

Further, the Holy Qur-án forbids the Muslim to insult even the idols themselves, and makes the idol-worshippers equal to the Muslim, according to the will of God.

Thus we read in the Holy Qur-án :—

Follow what is revealed to you from your Lord ; there is no God but He ; and withdraw from the polytheist. And if Allah had pleased, they would not have set up others (with Him), and we have not appointed you a keeper over them ; and you are not placed in charge of them. And do not abuse those whom they call upon beside Allah, lest exceeding the limits they should abuse Allah out of ignorance. Thus have We made fair-seeming to every people their deeds ; then to their Lord shall be their return, so He will inform them of what they did.¹

Moreover, the Holy Qur-án declares liberty of faith and debars the Muslims from forcing their religious opinions upon others :—

There is no compulsion in religion ; truly the right way has become clearly distinct from error.²

And say : The truth is from your Lord, so let him who pleases believe, and let him who pleases disbelieve.³

Therefore do remind, but you are only a reminder. You are not a watcher over them.⁴

In practice, Islam has given examples without number of its tolerance and piety, and of its brotherhood. For example, it gave equality to the non-Muslims in the Muslim world, and declared for them protection for themselves, their faith and their property ; and this general order and its ruling was given by the Holy Prophet himself : “They (the unbelievers) have the same rights and the same duties as we have, and so we are equal.” Hence the Muslim jurists laid it down that a Muslim is to be killed for killing a non-Muslim ; and further, the Holy Qur-án teaches that the punishment for the murder of a non-Muslim of an allied nation should be greater than for the killing of an actual Muslim of an unfriendly nation. And even the later jurist,

¹ The Holy Qur án, vi. 107, 109.

³ xviii. 29.

² ii. 256.

⁴ lxxxviii, 21, 22.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Ibn Abdin, wrote that perhaps the murder of a *Zimmi* (a non-Muslim subject) is more sinful than killing a Muslim. Space forbids me to mention the numerous examples of righteous dealing with the non-Muslim by the Abbaside Caliphs, who had, many of them, non-Muslims in high positions of power during their rule. Even the most fanatic people of Islam, the Shi'ites in Egypt, employed the Copts (non-Muslims) in the highest offices of State, as is done to-day.

And, in speaking of the Faith, it is well to mention, as a basis for these statements and arguments, the charter given by the Holy Prophet himself to the Christians of Najran in Arabia. It granted to the Christians the complete liberty of religious belief and freedom to observe the same.

Similar in character and scope was the charter given by Omar to the Christians of Jerusalem. Hence arose those privileges and rights of legal independence that afterwards developed into the capitulations granted to non-Muslims resident in Muslim countries.

It is noteworthy that the property of non-Muslims has always been as safe and secure to its owner as the property of the Muslim himself. Nay, it is more safeguarded. For example, if you damage or destroy the wine in a non-Muslim shop, it would be a crime, and punishable as such, and damages would be recoverable under Muslim Law; but not so, if the owner of the wine were a Muslim. The property of a non-Muslim is free from many taxes levied by Civil and Religious Law of Islam. Therefore, the non-Muslim's income and live stock are free from taxation, whereas the Muslim has no loophole of escape. It is interesting to find that the poor non-Muslim, or *Zimmi*, is allowed his share of the very poor-tax from which he is exempt; nay, that he is actually entitled to become a tax-collector of the same tax, and receive remuneration for such work

SPIRITUAL REVOLUTIONS IN ISLAM

as collecting taxes from the Muslims. Further, the non-Muslim, or *Zimmi*, is not compelled to fight in defence of the country in which he lives, and for these exemptions from military duty and taxation he has to pay, if capable, a very small tax ranging from six shillings to twenty-four shillings per annum, according to his standing. Supposing there were two men, one a Muslim and the other a *Zimmi*, and both were millionaires and were alike in wealth, property and live stock. The Muslim would have to pay £25,000 per annum in taxes and 2 per cent. from the live stock. But the *Zimmi*, or non-Muslim, would only be called upon to pay £1 per annum or thereabouts. This is the rule and practice of the so-called fanatic Muslim. What is the rule of the most tolerant Christian on these points? What a contrast would be found if comparisons were tried. No wonder comparisons are odious!

It would be well to mention here, that though the Arabs remained in Spain surrounded by *Zimmis* for a period of eight centuries, yet when the tolerant Christians took over the rule, how quickly they swept away the non-Christians and compelled those who remained behind, by means of the persuasive fire and torture, to embrace their tolerant faith.

A. W. AZZAM.

SPIRITUAL AND POLITICAL REVOLUTIONS IN ISLAM¹

It is unfortunate for those sections of Asia and Africa which have come to be known as the Near East, that they should have become the chosen hunting-ground of the amateur in world-politics. A. will visit, let us say, Cairo, and from the pinnacle of a two weeks' sojourn will launch a lucid exposition of the difficulties and complexities which have been

¹ By M. Felix Vályi. Kegan Paul. London. 7s. 6d.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

baffling the men on the spot (of all shades of opinion) for years. B.'s week-end trip to Damascus will equip him for an equally authoritative ruling on the French mandate in Syria; while a day at Biskra will more than suffice to give C. the experience necessary to enable him to rank as an interpreter of the Sahara and its problems.

Novels, articles in newspaper or magazine, or frankly polemical works that scorn disguise—they are all at one in their quality of special pleading, based on inaccurate information, or insufficient observation; and it is small wonder that the reading public of Great Britain—those of them who have a taste for the more serious aspect of things—tend to become puzzled, bewildered, and, at last, hopelessly at sea as to the real situation to-day in those mystical lands of which we read so much and know so little.

M. Vályi's book is therefore the more welcome, in that it throws a vivid light of intimate experience and actual first-hand knowledge on the tangle which the Great War and the Russian Revolution have wrought conjointly in Asia Minor and the regions contiguous thereto.

His book is divided into three main parts, entitled respectively, "The Turkish Revolution and the Future of Islam," "The Problem of Egypt," and "Russia in Asia Minor." On the first of these topics M. Vályi holds strong views, which, though they may not find universal acceptance among Muslims, are none the less suggestive for being temperately advanced and soundly reasoned. The difficulties which beset the "problem" of Egypt are handled in a lucid and masterly manner, without bias or prejudice, and the author has succeeded marvellously well in so stating the Egyptian point of view that it may appear neither unreasonable nor fanatical, to all whose opinions are not hopelessly befogged by the unscrupulous methods of the syndicated Press of to-day.

CORRESPONDENCE

The recent lamentable occurrences in Egypt lend, if anything, an additional, almost sinister force to M. Vályi's striking picture.

Perhaps the most valuable thing in the book, from the standpoint of pure politics (if the phrase be permissible), is the paper on "Russia in Asia Minor." Here M. Vályi supplies what has long been badly needed—a dispassionate and authoritative presentment of the age-long Armenian problem, and a close scrutiny of the dark web of intrigue and Pan-Slav ambition which Tsarist Russia sought so long and so patiently to weave in that corner of Asia.

M. Vályi's book will be read with real interest by all who are striving for a better understanding between West and East.

R. G. P.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of the ISLAMIC REVIEW.

SIR,—I have been greatly interested by the remarks and articles in your valuable journal relative to Usury in Islam, or, to put it more accurately, seeing that there is not a heap of doubt about Usury, I should say relative to the taking of interest on loans, investments, etc. The article of Mr. Sarwar in this month's [January.—ED.] issue impressed me very much. It was sound; it was learned; it was practical; it was devout. It went straight to the point and then somehow or other missed it; and rode away on what looked to me very much like a quibble. For it is inconceivable to me that Almighty God could have intended His creatures to dope their consciences with such an unconvincing sort of compromise. If it is wrong to receive interest for our money in the way of investment; if it can be shown from the pages of the Holy Qur-án that it is unlawful, then it's got to be dropped. That's how it seems to me. There isn't any manner of use in saying that if we refrain from doing that which is unlawful, we shall be unable to carry on. I reckon Allah will find a way, though it's not easy for us to see how.

Your editorial comment in the same number seemed to me to hit it well. You say there, sir: "We must have perfect confidence in ourselves if we are to be successful; and if we

ISLAMIC REVIEW

take interest, at the same time believing in our hearts that we are sinning against Almighty God, what becomes of our confidence, if we are sincere ? ”

To my mind your remarks in the October number seemed to sum up the case ; but apparently to others they did not, which suggests that there is a considerable amount of serious doubt on the point still troubling many.

I think, sir, it would be an admirable thing if you could arrange for a series of articles dealing with the whole question, from the pens of representative Muslims, or invite correspondence. For myself I should have been content to accept your view ; but as there seems to be so many who think otherwise, I doubt whether I ought to. And this should not be.

I am, etc.,

SHEIKH A. HAFEEZ.

New York.

To the Editor of the ISLAMIC REVIEW.

SIR,—The British Red Crescent Society will be very grateful if you will be good enough to insert the following in the next issue of the ISLAMIC REVIEW :—

Messrs. Coutts & Co., Bankers of the British Red Crescent Society, have received, among other donations for the “ Riff Medical Relief Fund ” :—

	£	s.	d.
H.H. the Begum of Bhopal ..	100	0	0
H.H. the Aga Khan	50	0	0
H.E. Izzet Pasha	25	0	0
H. Gurney, Esq.	10	0	0

Yours faithfully,

AMEER ALI,
President.

A. S. M. ANIK,
Hon. Treasurer.

Friday Prayer and Sermon.—At the London Muslim Prayer House —III, 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.

WHAT IS ISLAM ?

WHAT IS ISLAM ?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ISLAMIC REVIEW

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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