

DELHI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Cl. No.

Ac. No.

Date of release for loan

29 JUN 1967

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below. An overdue charge of 5 Paise will be collected for each day the book is kept overtime.



PAN-ISLAMISM

AND

BOLSHEVISM

BY

THE HONOURABLE

SHAIKH MUSHIR HOSAIN KIDWAI

OF GADIA

BAR-AT-LAW, MUSHIR MANZIL, LUCKNOW, INDIA.

(الشيخ مشير حسين قدوائي)

AUTHOR OF

"*Haqiqi Taraqi*," "Female Education," "The Miracle of Muhammad," "Pan-Islamism," "Islam and Socialism," "*Swaraj* and How to obtain it," "Future of Turkey," "Women under different religious and Social Laws," "The War and God," "*Swadeshi*," "The Standard Bearers of Islam," "The Philosophy of Love," "Hope," "After-effects of the Great War," etc., etc., etc.

LUZAC & CO.,
THE GREAT RUSSELL STREET,
LONDON, W.C.

FOREWORD

This Book is a deliberate **Challenge**. It is a challenge on behalf of Communism (Bolshevism) and Islam (Pan-Islamism) to all other political and social systems. It is a challenge on behalf of Islam to all other religions and moral philosophies and also to atheism.

While it is a challenge to Godless materialists or to stupid atheistic scientists, it is also a challenge to those *Sadhus*, monks and ascetics who neglect those duties which their sojourn in this material world demands of them and which they owe to their fellow-beings in the form of social services.

It is a challenge to weak-minded pacifists and *ahimvaits*; but it is also a challenge to those militant adventurers and revolutionaries who have shown callous disregard to human sufferings—even to human life, who have no principles and no moral code and specially those peoples who have developed a slavish mentality and a sentimentless attitude and indulge in heartless brutalities or who wage wars to exploit the weak.

It is a challenge to Leninists and Trotskyists and Kemalists as to Hitlerites and Mussolinists. It is a challenge not only to the avowed autocrats but also to all forms of autocracies even when camouflaged into democracy or parliamentarianism or republicanism or any religious colouring—a *mahatma* or a *pundit*.

It is even a challenge to those half-educated Mullas and Khwajas (Hodjas) and Mujtahids who have circumscribed Islam with extremely rigid formalism and who have divided it into sects and schisms although the chief object it had in view was to unite all mankind in one cord, one Nation, one Brotherhood.

I do not say that I have succeeded in making the challenge unanswerable, but I do say that if I succeed in arousing Muslims from their sleep then the time will come, and come soon, when Pan-Islamism is organised and triumphant and the future writer on the lines indicated by me will be in a position to offer a challenge not only in words and arguments or by referring to old practices only, but by indicating living examples and patterns, which will make his challenge unanswerable indeed. So far as arguments or references go, the Reader will find that not one of them is unauthenticated whether it is in respect of Bolshevism or Parliamentarianism or Islam or any other religion or institution. I have gone to the most authentic sources in each case and have not hesitated to make long quotations to support my assertions.

I was fully at home with each part of the Book, both Islam and Communism, and as my friend Allama Soalaby of Tunis wrote I had "undeniably a right to present such a Book to the East and to the West."

I have been a Pan-Islamist all my life. For long I have been in touch with the Islamic world. I have studied other religions and political and social Systems also. *Gita* was at one time my constant companion. I have worked in close contact and sympathy with persons of other persuasions—even with those who professed no religion, but I am a Muslim not only by birth but by strong and unshakable convictions. If I were not a Muslim I would have had no religion, and, to be frank, I would have been an extremely defiant and possibly a dangerous member of human society. After deep researches in Islam I have become a confirmed Pan-Islamist.

As to Bolshevism, I was not taken by surprise by it. I foresaw and foretold its coming. I even laid down lines of action and work for it. I came in contact with its advocates soon after its rise. Although personally I could not visit Bolshevised Russia but a few of my friends visited it and described to me their personal experiences.

I had written about Islam being Socialistic, *even Communistic*, long before Bolshevism was born or Lenin came in the field so the similarities now shown between Islam and Bolshevism are not after-thoughts or figments of my own brain.

Thus I was in a better position to write such a Book as I am presenting than many writers. But adverse circumstances intervened.

Although I had spent about twenty years of my life in Europe but it so happened that I had to write this Book not in any free European country where plenty of resources are at one's command and there are not so many restrictions on meetings or writings or speeches, but in poor and slavish India dictated and dominated by aliens, and divided and demoralised by internecine quarrels and sectarian differences and disputes, where bigotry and superstitions have taken the place of religion so much so that even the greatest universal force, moral as well as material, *i.e.*, Islam, has ceased to instil that maddening love of freedom, that moral courage, that self-confidence, that heroism, that defiance of all tyrants, even death, which characterised early Muslims or which were possessed to a certain extent by Muslims of the deserts or hills—Sanusis or Afghans of our age. It is sad to admit, but it has to be admitted, that even 800,000 Palestinian Arabs have shown greater love of liberty, greater courage of convictions, greater attachment to their country than have 90 million Muslims of India.

Such a Book as I have ventured to write does not harmonise with the very atmosphere of India. And to make matters worse both torturous physical pain and mental worries fell to my lot while writing this Book.

During the period of writing both increased and when the Book finished they also reached about their culminating point. The sudden death of my well loved brother, the Honourable Sheikh Makbul Hosain Kidwai, was the severest blow of all. If his grandchildren—my darling boys, Mr. Hamid Nazeer Kidwai and Mr. Ahmad Nazeer Kidwai (who are studying in the B.A. class) had not come to my rescue and had not done most of the proof-reading, I do not think I would ever have been able to get the Book through the press as my son, Mr. Mubashir Hosain Kidwai (M.A., Cantab., Bar-at-Law) who had gone through portions of the typed copy of the manuscript was also busy with his profession and election.

Dear Ahmad and Hamid did their work very diligently and efficiently, but I had been led to give the Book to a press in which it was not only delayed too long causing me great loss and making several topical subjects lose their opportuneness but it came out in a condition not quite fit for circulation. For this reason I had to find a new press and a fresh printing of the whole Book had to be done hurriedly leaving a few mistakes. So the Reader will have to excuse much regarding this work before him. I have another request to make to the Readers and it is that either not to read the Book at all or to read it through from cover to cover.

I frankly confess that I do not expect to please or even to satisfy the majority of the Readers. I may tread on one corn or other of theirs. My object will be served if the Book provokes their thoughts and stirs up their minds for or against my discussions. I assure them in advance that I will not mind their unfavourable criticism nor shall feel flattered by their laudatory remarks, if any. What I want most is to create a critical mind among the young men who have developed a slavishness or idol-worshipping mentality and ceased to think for themselves being overawed by personalities. If Muslims are not awakened to their own greatness and virtues and self-respect even self-assertion then I will think that they are dead and beyond cure (God forbid).

From Pan-Islamists I expect more and that is to gird up their loins to organise Pan-Islamism on truly Islamic lines and on world-wide foundations as indicated in this Book.

Muslims should never forget that Islam is the religion of Nature and does not lay any burden on a soul beyond its capacity (*wala ukalliful lah nafsan illa wusaha*) and that Pan-Islamism is the political, social and economic aspect of Islam and that

International Brotherhood which keeps the ideal of "Mankind forms one Nation" and has *waatasimu bi hablilah jamian wa la tafarrequ* as its motto to insure solidarity and unity for Independence and Progress as indicated not only by me or other Pan-Islamists but by Lenin himself.

Lately there has been a very welcome agreement and understanding between four Muslim States. There was already an understanding between Bolshevik Russia and Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan. This is good as far as it goes. But such understandings are governmental and are on paper only. If paper understandings or Treaties had counted anything Turkey would have been what she was after the Treaty of Berlin which guaranteed her "Independence and Integrity". So what is really wanted is an understanding and a bond between peoples and peoples as suggested in this Book—*i.e.*, active Pan-Islamism not only between Muslims and Muslims but also a lasting harmony between *Bolshevism* and *Pan-Islamism*.

MUSHIR HOSAIN KIDWAI,
OF GADIA,
Gulkada, Mushir Manzil,
Lucknow.

30th August, 1937.

CONTENTS

of

Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism.

Pages.

FOREWORD—This Book is a deliberate CHALLENGE .. .. a—d.

Part I—Similarities

CHAPTER I.

THE "FEROCIOUS WORLD-WAR" AND "THE SOCIAL WORLD-STORM"—BOLSHEVISM, FORESEEN. .. .. 1—5

(1) *Islam and Socialism* favourably received. (2) Political Prophecies (1909) regarding the War, Economic Depression and Bolshevism. (3) Social Reforms indicated in *Islam and Socialism*. Social Reforms anticipated by the Prophet Muhammad. (4) Bolshevism mis-located. English people better suited to carry the mission of World-reforms. (5) "Revenge is Sweet." Lenin and Kemal in a revengeful mood. The chief aims of Bolshevism are grand.

CHAPTER II.

THE POLITICAL AND SOCIAL EFFECTS OF THE GREAT WAR .. 6—21

(6) The "ferocious war" upsets the world. (7) Fascism and Nazi-ism against Marxism. (8) Democracy denounced by Mussolini and Hitler. Dyarchy. Indian Congress. The Nizam of Hyderabad. (9) The toy of Dyarchy fails to satisfy. The New Indian Act a greater fraud. (10) Indian autocracy worse than Italian and German autocracies. (11) Autocracy condemned. A Nation loses its Soul under autocracy. Mandates mean camouflaged annexations. (12) Arabs duped. (13) Germany and her Colonies. Iron hand in Syria and Palestine. Syria divided up. (14) Damascus bombarded. (15) France yielding now. Palestine Mandate dishonourable and against the Solemn Promises. (16) Sinister motive behind the Declaration of the Jewish Home in Palestine. Turkish and German treaties signed under duress. (17) Russo-Japanese quarrel undesirable for Asia. Need of an Islamic Power to serve as a policeman for Europe. (18) Forty years' efforts of the Author to wake up the Muslim Nation. Muslim Leaders are like Rip Van Winkle. New lines for Muslim advance. (19) A coalition and federation of Muslim States urgent. Years ago a counter League of Nations was suggested. Suggestions for the League of Nations. (20) Muslims must not be disheartened. Islam a Great Asset. Scientific inventions but not tango dances. Social changes as a result of the Great War. (21) Social and Educational Reforms.

CHAPTER III.

THE RISE OF BOLSHEVISM .. .. 22—47

(22) Other systems challenged by Bolshevism. Bolshevism became a terror for Europe. Europe's Guilty Conscience. European Powers refuse recognition to Bolsheviks. (23) Trotsky and Lenin save Bolshevism. Islam was even more intensely opposed. Russian Revolution's easy start. (24) Diplomats plotting. (25) Rising in Petrograd. Shooting of Demonstrators. Revolution growing. (26) Petrograd achieved "the February Revolution." No prominent Bolshevik Leader present. (27) Vladimir Ilyich (Lenin) arrives. Lenin insists on two points. The object was not the immediate introduction of Socialism. Trotsky also arrives. Neither Kerensky's nor Lvov's Government successful. (28) Lenin a "devil incarnate." Lenin's Call, "Comrades now is the time of action." A general massacre follows. Lenin entered the Winter Palace. His declaration. Bolshevist *coup d'etat* ratified. (29) Rodizianko the head of the Revolutionary

Pages.

people described by Trotsky as a monarchist landlord and Lord Chamberlain under Nicholas II. It was he who snatched the power from the Czar. Chance, luck, or Fate in favour of Bolshevism. (30) Lenin's and Trotsky's work for the Revolution contrasted. (31) Bolshevism like Islam escaped destruction by a hair's breadth. (32) Trotsky's superiority. Muslims never overawed by personalities. Lenin not a god. (33) The instruments of Lenin's power. Luck with Bolshevists. The first victory. (34) Powers counted without a first class diplomat like Lenin. Wilson's duplicity exposed. (35) The acid test. The double dealing. The Plan of action of the Allies against Bolshevists. (36) Litvinoff apologetic. (37) Lloyd George's political instinct. Sir Henry Wilson afraid of revolt in Ireland, Gibraltar, Malta, India. Palestine and India would have been free and Imperialism shaken. Prinkipo Conference turned down. (38) Kolchak reached almost the gates of Moscow. One by one Trotsky cleared all the fronts. (39) Very strict conditions for trade between England and Russia offered. (40) Wrangel defeated. "Victory could not go to those whose cause was hopeless." Bolshevism like Islam won over all the obstacles. (41) Similarity between Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism in respect of the first peace signed by each. Lenin's greatness in the Peace of Brest Litovsk although it cost great losses to Russia. Lenin possessed the greatest political sense of the age. (42) Lenin refused to take part in the Imperialist War. (43) The Peace at Hudaibiah. (44) Humiliating conditions of the Hudaibiah Peace. Test cases of the Prophet's faithfulness to the harsh terms of the Hudaibiah Peace. (45) *Inna fatahna laka fathum mubina.* (46) Brest Litovsk gave breathing time to the Bolsheviks. Hudaibiah gave an opportunity of the Islamic propaganda. Trotsky and others misunderstood the situation. Lenin alone understood it correctly. (47) Lenin had a Soul.

CHAPTER IV.

THE AIMS AND OBJECTS OF BOLSHEVISM .. .. 48 - 64

(48) Islam the Natural Religion. Leninism is Marxism. "It is the theory and tactics of the Proletarian Revolution," says Stalin. "Leninism is related to Marxism as species to genus," says Mitsky. The items in Bolshevism most frightening to Europe. (49) The Communist Manifesto. The Communist Declaration. (50) Abolition of private land ownership. A repudiation and denunciation of Capitalism and of the policy of the enslavement of the labourers in Asia. Remarks of an I.C.S. propagandist against Bolshevism. The good features of Bolshevism mentioned by a Hindu Scholar, and by a Muslim anti-Bolshevik Propagandist. (51) Mazdak's Communism the worst and Omar's Communism the best model for the best Government, State, Nation, Society. (52) Kolhoizy. Artel. Wages still scaled according to the type of work. (53) The first Five Years' Plan. The second Five Years' Plan. (54) Phenomenal progress in literacy. Will the "Trustees" of India ponder? (55) Agriculture. Industry. (56) Transport and Communication. (57) The Component Parts of the U.S.S.R. Those who do not work have no Franchise. The latest changes in the Russian Constitution as reviewed by Laski. (58) Only one Party. The new legislature different from old. (59) Social Rights. Powers to amend the Constitution. A criticism of the proposals. (60) Independent Judges. The Communist Party yielding some power. Another review of the New Constitution. (61) Development since 1933. Work of Stalin. Provisions as published. (62) Independent Judges. The right to vote. (63) Rights of citizens. Workers only. (64) Five commissariats under the present Constitution. Man under the old Constitution treated as a machine or like the ox of an Indian oil mill. The new changes will bring Bolshevism nearer to Pan-Islamism.

CHAPTER V.

SYSTEMS ATTACKED BY BOLSHEVISM .. .. 65—72

(65) British constitution over-loaded with an aristocratic Upper Chamber and a King who can do no wrong. Ecclesiastics make a class by themselves. The last two general elections undemocratic. Dictatorship

Pages.

of the Conservatives. Czaristic ordinances in India. Dual policy under Ramsay MacDonald in India and under Czar Nicholas II in Russia. (66) Shamness of the Representative System in England. Mr. Baldwin's autocracy. Power in Britain in the hands of a few. Claim of being a representative government in England shaken. (67) Bolsheviks would like to see greater democracy in America and less distinction of colour and race, etc. Nazi-ists and Fascists condemn the British, French and American systems as do Bolsheviks. Prof. Laski also condemns it in his *Communism*. (68) Herr Hitler, Lafarque do the same. Mr. Carter on transfer of power in the hands of the Cabinet. The greatest corruptive factor of the European Democracies. (69) The autocratic powers of the Head of the Executive in India unparalleled in the world. Those have been increased under the New Act. Autocracy and Imperialism of the French are a shade deeper than those of England. (70) Chechetin and Rodek remind the entente Powers of the condition of Ireland, Egypt and India. The greatest evil is the control by Financiers all over Europe. (71) The extension of Franchise is the only democratic measure in Europe. But the representatives of the people are not consulted at critical moments. In India the extension of Franchise means adding insult to injury. Balfour Declaration the handiwork of wire-pullers and financiers. (72) The *pas mal* British people are deceived. Workers illtreated everywhere before the rise of Bolshevism.

CHAPTER VI.

WHY THE MASSES WELCOMED BOLSHEVISM .. 73—81

(73) Man a Social animal. Bolshevists hold that the crowning discovery was that democratic government made no difference to the ordinary man. Mr. Gilbert Stone contests the Bolshevists' view. (74) Mr. Stone forgets India. Indians cannot help preferring the new Soviet System which recognises equal status for Asiatics and Europeans, Muslims and Christians. (75) A vivid contrast between the framers of the Russian and the Indian Constitutions. (76) The promise of the international Socialist family welcomed by Asiatic masses. "India's appalling poverty." (77) English and Russian conditions and Indian conditions contrasted. Cursed be the majority rule. (78) The Preamble of the League of Nations supports the Bolshevik views. Mr. Wilson's fourteen points not acted upon. Weak nations preyed upon as before. (79) Lenin championed the cause of the East. (80) If Muslim Nation makes a common cause with Bolshevism. Popularity of Communism. Different treatment of Communists in India and England. The majority of the people remained poor and distressed under the Parliamentary System. (81) The *best* political system is Communism. A new fetter for the British. Prohibition of wearing uniforms.

CHAPTER VII.

WHY MUSLIMS PARTICULARLY HAILED BOLSHEVISM .. 82—210

(*A*) *Bolshevists destroyed anti-Muslim Czarism* .. 82—88

(82) Fall of Turkey due mainly to the machination of the Czars. Turkey at her Zenith. "Sokelli." (83) Why Turkey's greatness did not endure? Ahmad Kiuprili. (84) Though Younger Pitt changed the anti-Turkish and Pro-Russian policy of Britain but who could believe in the "perfidious Albion"? Turkey's Naval Power destroyed by a British Admiral. (85) British Empire in the East built upon the ruins of Islamic Empire, but Czardom the greater enemy. Djaferoff's speech in the Duma. (86) Massacre of Muslims by the Armenians and Russians. Cross over the Crescent on a Geneva Russian church. Bolshevists removed three thorns from the Muslims' side. Muslims must bless Lenin. (87) Lenin's soul in "the Garden of Peace." A belief in accountability. Mr. Bridgman and Mr. Saklatvala favoured Muslim States. (88) Kemal can lead the Muslim world. Bolshevists liked because they have created an aversion against Muslim

Pages.

Imperialism also. Muslim States can prosper only with a Pan-Islamic outlook.

(*B*) *Bolsheviks helped Muslim States* .. .. 88—210

(88) The condition of Muslim States caused anxiety.

(1) *IRAN* .. .. 89—103

(89) "The Strangling of Persia." Iran divided by Russia and Britain into "Spheres of influence." Prof. Browne quoted. The Persian Oil Company on the lines of the East India Company. (90) British Government acquired shares. Russia more dominant than England : Not an agent as Trotsky asserts. Transaction between Russia and England regarding Constantinople and Iran. (91) Trotsky's offer to Iran. Iran a springboard for the British. General Malleson hanged two dozen Bolshevik officers. (92) Kara Khan's note to the Iranian Minister. Iran utterly helpless. Britain "poured troops into Caucasus". Why ? "Islam knows the answer." (93) Only when Raskolnikov drove the British forces from North Persia did Iran regain its breath of life. Raza Khan formed a new Cabinet. A new Iran arose. A Nation which could produce a Hafiz could not be surpassed in culture. Polished Iranian Representatives in England, personal friends of the Author. (94) India owes much of her culture and civilization to Iran—to Saadi, Firdausi and Hafiz. Bolsheviks rejuvenated Iran. Raza Shah removed evils planted by "mirzas," "mujtahids," and "aghas." Need of good mullas and mujtahids not denied. (95) Half educated mullas and mujtahids are a curse as they want to introduce in Islam the inferior ideas of other religions. But Islam is Islam and Muslims should acquire a commanding position as the best Nation (*Khairan ummatan*). Science the best gift of God must be acquired by Muslims. Muslims invented the clock but have forgotten now to use it. (96) No room in Islam for quarrelling sects. Raza Shah has removed the causes of quarrel among Muslim Schools. Iran should take the lead. Palestine question offers an opportunity for Iran to take the lead. Hosain's example is not to sit and cry and curse but to defy the tyrant and the despot even unto death. (97) The drowsy, weak, wicked, weeping Iran is dead. Raza Shah dismissed foreign military instructors and disbanded the Southern Persia Rifles. Raza Shah had the backing of Lenin's towering personality. The secret of Lenin's greatness. Lenin was no demagogue. He did not float upwards like Hitler or Kemal on luck. Mussolini brainy but Lenin brainier. If Lenin were a mere doctrinaire he would have tried to Bolshevize Iran after the Ghilan Episode. (98) British suggestion of division of Iran turned down by the Bolsheviks. Britain loses influence in Iran. The Anglo-Persian Oil Company. (99) The Government of Iran rescinded the concession by a *communique*. (100) The Resident Director's protesting reply. The richness of the oilfields. The matter before the Arbitration Court but Iran firm. (101) Britain climbs down as is its characteristic before power. An omen from Hafiz. (102) "Jihad, Jihad," at the Congress of the Eastern people. Lenin ready to help Halil Pasha but dissuaded by an Indian. If Lenin had known much of the Islamic spirit the world would have shaken. (103) *Aides toi et le ciel taidera*. Pan-Islamism alone can guarantee collective security for Muslim States.

(2) *AFGHANISTAN* .. .. 103—121

(103) The Tug of War between Russia and Britain. (104) The ex-King Musa Khan and his distinguished Princess. Amir Abdul Rahman Khan. *Daulats Khuda dad*. "Kidwai's Mania." Habibullah Khan. A seaport for Afghanistan. Amanullah Khan and the German mission.

(105) Nobody knows who killed Habibullah Khan. Muslims themselves do not realise the possibilities of Pan-Islamism. Sultan Abdul Hamid and Pan-Islamism. Anwar Pasha and Pan-Turanianism. Amanullah Khan's Nationalism. Mahmud Tarzi. Queen Suriya. Over-Europeanisation of the King and Queen. Agitation in India percolating

Pages.

to the masses. (106) King Amanullah Khan began well. "The Independent Afghan people." Amanullah Khan a Socialist. Godless Powers unreliable. England exhausted. The Afghan army. The Afghan General fires a gun by the help of an Indian Mathematician. The Victorious Peace. "Lenin wished to encourage the Pan-Islamic tendencies of Amanullah." "Fate sends to the Afghan people the great historic task". (107) Lenin a Pan-Islamist. Lenin's mighty genius. The Afghan King's inexperience. Fashions, Dresses and Dances. Unworthy Mullas. The Mullas and King Amanullah Khan. Amanullah Khan's mistakes. (108) Lenin's attitude. Muhammad Wali Khan. Trade agreement with Russia. The subsidy. Amanullah Khan more attentive to the head garment and toilet of the people. (109) Another great blunder. Amanullah Khan's provoking attitude. (110) Amanullah Khan's *khutba* at Bombay: The Author present. The cry of *Allah-o-Akbar*. The Queen's objectionable photo. Two Imperial policies of the British. (111) Afghan King's visit to London and Moscow. Mustafa Kemal's pernicious influence as against the Bolshevik's good advice. Kemal's personal prestige. (112) Author's prophecy fulfilled regarding Turkey. Turkey's misfortunes. (113) Mustafa Kemal's services. Amanullah Khan could not be compared to Kemal Pasha. Every Muslim proud of Kemal Pasha. (114) Afghanistan expected to give a lead. Mulla's ignorance and obstinacy. (115) Social obligations and *Haqqul Ibad*. (116) Mullas on Amanullah's nerves. Mullas got the better in Afghanistan but were overwhelmed in Turkey. Amanullah lacked money, army and friends, while Mustafa Kemal managed to get these. Amanullah Khan got gowns for his Queen, but neglected the army. (117) The Water-carrier victorious. Amanullah Khan fled to Italy. Nadir Shah on the throne. His murder a catastrophe. (118) Afghanistan not so free now. Statesmanship needed more than ever. Italy versus Britain. India well buttressed. Internal position also more secure. (119) Afghanistan must industrialise. Nadir Shah's policy best. Afghanistan's complete independence must be asserted. Russia must not be antagonized. The prospects of Muslim states gloomy but باشد اثر پردهٔ از پهاے پنهان هم مقرر "Allah-o-Akbar" again in the Cordova Mosque. Cloudy outlook in Europe. All European Powers cruel. Rt. Honourable Fisher quoted. (120) The future War. Afghanistan should be ready. An alliance with Muslim neighbours recommended. Air Force should be strengthened, resources developed. A Naval Port. European situation doubtful.

(3) *ARABIA* .. .. 121—135

(121) Marx on religion. Islam not opium. (122) Wonderful transformation effected by Islam. Islam energising. Miraculous early victories due to Pan-Islamism. Derar-bin-Azur. (123) Muslim army in the minority yet victorious. Noldeke quoted. The sword beholden to Islam, not Islam to the sword. Lenin did not consider Muslims to be opiated. (124) Why did Lenin show sympathy with Puritanic, Orthodox Ibne-Saud —a creature of the British? Husain's revolt. (125) Why did the Author condemn Husain's rebellion? Faisal and Djemal Pasha. British Prime Minister's boastful words. (126) The Author's reply. The Jewish "National Home." Arabs courted by Britain to betray the Turks. (127) Like the Arabs in Hedjaz those in Palestine being disillusioned. "*Palestine and Transjordan*" quoted. The Author's interest in Palestine since 1906. (128) Jewish constituencies in England. Why the White Paper was not acted upon? *Entente Cordiale* with the Jews preached and practised by the Author. Prof. Einstein quoted. Author's journey in 1934 to Europe. Sinister ambitions of Zionists. (129) The Quran's warning against the Jews. Mr. Ataturk's blow to Pan-Islamism. The Turkish nation still attached to Islam and to the Prophet. (130) Nemesis overtakes the Arabs. She threatens the British. Mussolini's most marvellous feat. "India will be liberated right here." Italian Naval Base in the Mediterranean. Mussolini not a firebrand like Hitler. Edward VIII's visit to Istambul. (131) Nemesis gives a long rope but *Shavad zalim zi zulme khud kharab ahista ahista*. Husain

Pages.

disillusioned. He turns to the Bolsheviks. Ibne Saud in the field. Husain sent to Cyprus. Ali. Akaba. Faisal got the throne through Indian influence. (132) Ibne Saud captured Jeddah. He thanked Bolsheviks for their neutrality. "Moscow reminds Arabs of the Anti-Imperialist Power." Ibne Saud under the British thumb. The crime of Ibne Saud. His Vandalism. (133) Puritanism of the Sultan Ibne Saud admired. Back to the days of the Prophet and the Khalifa Omar. Good administrative works of Ibne Saud. (134) "The Saviour of Humanity" must be duly respected. The King of Hedjaz held in disrespect by the British. Russia still sympathetic to Arabs. (135) Mr. Fisher quoted. Pan-Arab movement heavier on Imperialism. Arabia will regain her glory.

(4) *TURKEY* .. .. 135 - 210

(135) Turkey growing weaker and weaker. "The sick man." The dishonesty of the European Powers against Turkey. (136) Turkey robbed of her territory. Army under Sultan Abdul Hamid efficient. Edham Pasha smashed up Greece in a month. Edham Pasha's photo with بإذكار الدرس to the Author but he missed this fraternal remark on Mahmud Shaukat's later. (137) Muhammad V on the throne. A new deceitful enemy—Italy. (138) Prophecy of Syed Abul Huda Rafai. Indian medical mission to Turkey. Asquith's bigotry. The Turkish collapse. Lady Halide Edib. Her lectures in India in 1935. (139) Iswolski and his machinations. (140) Young Turks duped. Sultan Abdul Hamid the only far-sighted statesman in Turkey. Old Kamil Pasha's trust in Great Britain proves disastrous. (141) 67,000 veterans demobilised. Ottomanisation and Pan-Turanianism of Anwar Pasha called Pan-Islamism. The causes of Turkish collapse. Pan-Islamism was the only means of solidification of the Turkish Empire. (142) Sultan Abdul Hamid kept up the unity. Author's personal experience of Hamidian espionage system.

(143) Muslims the only people under their secularised State now. Turkey's "only asset" gone. The Balkan butcheries. The Carnegie Commission. (144) The "John Bull" of the East. Madame Edib's expectations falsified and its causes. India's help recognised. Madam's confession regarding Pan-Islamism. (145) Pan-Islamism certainly *not* dead during the Crimean or Tripoli or Balkan or the Great War. Pan-Islamic relations easier now than before. Baiat. Zakat. Author's dreams. (146) The Hedjaz Railway. The brainless Turks. The soldiers of Albania, Macedonia and Arabia linked together by Pan-Islamism. Insult to the Sultan-Khalifa. The Author and Ahmad Raza Bey. The British stick to monarchy. (147) "Secret of England's glory." The British Government encouraged the Sudan United Mission. Mussolini reconciles the Pope. The "Lay Republic" in Turkey. (148) The Muslim citizens cannot take any pride in it. The defence of the "Young Turks". (149) Lenin's compromises. Lenin's statesmanship and sound advices. Why did Turkey join the World War? (150) The irony in alliances. The British confiscated Turkish Dreadnoughts. German influence ascendant. (151) Why did the Turks join the Central Group? The Author and Mr. Montagu. Anwar and Djemal Pashas' mistakes and excesses. (152) Pan-Islamism *always* a living force. Sultan Abdul Hamid and Pan-Islamism. *The fatwa of Jihad.* India's Pan-Islamic agitation. (153) Indians and Turks strangers but for Islam. Salim the Grim's Pan-Islamism. (154) Degeneration and Pan-Islamism do not go together. Turks lack Pan-Islamism. Author engaged in Pan-Islamic work for about 40 years. (155) The *khudamal kaaba.* Allama Shawaish of Egypt. Islam remoulds the Turkish character. Anwar Pasha's war record. Chirol on Anwar Pasha. (156) Turkish losses in the war. Disease in the East begins from its toe—India. Sultan Vaheeduddeen on the throne. The "triumvirate" flies. (157) The Armistice. Entente's excesses. Constantinople would have been Russia's. Secret Treaties regarding Turkey. Arabs defrauded. (158) Provisional government in Russia; it wanted Constantinople.

Pages.

Bolsheviks respect Muslim sentiments but Britain disregards these. (159) Menacing agitation in India. Admiral Rauf Bey, a very great hero to all Muslims. Cabinet after Cabinet changed in Turkey. (160) Dr. Nihad Rishad. Djemal Pasha. Mr. Fischer's account of Anwar Pasha. Talaat Pasha's amazing optimism. Kemal's inferiority complex. Young Turks had a superiority complex. (161) Djemal Pasha and Halil Pasha in Moscow. Anwar Pasha's "wilder flights." Djemal Pasha and Afghanistan. "Anwar falling; Kemal rising." There are some fools who say there is no *Taqdir*. Anwar Pasha not disheartened by failures. He was a Muslim. A believer in *Taqdir* never loses hope. Anwar gets to Moscow. (162) He was anti-British as a Muslim. Kemal's and Anwar's antagonism. Bolsheviks and Fates preferred the weaker man—Kemal. Anwar loved by the Muslim world. (163) Why the Bolsheviks preferred Kemal to Anwar. Anwar Pasha failed to oust Kemal Pasha. (164) Anwar Pasha arrived in Bokhara. His ultimate fate. (165) Anwar Pasha killed by a bullet.

جوے طالع ز خرو ارے ھنو یہ

Big men in the hands of fate. Luck helps Kemal Pasha. (166) Indian leaders fail to seize luck. Bolsheviks attached to Kemal Pasha but failed at a critical moment to render help. An interesting story how munitions were smuggled; M. Briaud as a Buddha. Bolsheviks and Kemal in "close union." Kemal Pasha had a wider outlook before. His victory made him the Hero of the Hour. High expectations entertained. (167) Kemal Pasha developed an inferiority complex. Europeans happy. (168) Chirol quoted. Turkey a small State with no weight. Only 6,000,000 or 8,000,0000 people. (169) Chirol's "brightest hope" in Turkey's downfall. Kemal's timid policy. (170) The little that has been saved of Turkey may be lost. Italy's Imperialism. "Lay Republic" unnatural in Turkey: It has no moral basis. Why Turkey has not been involved in a new War. Kemalian rigid Nationalism is likely to fail as did Anwar's Ottomanism. (171) The Indian deputation to England. The Aga Khan's intense love for Islam: A glaring demonstration. His challenge to the British Prime Minister. (172) Pan-Islamism personified. Only those who are dead can call Pan-Islamism dead. H. H.'s love symptomatic of India's love. (173) British land more troops in Constantinople. The Saleh Cabinet dismissed. Damad Ferid Pasha again. Wide Muslim unrest. The Allied terms as related in the "Sword against Islam" and in "The Turkish Empire." (174) Turkey in a "Black hole." Turkey like an Oudh Talukdari; Sultan a slave. (175) Our reply to the "Council of Ten." The Turks "shall not die." (176) The traitor to Islam—Vaheeduddeen *not* Kemal. (177) Kazim Kara Bekir foremost in saving Turkey. He and others follow Hosain. The tragedy of Karbala—a heritage for the whole of mankind. Muslim Khalifa no sacrosanct. (178) The Greek savages. Arnold Toynbee quoted. The real *mujahids*. Mustafa Kemal performed the duties assigned by Islam to Khalifa. (179) Brusa captured by the Greeks. The Greek's "old and new Scores". Greek butcheries. Rechid Safvet's telegram. (180) Blessed be the Bolshevists. The Russians committed massacres in Erzerum, etc. The Armenians committed atrocities on Muslims. (181) Turkish entry into Batum disliked by the Bolsheviks. Solidarity between the two peoples—Turkish and Russian. The terms of the Russo-Turkish Treaty. (182) The gigantic feat of Kemal Pasha. His success. Reconquest of Smyrna. Houses illuminated, including Author's. As great a day in India as in Turkey. (183) Lord Harington and H. H. The Aga Khan avert a direct clash between England and Turkey. Aga Khan got his opportunity. The Grand National Assembly. Greece saved by England. Edhem Pasha's feat repeated. "The Turkish recovery."(184) The last service by the British to the slavish Sultan. M. Chechetin and Lord Curzon: The former's superiority. (185) Curzon wanted "to eject" the Turks. Lloyd George a convinced Venezelist. The Lausanne Conference. American policy selfish. Turkish demand of protecting Constantinople rejected. Turkey advised by Curzon to join the League. Chechetin denounces the League as impotent and untrustworthy. Ismet Pasha and Raza Nur

leave Lausanne. (186) The Conference resumed. "A war against Turkey in 1923 might have thrown India and the whole Muslim world into convulsion." Russians more Turkish. India and the Muslim world threatened convulsion. "Bolshevik prestige with Islam high." Indian agitation strengthens Ismet's hands. Lenin's help to Muslims in trouble. (187) Pan-Islamists must raise their caps to Bolshevists, Lenin's remarkable statesmanship. Turks brainless. Europe welcomes Turkish stupidity. (188) Turkey lost permanent Council Seat in the League by her folly. Greatness has drawbacks. Turkey's millions of friends. Pan-Islamism saved Turkey. (189) Indians kept England in check. Abolition of Khilafat a capital blunder. Why were Turks preferred to Arabs? Islam indestructible. (190) Ataturk should learn his own history. Khilafat destroyed before. Turks "tear off their living flesh." Muslims have "assured their survival." (191) "Christendom built up a new civilisation after the Renaissance." "Infidel culture." Kemal Pasha's excuse. The Aga Khan's and Justice Amir Ali's letter. Their motives questioned. Kemal's earlier suspicions justified. (192) But statesmanship demanded caution: Panicky fear of England and spite against the Shaikhul-Islam and Khalifa. Sense of proportion gone. The inferiority complex. Kemal Pasha forgets Turkey's past: Only the darkest page remembered. Turkey's pretentions. Miss Europa laughs at Westernised Turkey. (193) Kemal Pasha's lame excuse regarding new reforms, which were really old Young Turk's and older Nizamut Reforms. Young Turk's methods better so Europe disliked those; Now enemies happy. A "lay" Turkey will be isolated. (194) Pan-Islamism another name of optimism. Oriental dress more civilised. Naked European women have no right to set fashion. Childish reforms. Nationalism with a vengeance. Funny nationalism. (195) Denationalisation means Nationalisation! India passed that low stage which Turkey occupies. Japan sticks to her language, her alphabets. (196) Barbarous interference with liberty. Aga Khan more conversant with European culture and civilisation. Aga Khan proud of the "glorious brotherhood" of Islam. His remarkable speech in the League of Nations. Felstead's criticism of European dress and food, etc. The Prophet did not bring any new dress or language. 95 p. c. Kemalist reforms could be accepted. (197) The spirit objectionable. Kemal's low aspirations—Satisfied to learn the "goose steps." Beheads his own people. Disgraceful fall. Author's grief. Mustafa Kemal's conceit. Unalloyed truth necessary. Author's letter of congratulation to Mustafa Kemal in 1924. Turkey and not Japan as Saviour of Asia. (198) Author a "layman." The humblest beggar can be the Khalifa. (199) Mosques in London, Paris, Berlin, Kobe, and the Cordova mosque restored. Number of Muslims increasing. The "untouchables" in India. Messrs. Bennett and Browne's publication from the Quran. A "message of hope to touchables and untouchables." "Rejoice ye lowly of the earth." (200) Appearances, etc., do not matter. Sincere Hindu converts at work. Neither Buddhism nor Sikhism can satisfy the untouchables. Mr. Raghavan quoted. "Must leave Hinduism." (201) "An Imperialist design behind the move for conversion to Sikhism." "Muslim, the only nation in India." Hindu nation a "misnomer." Hinduism a "contagious disease", says Ambedkar. India a place for monkeys and peepuls, etc., but not for human brotherhood. "Islam and Islam alone," admits Ambedkar, "can give the depressed classes all they need." Sword of Islam blunt but spiritual power sharpened. Japan and India and Britain fields for proselytization. Pan-Islamists can never be indifferent to India. Muslim masses down-trodden. (202) Muslims of India lack love of liberty. Islam a diamond that shines even in darkness. A *Mehdi* needed. 250 million non-Muslims no credit to Indian Muslims. Not very many good examples set. (203) The brilliant example of Haji Waris Ali Shah. Bolshevists not responsible for Turkish follies. Lenin no fool. Lenin intended to Islamise Russia. He encouraged even the Pan-Islamic tendencies. A "cringing" dog could not be liked by Lenin. What Lenin did not like in Anwar Pasha? (204) Certain Muslims "confounded and dazed" by the European advance. Wrong to say that Khilafatist Turkey and Bolshevik Russia could not be friends. "Bolshevism is Islam minus Allah."

Pages.

Another cause given to Kemal for suspicion. Indian Khilafat leaders lacked political sense. Private embassy of Indian Muslims would have been better. Why a public deputation was refused. (205) Turkey's amazing decision. Arabs regain their chance. The clever Bolsheviks. (206) Mikado may adopt Islam. Mikado can become Khalifa. His empire could be spread over millions of people over all the world. Or Bolsheviks may adopt Islam to ensure the success of their objects. Author's love for Turkey and Mustafa Kemal. (207) His criticism of Turkey explained in detail. Islam without compulsion or bribe. Author does not approve of Ibne Saud's "iconoclastic" religiosity. No justification for declaring Turkey a "lay" republic. Legally and constitutionally Turkey *not* a "lay" republic. (208) Politically it was madness to call Turkey "lay." Expulsion of Khalifa may be justified. Khalifa not essential to Islam although Khilafat a highly beneficial institution. (209) To a Pan-Islamist abolition of Khilafat a colossal folly. A human symbol of solidarity and a disciplinaire necessary. Sectional leaders could be tolerated. Why the Muslim world protests against Turkey being called "lay." (210) The Author as a Pan-Islamist feels vexed. A progressive Turkey could rival the Islamic Spain but Kemal falls at Europe's feet.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ISLAMIC POLITICAL CONSTITUTION .. 211—243

(211) Political constitution of Islam called Pan-Islamism. Worldwide brotherhood initiated for the first time. Pan-Islamic constitution not rigid. The fundamental principle of collective reponsibility. Government by consultation even when the empire extended. (212) Commissars under Islam. The people possess the sovereign authority. Khalifa only the first servant of the people. *Baiat* (contract). Abu Bakr's first address. (213) Omar's dictum regarding the Khilafat. The Rule of Law. The majority could not tyrannise the minority. All income collectivised. Unemployed helped. (214) Khalifa has no privileges, no prerogatives. British King can do no wrong! Aurangzeb's warning that the King is responsible for the acts of his executives. State belongs to the *Malik ul mulk*. (215) The Prophet himself was not the Fountain of Law. Omar's stirring and telling vindication of himself. Executive authority very limited. (216) "The first Caliph's government the only constitutional government." Salt tax in India but forbidden in Islam. Foundations of the Islamic Laws. *Vernimft wird unsinn*. Door of Ijtihad open. (217) Methods of correct *ijtihad*. Constitution and Laws elastic. Muslims must govern themselves,

اولی الامر منکم

The Five Pillars of Islam. (218) (*i*) *Prayer*. Political and social value of the congregational Prayers. The meanings of *Falah*; Materialists and Bolsheviks advised to understand the Political and Social good of Prayers. (219) Prayers helpful to the Executive of the State. (220) Muslim Prayers should be encouraged by all the well-wishers of Society.

(*ii*) *Fasting* 221

(221) Its social value.

(*iii*) *Zakat* .. .. 221—224

Two kinds of charity—Spiritual and Political. (222) Items of expenditure of the *Zakat* money. Social services and the abolition of Poverty. (223) *Zakat* can give new life. Why charity and tax have been combined.

(*iv*) *Hajj* .. .. 224—226

(224) Its objects. (225) Both moral and political good. Mr. S. H. Leader on its spiritual advantages. Author's scheme for material "Bounty." (226) Hajj one of the most useful Pillars.

Pages.

(v) *Jihad* .. .. 226 -243

(226) The Prophet needs no apologists. (227) The value of *jihad*. Every Muslim a Constantine, an Asoka, a Cyrus. No need of the Sword. It is a Holy War to fight for all that for which Islam stands. (228) Nature engaged in *jihad*. (229) Rules for *jihad* are most benevolent. The Philosophy of *ahimsa*. *Ahimsa* and *jihad* propounded by Krishna, Christ and the Comforter (Muhammad). (230) The Prophet the best Exemplar of both *ahimsa* and *jihad*. The misapplication of *ahimsa* in India. (231) Carlyle on the use of Sword. (232) *Ahimsa* only for personal wrongs. *Jihad* superior to *Ahimsa*. (233) *Ahimsa* should also be practised with the spirit of *jihad*. Yes, yes, yes, Islam has been preached with the Quran and the Sword. Natives of Europe spread "culture" with: Bomb and Brandy. (234) Islam's dual objects.

Prophet the first man to teach the value of time. Fixed time for Prayers. (235) The Prophet, his companions and his model Nation all triumphed. (236) Prophet left no law for his succession. Prophets (the best men) have no personal property. (237) Hosain refused to accept the law of heredity in Khilafat. Ali insulted and misrepresented by his own "followers." (238) The chief *forte* of Ali. Islam saved by the first election for the Khilafat. Omar evolved the best religio-socio-political Communistic Constitution. The Author of "Social Contracts" approval. Islamic Constitution has the best of Political systems. Scientific and economic Communism unknown before Islam. Khilafat essential for the Muslim Nation. (239) Khilafat *more* necessary now. Bolshevists would need it themselves if successful in their objects. Islam not an individual personal matter only. (240) Pan-Islamism has its own outlook of human life and work. The greatest Charter of Liberty and Equality—(The Prophet's Sermon on the Mount); Blood vengeance stopped; Personal responsibility established; Usury abolished; Muslims as brothers. (241) Women and slaves given equal rights; Hard work of slaves (workers) to be shared by the employer. The permanent grip of the democratic constitution evidenced even in the rule of Sultan Abdul Hamid II. "*Kemal Pasvant-born.*" (242) Hideous autocracy under Gladstone. Equal opportunities offered even under Muslim autocracy. "Stalin a victim of centralised bureaucracy." Why did Arabs fight against *Al-Amin*? (243) The Political cause the same as that for the "white" enmity for Bolshevism. The same cause for Ali and Omaiyyad quarrels also. A fight between Despotism and Socialism. Alas! Despotism triumphed.

CHAPTER IX.

FUNDAMENTAL SIMILARITIES BETWEEN PAN-ISLAMISM AND BOLSHEVISM 244—247

(244) Objects identical. Internationalism, Collectivity, Communism the basis. Even Prayers collective; Haj international; *Zakat* Communistic. The sovereignty of the people. A classless society and authority in the hands of the people are the characteristics of Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism. Noldeke quoted. (245) Islam laid down the principle of "*Collectivity*" centuries before Marx and Lenin. Communistic Commonwealth of Islam. (246) Khalifa not a despot. "Communism like Islam" writes Rt. Honourable Mr. Fisher. Professor Massignon says: "Islam occupies an intermediate position." Bolshevism has reached nearest to Islam but Islam remains superior. *Ummatul Vusta*. (247) Islam produced a bolder spirit. Robots Men but not Men Robots.

CHAPTER X.

SPECIAL SIMILARITIES BETWEEN PAN-ISLAMISM AND BOLSHEVISM .. .. 248—321

(a) *World revolution aimed by both* 249 253

(248) *Rahmatul lil alamin*. Muhammad and the League of Nations. The Universal Mission. (249) The Prophet's call to Kings and Communists alike. (250) *Trotsky's "Permanent Revolution."* Disagreement with Stalin.

Pages.

Mr. Wells praises Islam though blind to the *virtues of the Prophet.* (251) Bolshevism fiendishly smothered. Stalin has lost courage. (252) The Russian Communists may become "the most conservative radicals." Bolshevism dead to the outside world. Reaction against democracy in Italy, Turkey, Germany and also England. *The Giants of Bolshevism gone.* (253) Curzon and Checherin: Curzon triumphed. Pan-Islamism still engaged in world mission. *utimma nurahi.*

(*b*) *No Special Rights and Privileges Recognised* .. .. 254—257
(254) "Most honourable is he who excels most in good works." The King Jabala. The servant riding the camel and the *Khalifa leading the string.* (255) The Conqueror of Egypt's son punished. "How dare anybody enslave and illtreat man *born to be free.*" (256) Similarities in the demeanours of the early Arabs and the Bolsheviks' envoys at Brest.

(*c*) *No Colour or Race Conceit Allowed* .. .. .. 257—262
(257) The Quran and Hadith quoted. A Negro Plenipotentiary. (258) The whole basis of man's social institutions democratised. Zoroastrian High Priest quoted. Also Dr. Dennison and the Author of *The Ins and Outs of Mesopotamia.* (259) Lady Evelyn Cobbold's remarkable Book "Pilgrimage to Mecca." (260) The Bolshevik's and the Islamic "Internationals." Dr. Stoddard and Prof. Hurgronje and M. Litvinoff quoted. (261) Bolshevik Russia and Islamic States can form a bulwark against greedy Imperialism. (262) Bravo! Bolshevik youths.

(*d*) *Anti-Capitalism* .. .. 262—267
(262) Islam attacked Capitalism in three ways. *Yaknizuna.* (263) *Abuzer Gaffari*,—The "Comrade". The first Bolshevik. Both Bolshevism and Anarchism reached in early *Muslim Socialism.* (264) Lenin unknowingly followed Abuzer. Abuzer called from Damascus to Medina. (265) Abuzer uses "Argumentum ad baeculum." (266) Abuzer exiled to Rabza. Death of the *First Anti-Capitalist* missionary. Bolsheviks see that Western Capitalism has stabilised itself. (267) "Bolshevists making it good themselves."

(*e*) *Labour and Work Encouraged* .. .. 267—274
(267) Old Rome, Greece, India, all treated workmen very badly. Indian untouchables. Untouchability. (268) The *karma* theory. Manu's Workmen's laws worse than the slave laws of Rome and Greece. No caste and class distinction in Islam. (269) Rules for the good of slaves (workers). "A person who trades in human beings is an outcast of society." (270) A Hindu Scholar quoted. The monument of a slave. Christianity of no help to slaves. Reinhold Niebuhr quoted. (271) *A naima ajral amalin.* The *akle-halal.* "Pay wages before *sweat dries.*" "He who is able and fit and does not work, God is not gracious to him." (272) The Prophet was the *first* man to raise the dignity of Labour. The Prophet sets personal example. "The Nizam betters labour conditions in his dominions," says an Indian Labour Leader. (273) The Prophet gave practical lessons. The great Prophet *the* Originator of the Labour movement. Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky put the same in modern phraseology. Neither Lenin nor Trotsky founders of *Workers' Party.* (274) Plekhanov's prophecy. The Labour Party in England and the Labour Group in India.

(*f*) *Landlordism Attacked* .. .. 274—276
(274) The theory of landlordism. *Malikul Mulk.* "Who so quickens dead land is entitled to it". (275) *Koolakism* non-existent in Islam; a kind of collective farming in vogue. Islamic reforms in Spain. A Social Democratic Revolution. Cities and Industrial towns sprang up. (276) Church as landlord.

(*g*) *Human Equality Established* .. .. 276—282
(276) Hinduism and Judaism do not claim to establish Equality. Buddhism and Christianity do claim. (277) Buddhism too theoretical,

Pages.

Self-torture its key. It has no collective view. It is of no help in daily life. Christianity's claim of establishing Equality not justified. (278) *Prof. Gibb quoted.* Christian Hatim and the fire-worshipping Nausherwan more respected in Muslim Society than many Muslims. Muslims, Jews, Christians, Sabians all on the *same footing.* (279) "Every man responsible for what he shall have wrought." Gibbon on the Prophet's extraordinary tolerance. (280) Author's friend Baron Rolf Ehrenfels quoted. (281) Salvation depends upon good acts: Not the Monopoly of Muslims. In every respect possible Human Equality established. Bolshevist outlook narrower than Muslims'. Communist Party's dictatorial attitude denounced. (282) Lenin would have taken a broader view. Fanatical and uncommunistic policy of the Communist Party.

(*h*) *Internationalism Encouraged* 283- 292

(283) *Kanan nas Ummatun vahidatan.* Boundaries separating clan from clan and people from people broken down. The divided become One Nation. (284) The State of Islam, the heritage of all Muslims. Muslims Internationalised under one Khalifa. The present Nationalization of Muslims is adopted for three reasons. (285) England like France seeking refuge under International Pacts and collective security. The New Roman Empire a menace to the British Eastern Empire. Nationalism adopted to curb individualism. Kings and Sultans against the spirit of Islam. Nationalistic idea may prove beneficial. (286) Nationalism may do Industrial good. But home-made goods are not encouraged by the use of foreign dress, etc. Mustafa Kemal, Lenin and Stalin could introduce all reforms under the aegis of Islam. *Hubbul watan minal iman.* (287) Pan-Islamism must regain its hold: It is the salt of Muslim life. "In a World of Nation States Islam has taken to Nationalism." "Muslim States turning from pure politics to religion." (288) The new Muslim youth movement. Egyptian deputation in India in 1937. The Author's old friend Shaikh Soalabi at Lucknow. Aga Khan's sermon preaching Muslim Solidarity. Author's Pan-Islamism—a practical International scheme. (289) "Russia eclipsed in International affairs." Russian internationalism weakened. Russia plays a poor part in the League of Nations. So does Turkey. (290) Internationalism and not nationalism will be the salvation of the world. Nature's primary end—"race building, incompatible with modern economics." Islam's compromise. The centre of gravity—the Khilafat. (291) Race distinctions wiped out. *Assalamo alaikum.* (292) Pan-Islamism the best form of Internationalism.

(*i*) *Equal Opportunities Offered* .. .. 292—295

(292) Equal opportunities the Keynote of all Social reforms. In England aristocracy rolled in wealth. (293) Thomas Attwood's proposals in 1830. Duke of Wellington's arrogance. The French Revolution and the British Reform Bill. "Britain not a true Democracy." (294) Bolshevik school an established fact. Bolshevists' efforts to give equal opportunities. The best medical aid and the best education to all. Islam's aim to give all God's creatures equal opportunities as far as Nature permits. (295) The secret of Islam's phenomenal success. "The natural level of capacity and courage." (296) Islam aimed at a World-Brotherhood.

(*j*) *Encouragement to Knowledge and Learning* .. .. .. 296—302

(296) Bolsheviks can be justly proud of spreading knowledge. (297) Education figures in Russia. Islam ends "the days of ignorance." "Read in the name of Rabb." Muslims built mosques with schools and libraries as their first duty. Even during the reign of Sultan Abdul Hamid "Islam outstripped the enlightenment of our age." (298) The mosques in Spain "active centres of scientific and philosophic studies." Khalid bin Yazid bin Muawyah and others collect Books. The *Baitul Hikmat.* Encyclopaedic writers like Al-Kandi and Bu-Ali-Sina. (299) *Kun aaliman ao muttalimun va laiakin aisalis fathahlaka,* "He dieth not who takes to

Pages.

learning." The most beautiful and convincing Saying of the Prophet, Guizot quoted. (300) Islam first to reveal the scientific fact that Nature can be made subservient to man. Appeal to Nature to prove the existence of God. (301) Islam suggests ways to perfect knowledge. (1) Tafaqquh, (2) Tadabbur, (3) Tafakkur, (302) (4) Taaqqul. Kulturegeschichte.

(k) *The Emancipation of Women* .. .. 302—307

(302) The greatest revolution achieved by the Prophet. The Arabian, Spartan and Indian custom of child murder denounced. (303) "*Women under different Religious and Social laws*" referred to. Reforms staggering to Manu, Nature not ignored. (304) The authoritative statement of the Aga Khan. (305) Study of the Author's Booklets, (1) Purdah, Haram or Seclusion, (2) Polygamy, and (3) Divorce, recommended. Let Bolshevists study the *whole* of the Muslim social system,—the real Islamic system as propounded and practised by the Prophet and his immediate successors. (306) Conjugal relations described in the Quran. Evils of Polygamy detected for the first time. (307) Polygamy in certain circumstances a blessing for *woman and Society*. Reforms needed in Muslim social practices of our days but neither Europe nor Bolsheviks offer a model Social life. Only the Islamic model can be the best—a challenge.

(l) *Abolition of Personal Ownership of Property* .. .. 308—321

(308) Abolishment of private property not new. Muzdak. Russian experiment most extensive but Islam first both in theory and in practice. "The ultimate goal can be attained only through persuasion." *Lahu mafirsamavati va mafil Arthe.* (309) Abuzer Ghaffari referred to. Even water used for ablutions will have to be accounted for. All property *a trust* from God. The Sovereign of Hyderabad quoted. (310) The *ashabe suffa*. Prof. Vambery quoted. (311) All gave away all his property. "Those who amass wealth and then lock it up" denounced. The Prophet remained propertyless. Islam and Bolsheviks allow about *the same amount of private property*. Rules for the distribution of property laid down. (312) The Law of Inheritance. *Waqf-alal aulad* curtails proprietary rights, even of one's children. The question why there are laws of inheritance answered. (313) Bolsheviks outrage human instincts but Islam avoids that. *Free will to man.* "Strive then to excel each other in good works". (314) "Use your intelligence." Man wants to fulfil his desires. Islam does not ignore natural love for family and for wealth. (315) Only as much check on personal liberty is put as is absolutely *necessary* for *Society*. (316) Private property can become a *blessing for Society*. Syed Mahmud and McNaughton quoted. (317) Charge against Bolshevists. لا غالب الا الله

A Muslim slave to none but Allah. (318) انت خير الرازقين

Bolsheviks' ruthless behaviour. Lenin respected "resolution of the lower rank." Alas! Lenin is no more. The N.E.P. (319) "The means of production." Bolshevism the *enemy of the middle class*. A true Muslim cannot leave much behind as an inheritance. (320) Encroachment upon personal liberty. Islam gains its communistic objects peacefully. Russia has not yet gained any superior advantage over America, etc. In Russia the experiment is being carried on. Private property will vanish or flourish. Author's reading. While Bolshevists reduce family circle, Islam extends it. The levelling up process. (321) Superiority of Pan-Islamism.

CHAPTER XI.

MISCELLANEOUS AGREEMENTS BETWEEN PAN-ISLAMISM AND BOLSHEVISM .. .. 322—348

(322) Islam used even Bolshevik ideology. (322) "Comrade"; "Commissar." Greater weight to action—Obstchestvennik. *Laisa lil insane illa ma saa.* "Surely we have created man to struggle with difficulties." Death unknown to *Mujahids*. (323) When Lenin and Trotsky arrived theorisation

ceased and action began. Jihad represents intense, selfless, unbending activity. Islam contrasted with Christianity and Buddhism. Most characteristic pictures of Buddha and Christ. Muhammad's career began when he came out from his cave at Hira. "*Qum—Abise*". (324) A Muslim active from *fajr* to *isha*. The spirit of *jihad* can give a new life. Bolshevism can live only with the spirit of World-Revolution. Bolshevism is dying and it deserves death. Pan-Islamism in four Muslim States has stopped bloodshed in Palestine. (325) The Palestine question. Imperial interests safeguarded by the Palestine Commission. Death-trap for the Jewish Community. Pan-Islamists must not tolerate the sharp wedge. Bolshevists should not be indifferent. (326) Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism both anti-god—*La Ilaha*. Sufis lay great stress upon *La-Ilaha*. Islam more iconoclastic and uncompromising than Bolshevism. (327) Even Society can be in the wrong. Author often isolated. A Muslim realises his personal responsibility. Having declared *la-ilaha* (there is no god) a Muslim *must* shout out *illa Allah* (except *Allah*). At once his passivity, disbelief, irresponsibility, agnosticism, pessimism, doubt and servility vanishes. (328) Nothing frightens a Muslim ; nothing overawes him. The complete formula. The divinity of Muhammad indirectly denied. (329) A Muslim rejects all gods including those of the scientists', Fascists' and Bolshevists'. Every true Muslim a superman. S. W. Koelle admits that Islam engenders religious superiority. (330) Isaac Taylor quoted. "Islam a reformed Judaism"—and also Christianity. It gave hope to the slaves. (331) Muslim brotherhood a reality. Personal experience of Major Glynn Leonard. A tragic demonstration of the death-defying character of Muslims on board the ship "Asia." (332) Could not the world be conquered again by the death-defying Nation ? How was the glorious character formed ? (333) If Bolsheviks are real well-wishers of Society they must copy Islam. It should no more be said that Bolshevism is Islam minus *Allah*. A belief in *Allah* does immense good to Society. (334) The Quran full of effective arguments to prove the existence of God. Muhammad a human sign (*Muzhar*) of God. (335) Muhammad, his companions, his Nation, all triumphant through their belief in God. Really Muhammad did not die. He is still a Sign. (336) The Author desires that Bolshevism and Pan-Islamism should jointly take up the uplifting of mankind. Gibbon, Goethe, Carlyle, Rousseau, Renan, Anatole France, Guizot, Haeckel, Draper, Leon Caetani, marvelled at the modernity of the Prophet. Bernard Shaw quoted. (337) The Saviour of Humanity. Muhammad being the final Prophet *Mujaddids* are born after every century. Muslims do not need only spiritual *Mujaddids* or Mehdi. An all-conquering Mehdi wanted. Renovation done collectively. (338) The probable start in Cairo. *Al Azhar*. Shaikh *Al-Maraghi*. Author's effort to link India and Egypt at the time of Mustapha Kamil. Under her promising young king Egypt can become a bulwark against the old and new Imperialisms. But the present Treaty not sufficient. Another Salahuddin needed. There should be no spring-board in the neighbourhood for a greedy Imperialist Power. Lenin a Political and Social Renovator. But he could not complete his work. Quarrels after his death. (339) D. Levine quoted. Dmitrievsky says, "I am suffocating in the atmosphere he (Stalin) has created." The Two Russias. "One hundred and fifty million stuff bricks." "Black bread rancid". The future hopes or delusions. (340) Laski in his Communism writes of the "Poison of Power". Herr Joseph Goebbels says, "Bolshevism is the dictatorship of the inferior and in practice it is horror-striking." But the trend is that Bolshevism will Islamise itself. Its antagonism against religion is getting less. (341) Bolshevists' excesses may be excused. No Government is free from excesses. The Mehdi or a "man like Muhammad" needed to secure "the much-needed peace and happiness". Writing Part II *not* relished by the Author. (342) One difference with Bolshevism is very great. *Shirk* is Anti-Islamic. If there is more than one Creator the Islamic communistic organism cannot flourish. Scholar Johnson quoted. After a *correct* knowledge of the religion

Pages.

of Islam it is expected that the Communist Party will make a common cause with Islam. Islam would supply what is lacking in European civilization on which Bolshevism is based. (343) To a true Muslim Islam is his all. "Islamic Society alone can restore the balance of Western civilisation," says Professor Gibb. (344) The mightiest "Potent force." Bolshevists and Nazis both denounce religion. We cannot defend any religion except Islam. Who can defend "Inquisitions" or Crusaders massacring of Muslims. Haeckel denounces Christianity's crimes. Prophet the most religious-minded man. (345) Through his *religion* he achieved the soul-rest, moral excellence and mental advancement of his Nation setting it to conquer Nature. Religion alone can reach the innermost cavities of the heart. Warnings in "*Islam and Socialism*". Bolshevists have kept the danger points in view. But they have taken a narrow view. (346) Islamic Socialism transgressed all boundaries. (347) We admit with excruciating pain that the Muslim Nation has degenerated. But if the Muslim Nation had not fallen and Bolshevism had not risen the object of this labour of love and the *raison d'etre* of this book would have gone. (348) A Decisive Challenge.

Part II—Dissimilarities 349—471

The main difference.

CHAPTER I

THE QURANIC CONCEPTION OF GOD .. .. 349—409

(a) *The Quranic God-idea is superior and unique* .. .. 349—356

(350) Abraham's revolt against the star worship. Death-blow to Nature worship. (351) *Sakhkhara lakum ma fis samavate va ma fil ardhe.* Nature subdued. (352) Judaic and Christian God-idea. (353) It is defective. Buddhism and Brahmanism. (354) Zoroastrianism. Muhammad's unique privilege. *Rabbul-alamin.* (355) Unique, Distinguishing and Majestic attributes of God. (356) *Laisakamislihi shaian. La tudrikahul absar.* Gibbon's remarks on Muslim God-idea.

(b) *The Islamic God-idea is helpful in intellectual, political, social, moral and spiritual advancement* .. .. 356—372

(356) Gibbon's admissions. (357) Quranic verses on the God-idea. Al-Quran not dogmatic. (358) Haeckel's monism. Quranic arguments from Nature. (359) Searching questions to scientists. (360) Islam can satisfy Physicists and Biologists, Philosophers and all men of science. (361) The attributes of *Rabb* and *Rahman* should be considered by scientists. Some attributive names of Allah. (362) Let a scientist study himself. (363) "Use your intelligence," says the Quran. (364) Dr. Stoddard quoted. Rev. Stephen's admissions. Islam helps a Moralist and a Social reformer, a statesman and a legislator. (365) The Quran forms a noble character by its verses and attributive names of God. (366) It satisfies also the soul-cravings. (367) Islam develops both the material and the spiritual sides by its schools and colleges and *Khankhas and hugras.* (368) Verses with mystic implications. (369) "Follow thou My laws and become like Me." (369) Man's spiritual and mental achievements by following God's Laws. (370) Superstitions elevated to philosophy. Muslim *Sufism* or mysticism based on Love. (371) *Sufis* serve a great purpose in our age. (372) Muhammad's Superiority.

(c) *The Muslim God-idea is the basis of culture, civilization, communistic organisation of human Society and Scientific Progress.* .. .. .. 372—399

(372) The very first Revelation mentions the use of Pen. (373) Prof. Lake quoted. Harun Rashid received embassies from Charlemagne and Emperor of China. (374) The Abbaside period. (375) Muslims and the flying machine. Avicenna; Al-Kandi; Abucasas; Avenzoor. (376) Al-Bucasis, Geber. Saracenic triumph in arts and sciences. Shipbuilding. Averroes. (377) Abdul Rahman Sufi. Muslims improved Astronomy, Abu Junas; M. Farzani; Abul Hasan; Abumazar. (377) Muslims expert in all sciences.

Pages.

Abul Wafa ; Nasiruddin Tusi, Nabdi ; Omar Khayyam; Fum-mul-hut (Formalhaut) ; Al-Batarquis and Sabit-bin-Qurrah; Abu Osman; Al-Razi, Al-Abbas, Al-Baithar; Al-Beruni; Ibne Batuta; Nasir Khusru; Archibald Hurd, Author of the Triumph of the Trampship, quoted. (378) Ibne Khaldun; Tabri; Masudi; Ibne Bhajja—also a musical expert, Agriculture improved. Innumerable Industries. Abu Rahman "the first of the race of men " to construct a table of specific gravities. Abul Hasan, the first to trace the path of the Ray of Light. (379) The physiologists of this age may accept Abul Hasan as their contemporary. "Not one of the sciences was omitted by the Arabs". The European Emperor (Charlemagne) "an almost wholly uneducated barbarian before Harun Rashid." (380) Arabic the richest language of the time. Muslim Libraries. (381) Public Libraries become common. (382) "Whether at this time any European Nation is sufficiently advanced to follow Muslims' example." (383) Undoubtedly Europe is dangerously ill. Materialistic-cum-spiritualistic civilization. (384) *Chasst Dunia.* Muslim Civilization different from Christian, Buddhist and Hindu civilizations. (385) India without culture. What Muslims gave to India—almost every mark of civilization and culture. (386-387) Very ingenious clocks. Muslims introduced highest civilization wherever they went. Draper's description. (388-89) Islamic civilization remained based on spirituality. The Moral tone set by the Quranic verses. (389-90) Muslim civilization has no room for the European vices, Bolshevism and Islam compared and contrasted. (391) Superiority of the Muslim civilization. (392) A Muslim can walk with erected head in the streets of Paris, London, and Leningrad. Mukerji's "A Dying Race" quoted. An ex-Indian Governor quoted. (393) *Signs of the Times* of America quoted. Statistics of the corruption of the American Society. Japanese also disgusted with European Civilization now. The recent blood bath as a proof. (394) The Communistic structure of Muslim Society and Constitution. (395) As long as Muslims acted according Islam they triumphed. (396) The most miraculous achievement of the Prophet was making God-idea the basis of scientific Progress. (397) *Ittati hikmata.....khairan kasira* an incentive for scientific researches. Europe proved an industrious but *wicked* pupil of Muslims. (398) The Quranic God-idea the actuating motive even for the world conquest. (399) The Turks metamorphosed by Islam. *The Standard Bearers of Islam* quoted. Self-inflicted wound of Kemal.

(*d*) *The Quranic God-idea Prompts Social Service* .. .. 399—406
(399) *Laisal birra....wa atial mal.* (400) The Quran replete with injunctions for *social services.* (401) The Bolsheviks asked "why do you not worship Allah ?" A moral from the dekoolakization tragedy. (402) Muhammad remains the best product of the Earth's millions of years' Revolution. *Haq-ul-Lah* and *Haq-ul-Ibad.* (403) The superiority of the Islamic social services. The best communistic State possible only under Islam. (404) Islam self-sufficient. Social problems cannot be solved by economics or science. Dr. Ure's "The Philosophy of Manufacture" quoted. Lenin's remarks in *Proletterri* criticised. (405) Mr. J. Strachey quoted. His admissions recorded.

(*e*) *The Quranic God-idea Elevates Humanity to its Ultimate Height* .. 406—409
(406-07) Man only a mammal, says science. Man born in sin according to Christians. The Buddhists and Hindus allege that he is only a criminal in this world. Islam gives man the position of the Vice-Regent of God ! It vouchsafes great power and progress to Man. (408) "The Kingdom of Heaven has come to man." (409) To encourage Atheism or *shirk* is criminal and against Society.

CHAPTER II.

BOLSHEVISM ENCOURAGED ANTI-GOD AND ANTI-RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS, 410—418

(410) Psychological mistakes of the Bolsheviks. The reason for anti-religious policy. Rasputin. (411) "Drunken debauch." Czarina's unshakable faith. (412) All courts corrupt. No scientific justification for

Pages.

anti-religiosity. Prof. Haldane and Sir Oliver Lodge quoted. The idea of angels *not* fanciful, says Sir Oliver. (413) Strachey's admissions. Hero-worship and slave mentality of young men: Foolish but excusable. Even an Atheist unblameable. (414) The three reasons against religions. A Muslim's brief reply. Islam encouraged social services. (415) The Prophet proclaimed "poverty is my pride." Islam gave impetus for researches and even travels. Prayers to strengthen the will and remove indolence, weak-heartedness and pessimism. (416) Lenin's irreligiousness. (417) Anti-religiousness and Atheism given the status of a state dogma *after Lenin*. The attributes of Qahhar will come into play. (418) Citizens of a communist State should have high morals.

CHAPTER III.

BOLSHEVISM CLAIMED NO MORAL AND SPIRITUAL BASIS .. 419—424

(419) "Whoever told you I believed in morality," said Lenin. Violence advocated by Lenin. (420) Persecution not the monopoly of Dictators. *Early History of India* quoted. The Prophet did not allow violence or torture or mutilation. (421) ... The highest value given to human life. Lenin not very scrupulous. The Grand Duke of Russia's story. (422) Neither age nor sex respected. Bolshevists "plunged into sexual orgies." (423) Bolshevists "immoral" even according to Lenin's standard. The whole system based on violence. (424) Lack of morality in other countries. Corruption in Russia. A strange human being created.

CHAPTER IV.

ISLAM GAVE NEW CONNOTATION TO RELIGION .. 425—428

(425) Muhammad had a really prophetic vision. All religions except Islam concentrate attention on after life. (426) Priests rule the destiny of mankind. Moses ushers Monotheism. Jesus concerned chiefly with "Kingdom of Heaven." (427) The *new* aims put before man by the Prophet. Religion meant to guide in all departments of human life. (428) Islam connotes a new faith, institution, social system, culture and civilization. All objections fail against Islam.

CHAPTER V.

THE ISLAMIC MORAL CODE IS PERFECT .. .. 429—433.

(429) Chamber's Encyclopædia quoted. The Quranic verses on morals. (430) Rousseau, Haeckel, Gibbon, Ingersol, Goethe, Carlyle knew and liked Islam but Lenin had not much knowledge of it. All who live a moral life are Muslims, says Carlyle. Personal responsibility in Islam. (431) Morality brought down from Copy Books to practical life. A Hindu scholar quoted. (432) Sykes confirms the practicability of Muslim socio-moral Laws. Goethe and Carlyle quoted. No mental reservation (*taqayya*) allowed. No suicide cases. (433) Lord Eversely on the causes of early Turkish Victories. Finlay's and Gibbons's confirmation.

CHAPTER VI.

DIFFERENCE IN OUTLOOK AND METHODS .. .. 434—439

(434) Bolshevism has a limited scope and vision. *La ukallifullaho nafsan illa wusahia.* (435) Islam handles science to check its mischief. The Bolshevists depend upon Cheka but Islam on persuasion. (436) Who is a *Momin*? The Philosophy of combating evil. (437) "To you your religion to us ours." A contrast in methods. Bolshevists' barbarism. "Liquidation of Koolaks." (438) Koolaks exterminated. Forced labour, etc. The Prophet could enter the hearts of all people. (439) Muhammad the best loved and respected man. Even after her degeneration the Muslim Nation is admired by her enemies. No class war.

Pages.

CHAPTER VII.

THE EVERLASTING TRIUMPH OF THE PROPHET AND ITS SECRETS. 440—460

(440) "The ideal representative and guide to humanity" :Renan quoted. Carlyle's and Bosworth Smith's appreciation. (441) The Prophet a threefold founder. Samuel Johnson on the Prophet's Modernity. (442) "Filled up the measure of My favours." Civilised world on "the verge of chaos." "The whole known world" united. (443) "Death had overtaken the human race." The Prophet's personality the chief secret of his success. (444) Prophet the greatest source of guidance. Islam is still the greatest spiritual and uniting power that solves the race problems, etc. (445) Other secrets of the Prophet's success. All gods fade before Muhammad. (446) "He is a portion of the primal *reality* of things." The greatest proximity to God. (447) The *mairaj* (ascension). The Prophet refuses wonder-working as a proof of the truth. (448) Nothing more foreign to the Islamic constitution than autocracy. *Shariat* does not contemplate a permanent subordinate position. Prophetic Revelations closed. The God-idea shall remain final to the finish. (449) Other Revelations to continue. (450) Revelation to the Bee to make honey. History proves that the Prophet's political, social, juristic and economic reforms have also remained unimproved upon. (451) The most well-known man in History. (452) Mirza Husain Khan Ala quoted. The best demonstration of the commanding powers of the Prophet after 1356 years. (453) Mr. Wells should consult a physician. "A Muslim minus Muhammad." Justice Akbar, K.C., says "Our Prophet *the* principal element in the scheme of all creation." (454) The Quran claimed as a permanent miracle. A challenge to the self-deluded people. (455) The "New Morality" anticipated by the Prophet. Its definition by the "embodiment of the conscience of the Communist Party." The Prophet's own Sayings on the subject. (456) Prophet encouraged equality at his own expense. The *right value* of the "old morality" indicated by the Prophet. (457) Nothing of Islam but its name left. Deceiving religious men—wolves in sheep-skin. God with men in difficulties. (458) Islam a wonderful combination of the *old* and the *new* and therefore beyond the grasp of the old and the young in certain respects. The threefold challenge in the cry of *Allah-o-Akbar*. (459) *Allah-o-Akbar* a democratic communistic cry. (460) *Magar mere Khuda tum ho Muhammad*.

CHAPTER VIII.

A FRIENDLY ADVICE TO THE BOLSHEVISTS AND OTHERS 461—471

(461) Author's sympathy with Bolshevism. Author believed in Communism before the birth of Bolshevism. Bolshevism slowly dying. Russia has cut a sorry figure in the "League of Nations." (462) Bolshevism safer politically but dying mentally. World watching the Communist experiment, otherwise unconcerned about Russia. Mussolini and Hitler more successful in their limited objectives. (463) "Government possible against liberal ideas." The Bolshevists should adopt different methods and set an attractive example for all as did Islam. (464) *Mushir's* (Counsellor's) advice. Economics the cause of the present troubles. Credit to Stalin. (465) Europe a war camp not because of wrong economics. The mere Bolshevisation can *not* solve the present troubles. Economic Rivalry and Imperialism caused the Great War. The causes of the present depressed situation. Germany was crushed still England lost her monopoly of the world trade. (466) Some moral and spiritual bonds should be forged. Generations-old experience should be taken advantage of. Other nations should adopt Socialism according to their own needs. In India Communism shall have to be kept in abeyance. Agrarian problem cannot be solved in a day. The drawbacks of small holdings. (467) Blind doctrinairism a crime in politics. Lenin should be followed. Leaders open to bribes and leading a double, camouflaged life. The Congress and the Muslim League quarrels stiffened by the inexperienced leader. Suicide demanded. Armchair politicians. (468) Mass Contact

Pages.

essential for the Muslim League. Muslim League can become stronger than the Congress. Organisation of village and town uplift and *Qarz Hasna*. Minorities have ruined great Empires. Muslims should never be non-nationalists. Muslim States from Indus to Maritza. Wonderful asset of Pan-Islamism. (469) Sad ironies—Shiah and Sunni quarrels. Shah of Iran has taken steps to cure rank madness. The Majority community adopts the domineering Imperialist spirit and a communal outlook. (470) Efforts to demolish a living monument of unity and the sweetest language. Hindu authorities quoted. The most deadly crime. Hindus excuseable but not Muslims. (471) When we ask Bolshevists to change we also ask Pan-Islamists to take the broadest view of Islam. Revived old Islam means Pan-Islamism which means Bolshevism.

لا تهنوا و لا تحزنوا انتم ا لا علون ان كنتم مومنين ـ

APPENDIX I- WHAT IS RELIGION ? .. 372—373

APPENDIX II—KEMAL ON PALESTINE. .. 374

FINIS.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم — نحمده و نصلي على رسول الكريم

PART I.—SIMILARITIES.

Mankind forms one Nation (*Al Quran*) II: 213.

كان الناس أمة واحدة

I.—The "Ferocious World War" and the "Social World Storm"—Bolshevism, Foreseen.

Now in early 1936 the Author has been persuaded to write this complimentary book to *Islam and Socialism* which was very favourably received not only in the Old World but also in the New. India's grand-old Man of Letters, Nawab Sir Imadul Mulk Syed Husain Bilgrami, a reputed scholar, both in Eastern and Western Literature, loved it and expressed repeatedly his admiration for it.

The late Mr. W. T. Stead of the "*Review of Reviews*," who was a world figure and the Author's friend, called it in his Review "thought-provoking and interesting."

Prof. Montet of Geneva remarked:—"I have read *Islam and Socialism* with increasing interest. I was specially struck by two declarations in this book:—

1. "To us (Muslims) Socialism means an organised, continuous and harmonious co-operation of individuals in all departments of life with a view to secure universal well-being and general prosperity." It is right, and I think Islam is in a very near connection with Socialism.

2. "Mussalmans of the world have a mission to be an intermediate nation to unite the East and the West."

Mr. Alexander Russell Webb wrote from New Jersey, U.S.A.:—

"I have received and read with deep interest your book on Islam and Socialism, and am prompted to congratulate you most cordially for the excellent work you have done. I earnestly wish that a copy of it could be placed in the hands of every open-minded, intelligent Christian in America. I will loan my copy to all who will read it . . . . . Your book will come as a refreshing gleam of light thrown upon what has been considered a dark and puzzling subject."

Islam and Socialism was written in the end of 1908. It was first printed in 1910 and then in 1912. Its chief characteristic was that it proved by authentic quotations from the Quran and Hadith, as well as by citing practical examples of the Prophet and his Companions, that Islam was the first of all religions to establish a State on Socialistic and Communistic

principles and that Islam advocated those principles in political, social and economic life of man as well as in religious. It was further shown that unless those Islamic principles were adopted it would not be possible to work peacefully a Communistic State or to form a harmonious Socialistic World Society. It was pointed out that the current tendency and atmosphere were harmful for society and in this connection a few prophecies were made. The first was that a "ferocious war" was inevitable. This was said in so many words:

"The natural result of the weakening of the restraining moral forces on the one hand and of exciting animal passions on the other will be a fierce fight *involving the whole of Christian Europe on the one side or the other* which will end—as the fight between two equally powerful ferocious beasts generally ends—in the destruction of both the assailant and the assailed."

The above prophecy was preceded by the following remarks:—

"The powerful nations of the West are presenting an ominous outlook before the eye of an imaginative philosophical mind. They are arming themselves to the teeth, they are straining their every nerve for a jealous competition with one another. While all their energy and genius is being devoted to invent instruments to destroy their rivals, they are hopelessly neglecting those moral bulwarks which protect nations from fatal disasters."

It was further said that "European militarism is charged with dangerous possibilities and seems destined to prove eventually self-destroying." It was foreseen that the economic situation would also become a cause of the war and "end *ultimately* in a crushing collapse." That is, the *general economic depression* that has followed the Great War, was also anticipated.

Moreover, not only were the political and economic disturbances and upheavals, which have changed the political geography and the financial outlook of the world, foreseen but "*the coming storm in the social conditions of the world,*" which has given rise to Bolshevism, was also visualised.

It was further expected that "the increasing power of labourites (workers) *and socialists will probably bring into existence a radical constitution tending more and more towards Socialism which might in its turn become a model for other States in Europe.*"

A perusal of *Islam and Socialism* will reveal the fact that the changes which the Bolshevists have tried to introduce in the prevailing political and social systems are not much different

from those indicated in that book to be necessary for the betterment of Society and the State. They were shown to be Islamic, and Bolshevism has, more or less, followed those very Islamic lines for advance and change.

Modern Socialists were quite surprised when they read in *Islam and Socialism* how, over thirteen hundred years ago, Islam had anticipated those social reforms which were only lately introduced in the advanced countries of Europe.

For instance, over thirteen hundred years ago, the Islamic State—the Islamic "Empire"—had initiated old-age pensions and a State allowance for children from the time of birth up to the time that the child could work for itself. Disabled citizens were looked after by the State. Perfect human equality was established and every adult was called upon to protect the State when the need arose, *i.e.*, every citizen was a volunteer, and soldier. There were no mercenary troops. There were no classes, no social gradations. The so-called slaves (workers) and their sons led armies, having in their ranks men of blue blood and high positions. Merit was honoured: not wealth. Poverty caused pride: not depression.

Adult women were made *sui juris* like men and held property of their own. All differences of colour and race were removed. Bureaucracy was abolished. There were no portfolios.

The State belonged to the people. It owned lands, pastures and groves. There was no law-making sovereign authority except that of God. All private monopolies were stopped. "Corner makers" were denounced. The rich were taxed for the poor. A House of Finance and Store was established for the public; and so forth. In short, it was shown that Islam was Socialistic in its Constitution. Now, we trust that the following pages will convince everybody that Islam not only anticipated Socialism, but also Communism or Bolshevism in its best form.

There is hardly any beneficent principle of Bolshevism which was not anticipated by the Miraculous Reformer—the great Prophet Muhammad—over thirteen centuries ago. He anticipated Rousseau. He anticipated Marx. He anticipated Trotsky and Lenin. All glory to him; all success to him! The State and the nation, which his immediate successors were enabled by him to establish on the ruins of the Byzantine and Persian Empires and which extended to Egypt and other countries also, *was a model Communistic organism and a marvellous international brotherhood.*

The Bolshevists, above all, would do well to study it to remove the defects and weaknesses of their organisation and to make it a world factor in civilisation and culture and in the material, moral and spiritual uplift of humanity.

In *Islam and Socialism* the lines of the coming Social changes were clearly indicated. It must, however, be admitted here that the location of the starting point of the Social changes was misplaced. It was thought that "the Mother of Parliaments," "was in the travails of a new birth" and that the *Social Storm* "will come first in the British Isles and then it will be carried to other parts of the world."

There is no denying the fact that if this prophecy also had proved true the world would probably have profited more by the social and political changes than it has done now, because the English people, in spite of their national weaknesses (which for their own nation are the greatest source of strength but are for others a scourge) are individually the best in Europe and more fitted, by the solidity and sincerity of their character, by their remarkable sense of duty, moderate and unexcitable temperament and sound political instinct, to carry the mission of World Reforms. We say this although we know that one of the most famous Britishers of to-day has said: -

"Every true Englishman detests the English. We are the wickedest nation on earth and our success is a moral horror."

And an American, Maurice Hindus, has written:—

"England is like an old woman who heroically persists in painting her cheeks to sustain the illusion of youth and power."

However, for some mysterious reason the birthplace chosen by Fate for Bolshevism was Russia *not* England. It is no doubt a fact that Russia was in more urgent need of political as well as social reforms than any other country in Europe. Nowhere, not even in India, was despotism so firmly entrenched and so strongly at work as it was in Russia. Nor was the old feudalism so unnaturally robust elsewhere as it was in Russia. Nor, again, was religious fanaticism so stupidly a part of the Government anywhere as in Russia. In fact, just before the Bolshevik Revolution, an extremely licentious and Machiavellian priest had got control of the whole Government machinery through the superstitions of the Czarina, who, in her turn, influenced the Czar. Thus it was that the Bolshevik Reformers had to clean the slate altogether and to uproot all the religious, political and social systems prevailing in Russia.

They say, "revenge is sweet," and so, because Bolshevism was born in the most tyrannically governed country, the Russian reformers (more particularly Lenin himself) could not completely overpower, as we are afraid Mustafa Kemal could not overpower, a personal desire of revenge. If the communistic revolution had taken place first in England instead of in Russia it is very likely that the personal element or passions would have found a lesser place in it and many such matters as were unnecessarily introduced in working Bolshevism and have brought it into ill-repute would have been spared. Probably the need of the Second Part of this book, at least the majority of its sections, would have disappeared.

Let us hope and pray that when excitement has subsided, experience has been gained and the personal passion of revenge has been calmed, Bolshevism will get rid of the very few disagreements it has with Pan-Islamism and it will become an unmixed blessing for the world.

The chief aims of Bolshevism are so grand, they are so highly humanitarian, they are so similar to Islam that every Muslim would like to see them flourishing all over the world in such a way so as to become beneficial for all peoples, all races and all countries.

II.—The Political and Social Effects of the Great War.

As a result of the World-War which undeniably was like a war between "ferocious beasts", in fact more savage and barbarous than that ; with its liquid fire and asphyxiating gas, bombing aeroplanes and Zeppelins, and destructive sub marines. millions of human beings, most of them young and promising, were mutilated and killed. Hundreds of years' old dynasties were violently uprooted from their ancestral thrones. Centuries, old extensive empires were forcibly reduced to the narrowest limits. Hereditary, autocratic kings and monarchs had to give place to Presidents chosen by the people for limited periods.

The Great War was indeed unprecedented in its ferocity and extent. It involved more than a score of nations. It spread over all the continents—Europe, Asia, Africa, America and Australia, all were directly affected by it. It caused many more changes than those which have been mentioned above. New economic theories have been propounded since then. New industrial questions have arisen. New systems of government are undergoing trial. Among these new systems the two latest and most daring are Fascism and Nazi-ism. In India, a Dyarchical system was imposed. In certain other parts of poor, down-trodden Asia and Africa a Mandatory system of rule is still being ruthlessly experimented.

Fascism and Nazi-ism are both generally believed to be the reaction against the most astounding and dazzling product of the War, *i.e.*, Leninism or Marxism or Communism-in-practice in Russia.

Fascism and Nazi-ism are both avowed Dictatorships. The Dictators who are running them, one in Italy, the other in Germany, are proud to declare that they have not the slightest faith in Democracy or in the Parliamentary system of government or in liberty itself.

George Seldes in his *World Panorama* quotes Mussolini, the father of Fascism himself, thus :—

"Fascism is not afraid to declare itself illiberal or anti-liberal. It has already passed, and, if necessary, will again pass, without the slightest hesitation, over the body, more or less decomposed, of the goddess of Liberty."

Mussolini has nothing but contempt for Democracy. He calls it "the absurd conventional untruth of political equality

dressed out in the garb of collective responsibility." He does *not* believe that the majority "can direct Society." He boldly declares that Fascism "denies democracy" and "combats the whole complex system of democratic ideology."

Mussolini is deadly against Marxism upon which Bolshevism has been founded.

He frankly announces:—

"Fascism is the complete opposite of that doctrine, the base of so-called scientific and Marxian Socialism, the materialist conception of History."

As to Nazi-ism, there seems to be nobody living who breathes more bitter hatred against Karl Marx, against in fact all Jews, than Adolf Hitler, the creator of Nazi-ism. Hitler hates Bolshevism. He abhors Marxism. In *My Struggle* he writes: "If the Jew, with the help of his Marxism creed, conquers the nations of the world his crown will be the funeral wreath of the human race, and the planet will drive through the ether *once again empty of mankind as it did millions of years ago.*" Could any man utter more fiery words against Zionism, Marxism and Bolshevism? No.

Hitler believes in force and autocracy. He writes:—"The *psyche* of the mass of the people is not receptive of anything savouring of half measures and weakness . . . The people love a ruler more than a suppliant and feel more inwardly satisfied by doctrines which suffer no rival than by an admission of liberal freedom." Adolf Hitler like his Italian contemporary, Duce Mussolini, has nothing but abuse for Democracy and Parliamentarianism. He calls Parliament "an absurd institution." He has nothing but vituperation for Marxism and Bolshevism. He writes:—

"Democracy in the West to-day is the forerunner of Marxism which would be inconceivable without Democracy. It is the feeding ground of that world pestilence which is enabled to develop there. In its outward form of expression the Parliamentary system appeared as a monstrosity of filth and fire (*eine spottgeburtans Dreck und Feuer*), in which, to my regret, the fire seemed to have burnt itself out only too quickly." Hitler, like all despots, the rulers of India *not* excluded, loves personal and autocratic rule. He believes in "personal discretion," "personal responsibility," "individual judgment," phrases with which the recent Government of India Act abounds. He asks, as a foreign Finance Minister in India means to do when he defies with contempt the majority vote for any "cut" in the Indian Finance Bill, "is the leading statesman's

task to consist not so much in producing a creative thought or plan, as in the act with which he makes the genius of his proposals comprehensive to a flock of silly sheep for the purpose of imploring their consent?" Hitler's contempt for the majority vote equals that of a Governor-General for India, who costs the Indian tax-payer a fatter monthly salary and other preferments than any State servant in the world and who deliberately overrules the majority verdict of the Legislature whenever he likes.

Hitler scarcastically asks:—"Do we believe that progress comes in this world from the combined intelligence of the majority and not from the brains of an individual?"

As to the Dyarchic system introduced in India after the Great War, the less said the better.

The Dyarchic system was only a fraud perpetrated to beguile Indians of servile mentality and foreign Governments and peoples who were unaware of real Indian conditions.

When Dyarchy was introduced in the Government of India the situation was something like this. The people were extremely dissatisfied with the system of Government prevailing. They had been clamouring for about two scores of years for Self-Government based on a representative system as in vogue in England herself and in her Dominions. Because Indians had known cultured and civilised Government long before the British entered India as traders, those Indians, who received modern education when the British took up the reins of Government in India, learnt in no time to examine and appreciate modernised methods of Government. A cry was raised for Self-Government on colonial lines, *i.e.*, like that in Australia or Canada or New Zealand. Educated Indians organised a National Political Congress. From the platform of that Congress, year after year, demands for Self-Government were forcefully put forward, but the arrogance and conceit of the Rulers remained undiminished and bitter despotism unsweetened. When the Great War came, although it was an European quarrel, each continental Power collected its vassals and hirelings and threw them into the furnace of the War. Indians in large numbers, and with millions of money, also came in. No individual person in the whole British Empire gave so much money for the European War as did the Nizam of Hyderabad, who, though by Treaty an Ally, is treated no better than other vassals. Indian armies sacrificed themselves on all

fronts. It was the Indians who saved Paris and the Channel Ports at the first onrush of the German army and thus saved both France and England by keeping intact the connecting link between the two. In the attack on the Dardanelles and on all the fronts in the East, Indians played an important part. Yet immediately afterwards in the loyal Punjab they had to creep on their bellies before the Demon of the Prestige of the Ruling Officials. This gave rise to a serious agitation in India for *Swaraj* (Self-Rule). In the meantime the treatment of Turkey by Britain aroused also the wrath of Muslims, who, though a minority in the population of India, have a current of the dynamic power of Islam in them. Something thus had to be done to soothe the situation. And Dyarchy was invented. The Government was divided up into two kinds of departments. One, the most important, completely reserved in the hands of the Executive, the other nominally transferred to the hands of "popular ministers." But control as a whole, both over the Executive, formed mostly by the foreign element in its vital part, and over the Purse remained and remains up to the present date, and shall remain also the same under the much boomed New Constitution, in the hands of the alien Govenor-General and Governors.

Dyarchy was invented to camouflage the unrepresentative character of the Indian system of Government.

One of the reasons for America not joining the Wilsonian creation—the League of Nations (what a harmful, colossal and expensive fraud!)—given by an American Senator was that if America joined the League its representative would have the same one vote as "England's chattel India." Dyarchy, which pretended to give India a Lower House, an Upper Chamber (the Author has a personal experience of both the Houses as a member unanimously elected again and again) and a number of authorityless "ministers" in the provinces, was introduced to make a show of the fitness of India to indulge in the extravagant luxury of becoming "an original member" of "the League of Nations," not with any advantage to herself, but in order to increase by one more the votes at Britain's command in the Councils of the League and to pay heavily for the supposed privilege.

The toy of Dyarchy did not, however, long satisfy intelligent Indians. Nor, probably, did it deceive outsiders much. Therefore a greater fraud has very recently been gone through and a cumbersome Act for India has been passed in the British Parliament which is supposed to have changed Dyarchy into full autonomy in the Provinces although keeping the same

powers (but not by name) in the Centre where the British official *bloc* is going to be replaced by the more servile and less talented and very indifferently educated State-nominated officials to out-Herod Herod himself in emergencies. By this new Act the autocratic powers of the Governor-General and the Governors have been intensified; "personal discretion" and "individual judgment" of a paid servant of the State has been, for the first time in history, given a statutory superiority over the judgment of the Cabinet and over the laws enacted by the Legislatures; and the irresponsibility of the head of the Executive has been increased. Yet recently, when the *bona fides* of the British attitude towards Abyssinia was discussed in the "League of Nations," the then British Foreign Minister (now relieved of his job) had the audacity to mention the new Government of India Act as an instance of the British love of independence and self-government for all countries.

Well has Hafiz said:—

Che dilaverast duzdai ki bakaf chirag darad.

Far be it from the Author who, as a Muslim, cannot but support Communistic Constitutions, Democracy and Liberty, to utter a word in defence either of Fascism or of Nazi-ism but the fact cannot be denied that in spite of their open antagonism to democracy and liberty both Fascism and Nazi-ism, being indigenous and national, have worked for the good of their country and their State and not for the foreign Capitalists, Exploiters and vested interests as is done in India. Who can speak a word against their patriotism and love of their country? While in India patriotism is a crime. Patriots are even incarcerated and interned without trial. Who can say that Fascism and Nazi-ism have been less concerned and less successful than Bolshevism itself in giving a new vigour, a new life and a new status in the international gallery to their respective countries and nations? Within the short period of three years Adolf Hitler has raised a defeated, disarmed, depressed and heavily burdened, bleeding and bankrupt Germany to the level of the haughty victors in every respect, while India has no position of its own and is considered to be only a chattel! It seems that Kemal and Stalin are not half as popular with their people as Hitler is with the Germans because they did not respect the feeling of their own people; 99.8 per cent. have voted for Herr Hitler in the recent general election in Germany. No wonder that the cry has gone up "Germany is Hitler." But Germany is governed by a Dictator while Russia is Socialistic and

Turkey is Republican! It seems that the poet was not beyond his mark when he said:—

"For forms of Government let fools contest;
Whatever is best administered is best.
For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right."

We have impartially related certain facts in respect of autocracies like Fascism, Nazi-ism or even Hamidism and that of the present "lay" Ruler of Turkey at one or other place in this book, which in some respects have done good to their States. But even if autocracy proves itself temporarily helpful in reviving the military spirit or in invigorating any people and in obtaining a position of domination or power for a country, the Bolshevists, who do not care for the means adopted and see only to the results, may not have any objection, but we, who scrutinize also the means adopted for the attainment of an object howsoever good it might in itself be, can have no love for autocracy. There is no curse greater than autocracy for the characters of individuals as well as for Society. It makes people cringing and submissive. One can for this reason say that even the 99.8 per cent. votes which Herr Hitler has got might have been due more to fear than to love; one can also say that the good done to the State in Germany as in Italy is only transitory and the people in both the above-mentioned places are not better off now than they were even a few years back. Taxes have increased; personal and public liberty has been curtailed. And who can guarantee that the successors of these Dictators will be able to get out, even temporarily, any benefit for the State from the pernicious and demoralising system of Despotism and Personal Rule whether it be Nazi-ism or Fascism. Autocracy is after all Autocracy. A nation loses its soul under it.

Besides the above-mentioned forms of Government the Great War's very own begotten child was the Mandatory system. This also was a camouflage. It concealed annexation. All the European Powers were used to annex parts of Asiatic countries even when they were not parties to a war. They took territories as a price for neutrality and sometimes to make the disturbed balance of power even. But in the Great War, School Master Wilson, influenced by the Bolshevik declarations, made "no annexation" one of his fourteen points for peace. So the School Master had to be made a fool of and instead of annexation, territories were taken over by the victorious Powers under the camouflage of Mandate.

Says the Right Honourable Mr. Fisher "The cruelty of conquest was draped in the veil of morality."

Yet another deception was made when it was alleged that Mandates would be taken over with the consent of the peoples themselves. In practice, victors conspired among themselves in secrecy to divide Mandates according to their own choice. Thus Mandates were taken even over countries whose "Independence" was recognised by the "Peace Treaties."

Despite poor Wilson, who turned actually mad, the Powers possessed themselves of large territories of their own choice under the guise of Mandates without taking the trouble of acquiring the consent of the people. They disregarded, in certain respects, as in those of the Arabs, the solemn treaties entered during the War.

Sir Valentine Chirol, who was known to the Author personally and was admittedly an imperialist and prejudiced writer, had had to write in *The Turkish Empire* thus: -

"The first promises to go by the board were those which had been lavished upon the Arabs and instead of the independence which was to have been their reward they were parcelled out into separate areas and subjected for the most part to foreign domination under the thin disguise of Mandates, which Great Britain and France conferred by secret agreement upon themselves without taking into account the wishes of the populations, though the Covenant of the League of Nations to which they had subscribed had laid it down that these wishes must be a principal factor in the selection of the Mandatory."

The third deception in this connection was the announcement that these Mandates were only temporary. Now, when Germany has expressed a desire to get back her colonies some of those countries which had got possession of territories as a Mandate have at once made it public that they would not surrender their Mandates in any case. On 13th March, 1936, a cable was published from Canberra to this effect:—

"It is unthinkable that Australia will ever consider handing over any territory," declared the Commonwealth Minister for External Affairs in the Senate, commenting on the German claims for the return of Colonies.

"The retention of New Guinea," he further said, "was essential for Australia's security. The principal Mandates secured a demilitarized zone which resulted in a feeling of equilibrium and security in the Pacific."

Recently Japan has also announced that she will not give up any mandated territory.

Our own opinion is that Germany will take back some of her colonies eventually or other colonies will have to be given to her from somewhere as a compensation. But it will only be at the point of the bayonet. The bayonet may not be pointed directly at the Mandatory Power but it will be there to persuade the handing over of the mandated territories which were in Germany's possession before the War. Germany may even seek some territory towards Russia or on the West African Coast. However, up to the present moment, excepting one mandated territory, no other has been released. Even the one which has been released has been bound down with a treaty. All others remain under the masterful possession of the Mandatories. They treat the mandated territory as they like. Some, like Syria and Palestine, are ruled with an iron hand in the teeth of opposition from the people of those unfortunate lands. Revolts are ruthlessly crushed. Historical towns are bombarded. Innocent women and children lose their lives. Every effort is being made to crush the spirit of nationalism and freedom. Syria has been forcibly divided up into parts to break up its solidarity.

"Divide and Rule" has been, and still is, the pernicious practice of the Imperialists. They also weaken the people by bribery and corruption not with cash alone but also with titles and positions to individuals and groups who support them at the expense of the interests of their own country.

These miserable, greedy, selfish, wretches—they would barter their very soul for only a title. No wonder that Bolshevists have abolished titles. The non-co-operation movement in India also tried to dissuade the Indian people from coveting titles.

As far as the Mandate of Syria is concerned France has so far been continuing adamant in not yielding to the demand of the Syrians for the reunification of their country. She established her Mandate by her military force and she has been continuing to keep it by the same.

Mr. J. Hampden Jackson writes in the *Post-War World* (1918-1934) :—

"The French had to inaugurate their mandatory régime by force and to maintain it by force. In August, 1920, a military expedition under General Gourand drove Faisal out of Damascus and declared the Arab kingdom which had lasted for two years to be abolished. In its place the French set up a military administration. *Divide et impera* was the policy. They divided the

mandated territory into no less than five separate States - Lebanon, Latakia, Alexandretta, the State of Jabal Druse and the larger district round Damascus which they called the State of Syria with different administrations, budgets and flags. In 1925 the French invited certain Druse Cadets to Damascus for conference and there treacherously put them under arrest. A general rising of Druses followed in which the Damascines joined. The French replied by bombarding Damascus—the oldest inhabited city of the world."

The World War was said to be fought to give weak nations as much right of self-government as was possessed by strong Powers. It was said to be fought to secure the sanctity of pledges and promises.

In the London *Times* of 27th October, 1925, an eye-witness has given an account of how poor Syrians were treated by the strongest military clique in the world when they expressed their dissatisfaction with the arbitrary assumption of Mandate over them. He writes :—

"The forty-eight hours' shelling, combined with the activities of the marauders, as might be expected, left substantial traces (in Damascus) . . . . The whole area lying between Hamidie and the "Street Called Straight" has been laid in ruins. In both bazars, shop after shop was destroyed either by tank machine-guns which riddled the iron shutters as they dashed through or by shell fire . . . . It was only several months later, when the French troops in Syria had been increased to 50,000 and Senegalese had been sent to burn down villages in which rebels were thought to be hiding, that the rising was subdued."

Patriotic Syrians, several personal friends of the Author, have been exiled from their homes. They have appealed over and over again to the League of Nations which was the guarantor of Syrian independence, and which has a Mandatory Committee to listen to the grievances of the mandated people and to examine their conditions periodically, but all in vain. All appeals to France itself in which a very prominent personal friend of the Author joined have also failed so far, though efforts are being continued. France has might and might is right. The Syrian news sent by the special correspondent of an Indian daily from Baghdad on 30th January, 1936, was as follows which shows the concern of Muslims of other countries regarding the fate of Syria :—

"A note of protest signed by eight Iraqi Senators and two Deputies against the methods used by the French as the Mandatory Power in Syria to quell disturbances in Damascus has been addressed to the League of Nations.

"The note, which was handed to the French Chargé d'Affaires in Baghdad, accused the French of suspension of liberties, imprisonment of seekers of independence and massacre of women and children." It added that the people "emphatically resent the suggestion that after all the bloodshed of the World War and the assurance given after it, the claim to freedom should be regarded as a crime. The signatories asked that the arbitrary measures now being taken in Syria by the Mandatory Power in the name of the League of Nations should be ended."

The Nationalists recently intensified the anti-Government campaign and opened a number of Peoples' Political Clubs all over the country from where they issued what is described as "threatening manifestoes." A Nationalist leader was arrested and sent to seclusion "upon which students took up the cudgels and indulged in a series of violent demonstrations in which the police were powerless. Troops were later called out."

The news has just arrived that the French have come to some understanding with the Syrian Leaders.*

As to the Palestine Mandate no act of the League of Nations has been so thoroughly dishonourable as that of allowing the Mandate over Palestine to be continued when it is seen that in a few years, at the present rate of influx of the Jews, the Arabs, to whom Palestine has been as a motherland for many long centuries, will become a minority, while the Jews who were an infinitesimal minority before the Mandate will become a majority. It is a most callous and cruel act to deprive hundreds of thousands of Arabs of their land. With British bayonets the Palestine Arabs are being compelled to give up their country—their hearth and home to strangers—the riff-raff and unwanted crowd from far off lands. History knows no such barbarism.

Palestine is supposed to be under "A Class Mandates" whose independence was recognised by the Peace Treaties, and by the Covenant of the League. Both France and England officially announced on 7th November, 1918:—

"The complete and definite emancipation of the people so long oppressed by the Turks, and the establishment of National Governments and administrations deriving their authority from the initiative and free choice of the indigenous populations."

The way in which the Arabs of Palestine are now threatened with an alien people (the Turks, being Muslims, were in no way alien) and are to be deprived of their "National Government and

*One of the most prominent exiled Syrian Leaders (*Al-amir Shikaib Arslan*) has informed the Author in April, 1937, that though the Treaty has limitations and defects and its own drawbacks yet it is being tolerated by the Patriots for the time being.

administration" is simply atrocious. And this is being done under a Commission of the League of Nations !

The motives behind the Palestine Mandate have been sordid from the first. The Right Honourable Mr. Fisher has exposed the policy underlying it in his *History of Europe* in these words :—"The conquest of Palestine was destined to have further consequences, the fruits of which were amply reaped before the close of the War. By proclaiming its intention to establish in Palestine a national home for the Jews, Great Britain rallied to the Allied cause at a time when money was urgently needed, the powerful and cosmopolitan community which, not from New York only, controls the loan markets of the world."

The natural result of thus depriving thousands of Arabs of their centuries old hearths and homes and lands was the bloodshed which the dumping of Jews from European countries, lately from Germany also, in Palestine has caused in the sacred land.

During the Turkish Regime perfect peace reigned in Palestine. If there was any quarrel it was only between the different antagonistic Christian sects themselves, otherwise the Christians, the Jews and Muslims, to all of whom Palestine was a sacred land, lived like brothers. The Jews already had flourishing colonies. But besides the policy based upon money which the British adopted in the shape of the Balfour Declaration, they imposed their Mandate upon the unwilling Palestinians to counteract the imposition of a Mandate by France over Syria and they accepted the immigration of the Jews so as to introduce a jarring and weakening element in that region which formed a solid Arab *bloc*.

The same old story of *divide et impera* is the keynote of the policy of all Imperialists, whether they be in France or Britain or Italy or Germany.

There is no doubt that the crushing collapse of the Central Powers in the West and of Turkey in the Near East has altogether upset the balance of power and has given a fillip to the Imperial arrogance of the victorious Powers.

The treaties signed by Germany and Turkey respectively were under duress and therefore had no moral significance. As long as these treaties remain the rancour in the minds of the vanquished will remain. For Britain particularly the victory was astoundingly complete. The Rt. Honourable Mr. Fisher says :—

"As for the English Prime Minister, he brought back trophies for his country such as even Chatham might have envied . . . Every point in the negotiations which could be won for the British Empire, Mr. Lloyd George was successful in gaining."

Even up to now while something has happened which has made France a little nervous nothing has taken place to disturb the contentment of Britain except the strengthening of the position of Italy in the Red Sea and also in the Indian Ocean. A time will come when this strengthening will tell against the British position in the East as the forceful and treacherous occupation, by the connivance of Britain, of Tripoli and Dodecanese did in the Mediterranean. But for the present it is France alone who is feeling a little shaky.

Alas! it is only at the hands of a European Power, which is no less Imperialistic than the others are, that this trepidation of France has taken place. Now no European Power has in the least any cause for anxiety at the hands of an Asiatic Power. Japan is engaged in realizing her ambitions in Asia. She is not concerned with Europe. If Russia, which is only half European, enters into a quarrel with Japan that will strengthen, rather than weaken, as the Author told M. Litvinoff, the position of the European Powers because the fear of Bolshevik Russia and Eastern Japan which, for the present, is a little check upon unbridled arrogance, will also disappear.

We wish there were another Power in Asia like Japan which could tell these self-centred European Powers—these dacoits—that non-Europeans resent as much, if not more, the breaking of solemn pledges and treaties and that what is sauce for the gander is also for the goose.

There was a time when Islamic Powers used to tell Europe such unpalatable truths. There was a time when Turkey herself used to keep these Powers on their best behaviour.

Let us hope that Turkey will re-rise or some other Islamic Power will come into the field to act as a policeman over Europe. Or will Bolshevists ally themselves with the Muslim States for this purpose? Some restraint to European haughtiness and wicked Imperialism is overdue indeed.

As a result of the Great War there was undoubtedly a stir in the Muslim lands. This stir in itself is a sign of life. Dr. Stoddard writes:—

"The entire world of Islam is in profound ferment. From Morocco to China and from Turkistan to the Congo, the 25,000,000 (rather 685,000,000) followers of the Prophet Muhammad are stirring to new ideas, new impulses, new aspirations. A gigantic transformation is taking place whose results must affect all mankind. This transformation was greatly stimulated by the War. But it began long before. More than a hundred years ago the seeds were sown, and ever since then it has been evolving;

at first slowly and obscurely ; later more rapidly and perceptibly, until to-day, under the stimulus of Armageddon it has burst into sudden and startling bloom ?"

For about forty years past the writer of these pages has himself been trying to create the stir mentioned by Dr. Stoddard. But the sleep of the Muslim Nation was so profound that it needed an earthquake of very great intensity to effect a shaking and to arouse it from its deep slumber. The Great War served the purpose of an earthquake. But alas! it has come late, though, let us hope, not too late. Because of the long somnolence much valuable time has been lost. Worse still—the antagonistic elements have gained time to become more effective. They have almost caused decay. If the awakening had been quicker, degeneration would not have been so disastrous. And the efforts needed for regeneration would not have had to be so Herculean.

Another defect which seems to have crept in, is that the Leaders themselves have been too long in an unconscious state and now that they have suddenly awakened, most of them are in a dazed condition and do not quite know the best means to be adopted for the regeneration.

They themselves are in the position of Rip Van Winkle. On opening their eyes they have only seen the superficial glitter of European materialism and have come to think for the moment that the regeneration of the Muslim Nation should be on the very same lines. It is hoped that they will soon realise that all that glitters is not gold and that while many points in European material civilization will have to be adopted, there are many more which will have to be avoided as Japan, in the East, is now doing.

For the Muslim Nation its Glorious Past must not be forgotten. Its own magnificent culture and civilization will have to be revived. Those must not be thrown on the scrap-heap.

In a book written over thirty years ago in Urdu entitled *Haqiqi Taraqqi*, the *Real Progress*, the Author said that if the Muslims desired to regain their past superiority and to pass the train of modern European progress, running at full speed, they shall have to lay down *new* rails and then to give a greater momentum to their train after making sure that the great speed would not cause the engine-boiler to burst. If they did not lay down a new parallel rail-road, if they ran their train on the very same lines on which the European train was running then they may overtake the train but will never be able to pass it. And the greater the speed of their train the more will there be the danger of a disastrous collision. Now we say that as there are bold signs

that the boiler of the engine of the European train is on the point of bursting, **the need of a new rail-road is more urgent,** otherwise, when the European train collapses, its very *debris* will destroy the train following it on the same rails.

From the Muslim point of view the political effects of the Great War have been disastrous inasmuch as the Turkish Empire —the Khilafat—has collapsed. But because Turkey then was far from being a model of a democratic Muslim State and because it lacked the intellectual genius and character of Islam, if the regenerated and remodelled Turkey adopts not un-Islamic lines for its development and advance and if the solidarity and internationalism of Islam are regained by effecting a closer understanding, if not an actual federation or coalition of the Muslim States, the present dark outlook will soon brighten up.

We suggested as early as 14th February, 1919, in our book *Turkey*:—

"If the Wilsonian League of Nations is founded on militarism and bigotry and the non-Christian Empire in Europe (Turkey) is disintegrated, then the only alternative for Muslims and other dissatisfied people will be to establish, on justice and equality, a counter-League of themselves."

Even before this, in the December of 1918 issue of the *Islamic Review* we said under the heading "Muhammad and the League of Nations":—

"Freedom is the birthright of every man, every nation. Those nations who have lost their freedom deserve greater sympathy, *not less*. It is they who have to be protected from oppression, from exploitation, from aggrandizement. It is they who should be given a greater voice in the League to have those wrongs which were done to them redressed. In short, all the people of the earth should receive equal treatment. By the League of Nations humanity should be treated as a whole.

Then, the chief object of the League should be to keep the equilibrium—the Peace. Every effort should be made to keep the peace between people and people without having recourse to fighting, but if the wrong-doer and oppressor or **aggressor** would persist in his wrong then the League should help the oppressed and fight against the culprit."

This we said when the League was still in its embryo. "The League of Nations" was born but it has worked on what lines we all know. It has proved quite unworthy of the objects in contemplation.

We think that all the Muslim States should now join hands and strengthen themselves by every possible method. They

should also try to help, morally at least, all those Muslim peoples who have been deprived of their liberty. Because of their having neglected to equip themselves with modern necessities for power and strength (it was against the dictates of Islam so to neglect) they will remain weaker than the mighty European Powers even if they unite, but their position is such that if they unitedly take action to strengthen themselves with modern equipment they will, in a very short time, compel these Europeans not to ignore them. If they become truly Muslim, victory will be guaranteed to them. They should not forget:--

"How often has a small party vanquished a numerous host by Allah's permission." (ii. 294.)

In Islam they have a great asset as it creates a death-defying heroism and is all-conquering. Europe has had an experience of it, as have other parts of the world. May history repeat itself! Although broken by the War it is for the Turks to take the lead of the whole of the Muslim East. An advancing and progressing Turkey will set a sound example to all Muslims *if her progress is on the right lines.* Turkey, like Iran and Afghanistan, has to learn from Europe the secret of its scientific and mechanical progress and its useful inventions which have given it a dominating position in the world. All the Muslim States have to learn how to defend themselves from asphyxiating gases and bombs from European machines and aeroplanes. They have even to learn to counteract the European aggression and exploitation. They will themselves have to make asphyxiating gases and tear-shells. In retaliation is life indeed.

But they must not take from Europe tango-dances and wine-bibbing and above all that inhumanity and animality, that fraud and deceit and untrustworthiness, that exploitation and milching of the weak peoples, which have become permanent features of the European civilization. All the Muslim peoples, *i.e.*, the whole Muslim Nation, in whatever country it may be living, whether it may be in the majority or minority, must never forget that:—

"God has promised to those who believe and *act aright* that He will make them rulers in the earth as He made rulers those before them." (XXIV: 55.)

Like changes in the systems of Government, changes have also taken place in social thought as a result of the War.

In England, particularly, the feminist or suffragist movements, which were fought bitterly against by the Government before the War, obtained complete success during the War.

Out of the 31,000,000 voters on the Register in Britain and North Ireland, on 15th October, 1935, the majority now was of women. All the disabilities of the "weaker sex" have been removed. All professions have been opened to them. As a result of the War, home-life in Europe has undergone a radical change—even in conservative England. It is not the Bolsheviks alone who are changing the old family ideals. In unchanging England too it is not the same now. Slums are being cleared up. The social conditions of workmen are also changing. In short, there is a change evident everywhere. The "never changing" East is also pulsating with a changed life. The mental outlook seems itself to have changed and the change in the educational system now going on will effect more changes in it. "The nation's failures and successes", says Professor Adamson, "in the field of education have been made manifest in the course of the Great War. With those lessons to instruct policy, and machinery at hand to give it effect, the greatest chapter in the history of British education lies in the future."

But nowhere were social reforms, in all branches, taken up with such a revolutionary zeal as in Russia after the Great War.

We have given above the changes effected by the War in detail so that it may be possible to give its due place to the greatest political, social and economic change which the Great War has brought about, *i.e.*, *Bolshevism*. One can correctly appraise Bolshevism only when he knows something of the world situation and of the political and social changes effected by the War and the different systems of Government that have come into existence since the War.

III.—The Rise of Bolshevism.

While the "Big Berthas" of the Great War were still booming, something happened in Russia which gave a great shock to the whole of Europe. Europe was aghast to see a system of government on communistic lines brought into being in Russia after a gigantic revolution. This communistic constitution took the nickname of Bolshevism. The Bolshevist Revolution not only uprooted the most powerful monarchy of the day in its own home, it also challenged all other political and social systems then existing anywhere. Trotsky declared at Brest Litovsk:—

"The hour, we hope, is near, when the oppressed working class of all countries will seize power as has the proletariat of Russia."

Bolshevism became, for the time being, a terror for Europe. Its very name became a bogey. It was due to its own guilty conscience that Europe got frightened of Bolshevism. Europe had been for many years past sweating its own workers. It had been exploiting all weak peoples. So the communistic Bolshevik Revolution frightened her. The time at which the Bolshevik Revolution came was particularly unsuited for the larger group in Europe. On the side of the *entente* group the Great War was being fought chiefly on the strength of the "Steam-roller," as Russia was then called. It is unfair to put the blame of War on Germany. The truth is that the Great War was precipitated by Czarist Russia and her ally France (for her own reasons) and then England and other Powers found before them an opportunity of crushing the rising State—Germany, and hastened to join her enemies. But as soon as Russia became Bolshevik and did away with the autocratic Czardom her old "liberal" friends and even her old "republican" ally turned upon her. M. Pichon called the Bolshevik régime "criminal, which did not represent in any degree that of a democratic Government." The *entente* group, of which Russia before was such a prominent member, refused to recognise the Bolshevik Government. On 23rd November, 1917, Lord Robert Cecil, speaking for the British Government, declared: "There is no intention of recognising such a Government." M. Barthelot said the same on behalf of France. Ambassador Francis of the United States wrote:—

"Of course we cannot, or I would not, recognise any ministry in which Lenin is Premier or Trotsky is Minister for Foreign Affairs."

Russia's old allies not only refused to recognise her, they also spent millions of dollars in equipping expeditionary armies against Bolshevik Russia. Foreign soldiers and officers gave their full

support to the enemies of the Bolsheviks and fought for several years against the Bolshevik régime. District after district was devastated by the invaders which caused colossal expenditure and took many long years to repair. But all their attempts failed to destroy Bolshevism. There were several causes for this failure. It was due to mutual jealousy and the exhaustion caused by the prolonged war. The failure was also due to the genius of Trotsky, who created a strong army in no time and met and repulsed attacks on almost a dozen fronts. It was also due to the remarkable statesmanship of Lenin, who stuck to the main object of the revolution while conceding in details. For years Bolshevism had to fight for its life but survived.

Islam at its birth had to contend with even more unfavourable and inimical circumstances and forces. It had no successful military revolution to float upon. It had no armies at the start at all to back it up. It was mercilessly attacked from all sides. It was in itself a miracle that Islam was not annihilated in its very infancy and that the numerous enemies failed to kill the Prophet himself when he, all alone, came forward to preach it, in spite of the tremendous opposition and with the enmity of a barbarous and superstitious people whose cherished idols were attacked and whose whole life -social, political and moral—was denounced. Even later on when he had succeeded in persuading a few people to accept the Truth he had been preaching, he and his few followers were savagely persecuted. They were ostracised for three full years and confined to a place where very little food and water could reach them. When they could collect a few helpers they were forced to engage in pitched battles with tremendous odds against them in numbers and equipments, etc. But in spite of all that, Islam succeeded, and established a Communist State besides reforming the spiritual, moral and social conditions of the people on quite a novel and unique basis. There is no other instance in history where such a small band of people triumphed over a well-organised and well-equipped military opposition.

Nobody can deny that the circumstances were deadly against Islam but it has also to be admitted that Bolshevism too, at a later stage, had to face very strong antagonists.

The start of the revolution in Russia was an easy one. It was a walkover. Several reasons contributed to this.

A. F. Kerensky, who has played not an unimportant part in the Russian Revolution, wrote in the *New York Times*:—

"Long before the destruction of the Czarist Regime (12th March, 1917), the army of the front had developed acute indication of disintegration. By January, 1917, more than a million

deserters were roaming about in the rear of the army. During the first of the March revolution the Russian army ceased to exist as a fighting force."

Even in 1915 Czardom was cracking. The Czarina herself was thought to be trying to help the Germans by sending them a chart "with a detailed designation of troops on the whole front." And because the Czar was under her thumb the idea was gaining ground even in responsible Russian circles that both should be removed—killed.

The Grand Duchess Maria Pavlovna insisted in the presence of her sons that Rodzianko should take the initiative in "removing the Czarina."

The Czar's own brother Michael said to Rodzianko, "The whole family knows how harmful Alexandra Feodorovna is. None but traitors surrounded her and my brother. All honest peoples have left."

General Denikin has written in his memoirs: "In the army there was loud talk, unconstrained both in time and place, as to this insistent demand of the Empress for a separate peace, her treachery in the matter of Field-Marshal Kitchener of whose journey she was supposed to have told Germans, etc." Denikin adds, "This circumstance played a colossal rôle in determining the mood of the army in its attitude to the dynasty and the revolution." Grigorowich, the Minister of Marine, said, "It is no secret that the army does not trust us and is awaiting a change."

Polivanov, the War Minister, in 1915, went to the extent of foreseeing, "only a policy of conciliation towards Society can save the situation. The present shaky dykes will not avert a catastrophe."

In the Duma Session of 21st August, 1915, Prince Sherbatov, the Minister of the Interior, had the boldness to declare "all of us together are unfit for governing Russia in the situation that is forming."

A large number of people even in the high commanding staff sympathised with the idea of a *coup d'état.*

Propotov testifies that, "Certain individuals were in touch with and under the influence of the chief leaders of the so-called progressive Block. And all diplomats, particularly the British Ambassador Buchanan, were considered accessories to the plot." Propotov reported this to Czar Nicholas himself and the Intelligence Service noticed every day the relations between Miliukov, the head of the Kadet Party, and the British Ambassador. "It seems," says Trotsky, "that the break in the army first appeared among the Cossacks, those age old subduers and punishers."

On 23rd February, 1917, under the flag of "The Women's Day" began the long ripe and long withheld uprising of the Petrograd working masses. It began with a strike. In the course of three days it became general. On the night of 26th about a hundred persons were arrested in different parts of the city—people belonging to various revolutionary organisations, and among them five members of the Petrograd Committee of the Bolsheviks. Trotsky says, "The leaders were watching the movement from above—they hesitated, they lagged—in other words, they did not lead. They dragged after the movement." On the 26th of February, which was a Sunday, about forty persons were killed and as many wounded. Rodizianko was then the President of the State Duma.

The shooting of demonstrators increased the uncertainty among the leaders. Even twelve hours before the victory, discussions arose at the meeting of the Vyborg Committee whether it was not time to end the strike. An incident happened and on the eve of that day the fourth company of the Pavlovsky regiment of the Imperial Guard mutinied. Excepting twenty-one, others returned to the barracks. Not only Kerensky, Cheidza, Skobelev of the so-called "socialistic" staff began to oppose the insurrection but even the central Bolshevik staff, composed of Shliapnikov, Zalutsky, and Molotov, "was amazing in its hepelessness and lack of initiative." But the revolution was growing of itself. On 27th February the crowd liberated, as did the crowd during the French Revolution, without bloodshed, from the many gaols of the capital, all political prisoners—among them the patriotic group of the Military and Industrial Committees which had been arrested on 26th January and the members of the Petrograd Committee of the Bolshevik, seized by Khabalov forty hours earlier.

A political division occurred immediately outside the prison-gates. The Menshevik patriots set out for the Duma, where functions and places had to be assigned. The Bolsheviks marched to the districts, to the workers and soldiers, to finish with them the conquest of the Capital.

Towards the evening of the 27th, a stream of soldiers, workers, students and miscellaneous people marched to the Tauride Palace which temporarily became the "Field Headquarters, Governmental Centre, Arsenal and Prison fortress of the Revolution."

The Revolution was then still good-natured, trustful and kindhearted. It became ruthless only after a long series of treasons and deceits.

Trotsky says that, "Petrograd achieved the February Revolution." The whole country followed the footsteps of the Petrograd revolutionaries. Another peculiarity of the 27th February Revolution was that it was not started by leaders.

In his history of the "Russian Disorders," General Denikin has written :—

"On that decisive day there were no leaders, there were only the elements. In their threatening currents there were then visible neither aims, nor plans, nor slogans."

Zinoviev, the President of the Social Revolutionary Party, said, "The Revolution fell like the thunder out of the sky. Let us be frank: it arrived joyfully unexpected for us, too, revolutionists who had worked for it through long years and waited for it always."

The Bolsheviks had none of their prominent leaders present. Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev were in exile. So were the then little known political leaders Sverdlov, Rykov and Stalin.

On the critical day of 27th February, when, in the "dissolved" Duma, Miliukov was still debating the point whether it was not "too soon" to come to a decision, the Revolution was creating in the same building another institution. The Mensheviks liberated from prison, the members of the Military Industrial Committee meeting in the Tauride Palace, with the leaders of the Trade Union and co-operative movements, likewise of the right wing and with the Menshevik deputies of the Duma, including also a few Bolsheviks, in their ranks, supplemented by the official representatives from all Socialist Parties, straightway formed a provisional Executive Committee of the Soviet of "Workers' Deputies." At the first session it was decided to unite the garrison with the workers in a general "Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies."

From the moment of its formation the Soviet, in the person of its Executive Committee, began to function as the Sovereign. It occupied the State Bank, the Treasury, the Mint and the printing office with a revolutionary guard. But up to that time the Bolsheviks were in an insignificant minority even in the Petrograd Soviet. Worker-Mensheviks had the leading rôle.

A revolution was after all a revolution. Incident after incident had followed. The Czar was at the front; the Czarina at Petrograd. She sent wire after wire to the Czar to come. When the Czar started, his train was side-tracked on the way by the railway workers. The Czar abdicated in favour of his son with the Grand Duke Mikhail as the regent. But a Provisional Government under Prince George Lvov—a landlord and a member of the Constitutional Democratic Party, was formed and the Duma

abolished. Alexander Kerensky of the Social Revolutionary Party represented the Petrograd Soviet in the Provisional Government whose first act was to proclaim freedom of speech, of association, of the press and of religion. Eventually Kerensky became the Head. We are told, he is proud, up to this day, of having been the Head of Russia for a little while. The Provisional Government also announced that the permanent Democratic Government for Russia would be formed by a National Constitutional Assembly elected on universal suffrage.

On the 3rd of April, 1917, Vladimir Ilyich (Lenin) arrived in Petrograd. The Petrograd Committee, with the co-operation of the military organization, mobilised several thousand workers and soldiers with a division of armoured cars, for a triumphal welcome to Lenin. "Only from that moment," says Trotsky, "the Bolshevik Party began to speak out loud" and "with its own voice."

Lenin insisted on two points. First, that the War must be ended. Secondly, that Parliamentary system must not be adopted for the Government in Russia but a Republic of Soviets of workmen's, labourers' and peasants' delegates be formed. The name of the Social Democratic Party was changed into the Communist Party as an indication that the Paris Commune would be taken as the type. "Not the introduction of Socialism as an immediate goal, but only the control of the Soviets over the national production and distribution of produce" was aimed at. Lenin's programme or "thesis" consisted of propaganda through posters, papers, leaflets "and the organisation of fighting units and arming of the workers." On 2nd May, 1917, the Government sent a message to the Allies that the Russian people are firm in their loyalty to the Allies even to the extent of "an annexationist policy." This caused a mutiny but the Bolsheviks did not support it. In the meantime Trotsky had also arrived. In July, 1917, a meeting was summoned by Lenin of his comrades to discuss if war was to be undertaken but Kerensky, who had become the Dictator, put most of the minor leaders of the Communist Party into prison. Lenin, however, hid himself near the Razelov Railway station and published articles against the Kerensky Government. Then he fled to Finland and on his way he halted at Vyborg. "Where," writes one of his biographers, "he incited a massacre at Kronstadt where the sailors, after killing their officers, captured the fortress and the whole Baltic fleet. That was put down but the coalition Government under Kerensky was not more successful than the Lvov Government had been as it could neither conclude peace nor conduct the war with any good results." Peasants were hungry and dissatisfied, workers unemployed and starving, soldiers discontented and rebellious and the

Provisional Government tottering on its legs. Lenin, on the advice of Trotsky, appointed the 7th of November, the date fixed for the second Soviet Congress, to start the Bolshevik Revolution.

Mirsky says that for the bourgeoisie and for the social patriots, "Lenin before long became the devil incarnate and the Bolsheviks a race of savages not to be gauged by ordinary human standards."

The Provisional Government did its best to have Lenin arrested but failed. Lenin did not even think it necessary to hide himself. He addressed a public gathering thus:—"Comrades, now is the time for action. To delay any longer will be treason in the face of Revolution. The rebellion of the armed forces has to begin at once. The Russian Government has for the moment neither intelligence nor a policy. It has neither forces nor resources. It will have to surrender. Then peace with Germany will be immediately concluded. The land will be distributed among the peasants, the factories will be given to the workers."

The author of *Rebels or Redeemers* in his life of Lenin says, "A general massacre followed. Everybody killed anybody whom he regarded as an enemy of the Revolution irrespective of his age or sex. The villagers had complete freedom to avenge their old wrongs. Lenin connived at this legalised mob rule."

Lenin entered the Winter Palace. All the valuable paintings, pictures and furniture was in ruins. He declared, "Brothers, Comrades, you have been victorious in the Capital. The workers of the world will never forget your zeal and your courage. Now you will establish the Commonwealth of the Proletariat. You will crush your enemies with the new State. The struggle will be a long one but you must never see backwards. Remember that your comrades are now conquering Moscow and that others are shedding their blood in all the towns of Russia. Yours is the victory. You, and none but you, will govern and judge. You will use for yourself the wealth of this country. There will be no laws to bind the freedom of workers, peasants and soldiers. There will be no special privileges. There will be no more wars. On the very next day we shall propose to all the fighting nations a peace without annexation and indemnity. We shall arrange an armistice between us and Germany. The land held by the Czars and the bourgeoisie will pass to the peasants. Factories, banks, railways and ships will come to the workers. They will rule the country."

On 10th November, 1917, the National Congress of Soviets ratified the Bolshevist *coup d'état*. The new Government occupied the Smolney Palace.

This "October Revolution" was a planned revolution but the March one was almost spontaneous. About that the Right Honourable Mr. H. A. L. Fisher says in his *A History of Europe*:—

"In Russia it was a revolution of hunger, misery and fatigue, the ruin of Russian armies and four million casualties."

The whole country, nobles as well as bourgeoisie, soldiers, liberals, socialists had fallen away from the allegiance of the Czar.

Lenin himself said, "The army voted for peace with its legs. It ran away." The March Revolution was certainly not the work of the Bolshevist leaders. The two greatest Bolshevist leaders —Trotsky and Lenin—were not even present anywhere on the Russian soil when the Revolution was started early in 1917. They came months after on the scene.

Strange indeed are the ways of Fate. The head of the revolutionary people during the first days of the fateful uprising in 1917 was Rodizianko, whom Trotsky has described thus:—

"A page in the Court of Alexander II, an officer of the Cavalry Guard, head of the nobles of his province, Lord Chamberlain under Nicholas II, a monarchist through and through, a rich landlord and member of the Octoberist Party, a deputy in the State Duma;—This man was elected the head of the Provisional Government which snatched the power from the Czar and paved the way for the Leninist Workers' Constitution in Russia . . . It was he who recovered the power from the hands of conspirators, rebels and tyrannicides."

Well has a Muslim poet said:—

Udu shavad sababe khair gar Khuda khwahad.

If it pleases God the enemy becomes the instrument of good.

Circumstances over which neither Trotsky nor Lenin had any control gave these Bolshevik geniuses the opportunity which they had been seeking for many long years. In 1905 the opportunity came but was missed. In 1917 it came and it was utilised by an enemy of Bolshevism to start the Revolution, to break up the power of the Czar and to dissuade the army from its allegiance to its Commander-in-Chief—its Field Marshal—its Monarch. Rodizianko was chosen by Fate to be an instrument of the Revolution. If Rodizianko had not been there, neither Lenin nor Trotsky would have been able to put their feet on Russian soil. In fact Lenin, when he was permitted by the German authorities, of course to further their own objects, to travel in a "sealed" carriage to Russia one month after the Revolution had already taken place, was himself afraid up to the last moment

that he would be caught when he alighted from the train and would either be imprisoned or exiled. Against all these expectations, when he alighted, he was hailed by the revolutionaries with ovation and given the desired opportunity of conducting the Revolution according to his own desire so much so that the proposal of calling a Constituent Assembly also had to be given up to meet Lenin's wishes.

There is no question that it was Lenin who conducted the Revolution on Bolshevik lines but there are also no two opinions on the subject that Bolshevism or Leninism would have remained only confined to books, as Marxism had been, if Trotsky had not been able to come to Russia. The Revolution itself had been easily accomplished. It had been accomplished neither under Lenin nor under Trotsky but under a third person—under one whose principles were against those of Trotsky and Lenin. But the most difficult problem was how to maintain and protect the Revolution from the friends and Allies of the Czar on the one hand and the anti-Bolshevist elements in Russia on the other ? Pious resolutions and words could not do it ; orations and theses could not do it. Only a well-organised army could do it. Lenin himself told his friend Gorky, "Show me another man (besides Trotsky) who could organise almost a model army in a single year ?" Mirsky, the biographer of Lenin and the colleague and friend of Stalin, writes :—

"During these years of Civil War two men personified the Communist cause—Lenin and Trotsky." He admits that "without Lenin the second revolution would certainly have taken place —the situation made it unavoidable." But he thinks that "it would have been a chaotic and disorganised rising of despairing and leaderless masses." It seems to be simply hero-worship on the part of Mirsky to say that without Lenin the Revolution would have remained chaotic. It did not remain chaotic for a month in the absence of Lenin. Even a Provisional Government had been formed and surely it would have taken an organised shape after the arrival of Trotsky. Mirsky himself acknowledges that Lenin did not take a direct part in the tactical direction of the insurrection and he admits that the part played by Trotsky "during the critical years saved the Soviet Republic." Others like M. C. Uritsky said, "This great Revolution is come and no matter how intelligent Lenin is he begins to dim a little before the genius of Trotsky." Another Bolshevik writer says : "There are points in which Trotsky indubitably excels him (Lenin) : he is more brilliant, he is more clever, he is more mobile. Lenin is perfectly fitted for sitting in the President's chair of the Soviet of Peoples' Commissars, and guiding with genius the World

Revolution but obviously he could not handle the titanic task which Trotsky took upon his shoulders, those lightning trips from place to place, those magnificent speeches, fanfires of instantaneous command and rôle of continual electrifier, now at one point, now at another of the weakening army. There is no man on earth who could replace Trotsky there."

It was no doubt a fact that as the civil war in Arabia endangered the very existence of the little model Communistic Islamic State formed at Medina over thirteen hundred years ago, so did the "White" Russians, who "were helped by all the Great Powers," imperil the Workers' Soviet Republic of Russia soon after the Bolshevik Russian Revolution of October 1917.

Many and yet many were the occasions when, like Islam, Bolshevism escaped annihilation by a hair's breadth. At one time it was threatened by Germany, at another by Japan and most of all by Denikin and Kolchak and others, helped by France and England and even Italy. Lenin could not save it from so many enemies by his orations or theses.

It was a Napoleonic military feat indeed to have saved the Russian Bolshevik Revolution from so many attacks with very poor resources and the credit of this cannot go to any person other than Trotsky. It was he who had to accomplish a stupendous task and he did accomplish it. If he had not been there the Sun of Bolshevism would have risen only to set within twelve months, if not earlier, for years and years and years to come, if not for ever. It was in fact Trotsky who gave an opportunity to Lenin himself to "canalise," as Mirsky says, the revolution into the formation of an efficient fighting Government that spoke the language of the masses and treated its enemies, in Marx's phrase, "in the plebian way." But the "fighting Government" had, under Lenin's guidance and insistence, given away, at one time or other, all other Marxian principles except the Revolution itself and that would have also had to be yielded before *force majeure* if Trotsky had not valiantly countered it. And then, nobody can say that Trotsky is only a man of the sword or only a man of action. He is certainly as good a man of brains and a good writer and a speaker of merit.

Mr. Louis Fischer writes in his *Soviets in the World Affairs*:—"Foreign States spent millions of dollars equipping expeditionary forces against the Soviet régime. Thousands of foreign and foreign-supported troops fought for months and years against the Bolsheviks. Whole districts were laid waste by the invaders and ruin caused which it required years to repair."

Who faced this terrible situation and who gained the ultimate victory ? Trotsky and again Trotsky.

Mr. Fischer further writes:—"Intervention found the Soviet standing alone on a small piece of territory faced by a combination of Russia's *bourgoisie* and troops of foreign countries. They had little money, an imperfect organisation, a weak army, limited experience and insufficient military equipment. The enemy disposed of huge financial resources, expert military leadership, boundless supplies of arms, ammunition and stores, great stretches of territory, (Siberia, the Ukraine, the Caucasus, the North, etc.), and the richest agricultural raw-material producing and industrial sections of the country. Yet in the end victory came to the Soviet. Single handed they fought England, America, Japan, Serbia, Italy, Czecho-Slovakia, the Baltic States, Kolchak, Denikin, Petlura, the Mensheviks, Yudenich, Wrangel, Semenov, Kalnikov and most of lesser forces, and won."

An Italian author called "Malaparte," who visited Moscow in 1929, has repeatedly asserted in his book, *Coup d'Etat—The Technique of Revolution,* that it was not the "strategy" of Lenin that won the October Revolution but the "tactics" of Trotsky. This author has put in the mouth of Trotsky himself these words addressed to Lenin. "Your strategy demands too many favourable circumstances: an insurrection needs nothing; it is self-sufficient." Trotsky in his *History of the Revolution* ridicules poor Malaparte but in that book Trotsky himself puts the question regarding Lenin's part in the Revolution and answers it. He writes:

"It remains to ask—and this is no unimportant question, although easier to ask than answer:—How would the Revolution have developed if Lenin had not reached Russia in April, 1917 ? If our exposition demonstrates and proves anything at all we hope it proves that Lenin was *not* a demiurge of the revolutionary process; that he merely entered into a chain of objective historic forces. But he was a great link in that chain. The dictatorship of the proletariat was to be inferred from the whole situation, but it had still to be established. It could not be established without a Party. The Party could fulfil its mission only after understanding it. For that Lenin was needed."

It is immaterial for our purposes to settle the question one way or the other who really was the mainstay of the Bolshevik Revolution—Lenin or Trotsky ? Personalities do not count with us. No true Muslim is ever overawed by personalities. That is one of the hundreds of advantages of being a worshipper of One and Only God. Nothing else can be worshipped—not even the mightiest man. All human beings have their limitations. Lenin had in fact too many limitations. His success, as that of

many others, had many elements, call them chance, or luck or Fate, which were beyond his control—in truth some of those were beyond human control. So, however great may have been his qualifications, no Muslim would bow to him as do some unthinking, really slavish-minded young men. Even the success which fell to his lot cannot all be attributed to his own cleverness. It was Fate that helped him. He was a man—fallible, weak, even inconsistent. He was an opportunist. He stuck to no principles. Bolshevist success was *not* all due to him. Different people have given different reasons for the success of Bolshevism in establishing itself in Russia. The Right Honourable Mr. Fisher says:—

"The instruments of Lenin's power were (1) a highly organised Communist Party, (2) a secret police inherited from the Czarist régime and (3) the Red Army."

In the organisation of the Party, Lenin undoubtedly played not an unimportant part. In the organisation of the Red Army, Trotsky played the all-important part. But neither would have succeeded if circumstances or Fate had not favoured them at very critical moments. It was only through the favour of others—their enemies—that both were allowed even to reach Russia. In the course of the struggle many and yet many were the occasions when, if luck had not favoured them, they and their cause would have been destroyed. During the Revolution, Lenin escaped death from four bullets. One should have been sufficient to kill him. On many occasions the enemies of the Bolshevik Revolution seemed to have got the upper hand. Many a time to all appearances the Revolution was on the point of being suppressed. It was not suppressed. Bolshevism did rise. Circumstances favoured it. Luck was with its leaders. Bolshevism was victorious.

The first victory of the Bolsheviks has been described thus:—

In August, 1918, British, French and Russians were pushing down from the North, the Czecho-Slovaks continued the victorious march in the Volga districts. Krasnov, the German-subsidised "White", pressed up towards Moscow, and in Moscow itself anti-Bolshevik machinations by allied representatives and assassinations by hired agents, continued to multiply.

Bolshevik prospects did not seem bright. The bullets that temporarily felled Lenin struck horror into the hearts of the Kremlin leaders. For a moment it appeared as if the end had come. But they girded up their loins for a greater effort. On 2nd September the central Executive Committee of the Soviet Government placed the entire country under martial law, and three days later the Council of Peoples' Commissars announced the initiation of "the Red Terror" as a weapon against the Savinkov organisation and

other opponents of the Revolution. "Death to all traitors," and "Merciless war on foreign invaders," were the new slogans. Bolsheviks had been driven to the wall. They fought with all the fierceness of a beast at bay. While the *Cheka* mowed down the scheming officers and conspiring "Whites" operating on the Bolshevik territory, the Red Army and Navy moved against the Czecho-Slovaks. Petrograd Workers and Units of the Baltic Fleet were brought from the Neva river, through the tedious, intricate canal system which makes it possible to go by water from Petrograd to Persia, and concentrated on the Volga near Kazan. At the same time land forces led personally and inspired by the fiery eloquence of Trotsky, bore down on the same Tartar city. Meanwhile the Kazan proletariat sabotaged within the walls. On 10th September the town fell. A cry of rejoicing went up in the Communist camp. It was their first victory.

But this victory was on only one sector. The enemies had massed troops on several fronts. That had to be met. The Red Army multiplied. One dealt with Kransnov ; the other pursued the Czecho-Slovaks. The third kept watch on Ukraine. A fourth gave a check to the Allied armies at Murmansk and Archangel. At the same time Bolshevist peasants and Red bands harassed Semenov and Kalnikov in Eastern Siberia.

Expecting a revolution in other countries the Bolsheviks were glad when the Central Powers collapsed. But because the victorious Powers felt that Bolshevism represented not only a power but also an idea which if allowed to spread would be extremely dangerous to their hegemony, they concentrated all their attention to defeating Russia after they had finished with Germany and her Allies. As usual these Western Powers, led for the time being by President Wilson, adopted a double-faced policy. But Trotsky met their military power and Lenin, helped by Chechcrin and Radek, proved himself more than a match to them in diplomacy. These Western Powers must have thought that they would be able to deal with the Bolsheviks as they had treated the Turks. But they counted without a first class diplomat like Lenin. They found out that they could not beat him in diplomacy and tact. A note sent by Lenin to Wilson mercilessly exposed the duplicity of the latter. It reminded Wilson that while he had proposed friendship with Russia, the United States Government lent its assistance to Czecho-Slovakia in their attack on Russia, causing famine.

The note said:—"You have promised, Mr. President, to help Russia secure full and unhindered opportunity for the adoption of her independent decision with regard to her own political

development and her national policy. But in reality this assistance expressed itself in the fact that Czecho-Slovak troops, and soon afterwards your own troops and those of your Allies, attempted at Archangel, at Murmansk, in the Far East, to force upon the Russian people the Government of the oppressors.

"The acid test of the relations between the U. S. and Russia has not given exactly the kind of results that one would have expected after your message to the Congress."

The note gave a broad hint of Russia's war preparedness in these words:—

"Our experience has helped us to create a firmly-welded, disciplined Red Army which is growing every day in strength and is learning to defend the Revolution."

It contained the advice:—

"Why not establish a real League by first overthrowing Capitalism?"

It exposed the double dealings thus:—"We have had to do with the President of the assault upon Archangel and of the invasion of Siberia. We also have had to do with the President of the peace programme of the "League of Nations." Is not the first of the two the real President who actually directs the policy of the American Capitalist Government?"

Then the pertinent and sarcastic question was:—

"Do the Governments of America, Great Britain, and France intend to cease calling for the blood of the Russian people and the Russian citizens if the Russian people agree to pay them for it and to buy themselves off by ransom?"

No reply was, or could be, sent to this pungent note. It has been said that the British even "intrigued" to erect a "monarchist dictatorship." But when they failed they, according to their old habit, went to the extent of suggesting to their Allies that all the Russian Governments should call an Armistice and send their delegates to the Peace Conference at Paris. This suggestion was rejected by Czarist Russia's old Ally—France. M. Pichon recalled the Allied policy of "furnishing at all accessible points of Russia all the aid and succour which it is possible to give to the healthy, faithful, honest, elements in Russia in order to help them escape from the bloody and disorderly tyranny of the Bolsheviks."

On the other hand a conference was held for seven days, ending on 24th November, 1918, at Jassy, the temporary capital of Roumania, of the Russian "Whites," (the enemies of Bolsheviks), and it was decided to appoint a Czarist Staff-General as Dictator for the whole of Russia, Denikin was chosen and request was

made to the *Entente* Powers to send a force of 180,000 men to Russia. "The plan of action of the Allies," wired Premier Clemenceau, "is to realize simultaneously the economic encirclement of the Bolsheviks and the organisation of order by the Russian elements."

This plan was made public and M. Pichon, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, read the telegram in the Chamber of Deputies on 29th December, 1918.

The encirclement was soon completed. On the North, Russia was cut off from the outside world by British, French, Italian and even American troops ; on the West, by the Baltic buffers, the German, the British fleet (Turks having been defeated Dardanelles was open) and by Poland ; on the South, by the French in Ukraine, Denikin in the Kuban, and the British in Caucasia and Transcaspia; on the East were Japanese with their faithful Atamans in Eastern Siberia and by Kolchak and the Czechs in Western Siberia.

Among the War aims of the Allies it was announced that the chief was "to make the world safe for Democracy." But on 24th December, 1918, M. Litvinoff, the talented Minister for Russian Foreign Affairs, had to remind President Wilson, who later read the note to the Paris Peace Conference, that "the Russian workers and peasants fail to understand how foreign countries which never dreamed of interfering with Russian affairs when Czarist barbarism and militarism ruled supreme, and even supported that régime, can feel justified in interfering in Russia now."

M. Litvinoff even went to the extent of asking for "technical advice how to exploit Russian natural resources." In the end he said :—

"The Dictatorship of toilers and producers is not an aim in itself but the means of building up a new social system under which useful work and equal rights would be provided to all citizens."

He very logically added :—

"One may believe in this or not, but it surely gives no justification for sending foreign troops to fight against it, or for arming and supporting classes interested in the restoration of the old system of exploitation of man."

It was on this note that America and Britain suggested that the Bolsheviks may be allowed to send representatives to Paris but M. Pichon rejected the idea. The French Minister for Foreign Affairs raised no objection to the presence of Russian counter-revolutionaries like Kalnikov and Semenov, Kolchak or Petlura.

M. Pichon declared that "the French Government will have no contact with crime."

Even at Versailles, Foch urged a quick peace with Germany to free the Allied forces to crush Bolshevism by force. All the chief anti-Bolsheviks were there like Chaikovsky, Maklakov, Sazanov, Savinkov and Prince Lvov, even Kerensky.

In vain did Mr. Lloyd George point out that "a report has come that the Bolsheviks are stronger than ever, that their internal position is strong and their hold on the people stronger . . . . . It is also reported that the peasants are becoming Bolsheviks." Moreover "the hope that the Bolshevik Government would collapse had not been realized."

It was not that Lloyd George liked Bolshevism. He did not conceal the fact that "the Bolshevik movement is as dangerous to civilization as German militarism". (Why not "as European Imperialism ?" M.H.K.).

Mr. Lloyd George's opponents were not slow to turn his own opinion upon him by remarking "if we could smash up Germany we could surely overthrow the handful of men who reign from the Kremlin."

But the well-developed political instinct of Mr. Lloyd George made him say, "the mere idea of crushing Bolshevism by a military force was pure madness. The armies would mutiny." He went to the extent of giving the warning that "if a military enterprise were started against the Bolsheviks that would make England Bolshevist and there would be a Soviet in London."

Sir Henry Wilson wrote in his diary on 22nd January, 1919, that at a London Cabinet meeting "I emphasized the urgency of the situation, pointing out that unless we carried out our proposal we should lose not our army of the Rhine, but our garrison at home, in Ireland, Gibraltar, Malta, India, etc., and that even now we dare not give an unpopular order to the troops, and discipline was a thing of the past."

How every down-trodden son of the East would have blessed the day if "a Soviet ruled in London." Egypt, Palestine, Iraq, India and even Syria would have been free. The Imperialism of the whole world would have been shaken to its very foundation. But that was *not* to be. Although Lenin—that means Bolsheviks—offered a compromise repeatedly, and showed his willingness to yield on every point, only if the Western Powers gave him a chance to come to terms, although Wilson, and more so Lloyd George, were willing to call the Bolshevists to a conference, Prinkipo was even suggested, but the French, the Republican French, who were

friends of the autocracy of not only the Russian Czars of old but also of the anti-revolutionary Russian "Whites," remained adamant.

Thus encouraged and helped Kolchak almost reached the gates of Moscow and Denikin also advanced dangerously forward. The French had occupied Odessa as far as Kherson in order to ensure food supply to the enemies of the Bolsheviks. But the French were soon disillusioned with Denikin and Petlura because the Red Army bravely advanced on Kherson and inflicted losses upon French men and officers themselves. The first week of April, 1919, saw an end of the grandiose French scheme of intervention in Soviet Russia. But before this had happened the army of Kolchak, 120,000 strong, broke through the Bolshevik defences on the Ural front and forced the Red Army to retreat towards the Volga. This encouraged the interventionists among the Allies and on 26th May the Supreme Council, after having handed a neatly bound copy of Peace terms for Germany to Count Brockdorff-Rantzau in the Versailles "Hall of Mirrors" addressed a joint note, signed by Clemenceau, Wilson, Lloyd George, Orlando and Saiorgi, the Big Five as they were called, to Admiral Kolchak as "the Supreme Ruler of all the Russias." The note asked Kolchak and his friends to call the Constituent Assembly "as soon as they reached Moscow" and recognise the independence of Finland, Poland, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania and the Caspian and Caucasus Republics."

But these great statesmen counted their chickens much too early. By the time Kolchak's reply reached Paris, the Red Army had thrown Kolchak back towards the Urals.

One by one Trotsky cleared all the fronts. On 13th May, 1919, Yudenich had begun his offensive towards Petrograd supported by two reactionary organisations called "National Centre" and the "Resurrection Union" which were financed by foreigners. But the Soviet counter-offensive, which commenced in August, met with instantaneous success.

General Yudenich was acting in concert with Denikin and Denikin had accepted the supremacy of Kolchak.

By rapid advance the Red Army conquered Western Siberia, took 100,000 prisoners and compelled the "Supreme Ruler" to resign his military command to Ataman Semenov. He surrendered himself to the French General Janin, in charge of the Allied forces in Siberia but the Bolsheviks forcibly got him into their hands and after a trial shot him dead on the 7th February, 1920.

In May, 1919, Denikin had advanced in three directions: towards Tzarian to unite with Kolchak, towards Moscow and

towards Ukraine—good cavalry was Denikin's strong point. It gave him mobility. The Bolsheviks lacked that. But there was Trotsky's genius. He issued a summons in a couple of words, "Proletarians ! to horse."

This brought forward a great horseman. Budenny's mounted Cossacks played a decisive rôle, and after a few ups and downs the "great General Denikin" was seen, in May, 1920, in London, writing his memoirs. Thus ended that campaign also against the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks won. But another campaign against them opened. On 8th May, 1920, Kiev, the ancient Capital of Ukraine, fell into the hands of the Poles with lightning speed. The Bolsheviks were still engaged with the remnants of Denikin's army. They were taken unawares by Pilsudski's army. However, this invasion of Ukraine was not liked even by General Brusilov and other "White officers." The peasantry of Ukraine also got frightened of the old Polish landlords. Meanwhile Budenny created the impression of some "legendary and invincible power" as Pilsudski himself admitted. The tables were soon turned: 150,000 Reds under Tukhachevsky, aged only 27, took the offensive. The Bolshevik army was soon knocking at the doors of Warsaw. Poland was the pet of France. France rushed to help —so did Britain. The Bolsheviks, however, agreed to open peace pourparlers with Poland direct. Lloyd George tried to persuade France to agree to an armistice between Poland and Russia. Millerand, Foch and Berthelot met the British Prime Minister at Lympne. They were still for crushing Bolshevism.

Millerand declared that he did not trust the words or signatures of the Bolsheviks who "had neither honour nor laws."

When the Poles were still at Kiev, Krassin had come to London on a "commercial mission"—to talk trade ! But politics had been talked.

Mr. Lloyd George detailed a political programme. If Bolsheviks (1) would not harm the British garrison in Batum ; (2) would leave alone the Menshevik Government of Georgia ; (3) would not help Kemal Pasha ; (4) would not fight against the Balkan States ; or (5) against Baron Wrangel in the Crimea ; and (6) would stop sending agents into India, Afghanistan, Persia and Asia Minor, then England would be pleased to allow trade with Russia.

But the Bolshevik advance had changed the situation in favour of Bolsheviks. Grabski, the Polish Prime Minister, was terror-stricken. He fell at the feet of Lloyd George and pocketted a good scolding from the Welshman. The Bolsheviks had the upper hand. But Lenin, as usual, was ready for compromise. On 18th March, 1921, the Peace Treaty was signed by Poland and

Russia at Riga. The Bolsheviks had triumphed in this campaign also though their march on Warsaw failed by being too impetuous, without having properly organised their rear, as did that of Von Kluck on Paris in 1914, which, if successful, would have changed the whole course of the Great War. The Bolsheviks hastened a liberal peace with Poland to meet the danger from the advance of Baron Wrangel. As usual France and Britain gave all help to Wrangel who began his serious operations in May, 1920. While Miller, Yudenich, Kolchak and Denikin were "England's puppets", Wrangel was the tool of France. He was to capture permanently the coal and iron fields and mines of Ukraine for France. Pitched battles were fought at the neck of the Crimean bottle. The author of *The Soviets in World Affairs* says, "Victory could not go to those whose cause was hopeless."

By the 10th of November, 1920, the whole of the Crimean Peninsula was in the hands of the Red Army and Wrangel had to take to his ships after giving away more than a hundred Russian vessels to France. The end of 1920 marked the finish of the Russian civil war. The Bolsheviks had won at last. Epidemics raged, transport was crippled, famine threatened, but they won. In 1920 according to the official figures the armed forces consumed 25 per cent. of the flour, 60 per cent. of the fish, 60 per cent. of the meat, 40 per cent. of the fats, 100 per cent. of the tobacco, 90 per cent. of the men's shoes, and 40 per cent. of the cotton goods of the entire country. The strength of the army increased from 435,000 in December, 1917 to 1,500,000 in the middle of 1919 and to 5,300,000 in 1920. They had had to suppress rebellions and mutinies. They had to find colossal sums for arms and ammunition, etc. And above all they had to meet most malicious propaganda against them. But they won in spite of all the obstacles.

Here is a distinct similarity between Bolshevism and Islam. The Prophet Muhammad, when still almost alone, declared that if his enemies put the Sun on one hand and the Moon on the other to stop him from his work of preaching Islam, he would not desist. *And he did not desist.* He had to fight scores of battles. He had to overcome innumerable difficulties. But he achieved complete triumph. All historians agree that both the rise and success of Islam were miraculous. They were the most glorious and amazing events in human history.

So have all historians to admit that the success of Bolsheviks in Russia was wonderful. And even the most prejudiced man cannot deny the fact that Bolshevism succeeded in drawing the attention of the whole world towards the poor, the exploited, and the depressed masses.

President Wilson himself said, "Bolshevism is a protest against the way in which the world has worked."

The "Labour" and other philanthropic departments in the "League of Nations" were themselves a counterpoise against Bolshevism. But it rose, in spite of all, as a living factor in the politics of the world. It fought its opponents out and defeated all their attempts to destroy it.

There is not only a similarity with Islam in the way Bolshevism was attacked on all sides ; there is also a similarity in the peace Bolshevism had had to make with her first enemies—Germany and her Allies, at Brest Litovsk. Lenin's own colleagues were against the peace terms which Lenin was prepared to accept. All thought these terms to be too humiliating. The Allies of Czarist Russia were also opposed to the peace at Brest.

Lenin telegraphed to General Dukonin, who was commanding the Russian army on the German front, to open negotiations with the Central Powers. The Allies persuaded the General to refuse to obey Lenin's orders and demanded the authority of the Central Government of Russia. Lenin therefore sent Lieut. Ensign Krylenko to dismiss General Dukonin and to put him to death. Lenin's further instructions were, "if there are any disorders carry out a mass execution." Trotsky was sent on 27th November, 1917, to Germany. An armistice was signed. On 12th December the historic negotiations began at Brest Litovsk. Germany proposed such hard terms that Trotsky and his colleagues who had been sent by the Bolsheviks to arrange the peace, found it impossible to accept them. Nor did Lenin's proposal to all the belligerents to have an armistice for three months, and in the meantime a general conference to settle peace terms, met with any response. But Lenin was determined to have peace.

He once said, "I shall perhaps be alone but I shall never be turned aside from my opinions. I shall never cease to champion them and follow the straight line." Lenin did not always follow the "straight line." But he was obstinate for the occasion. Sometimes he was inconsistent ; sometimes he quietly changed his views. *But he was determined to save the Bolshevik Revolution at any cost.* That he did. There lies his greatness. He thought at first that he would be able to save it by creating the same kind of revolution all over Europe. When it did not materialize soon and the Germans victoriously advanced in Russia, he at once accepted all the German terms. His party also agreed with him now and on 19th February, 1918, the Council of Commissars sent a telegram to the Germans accepting their terms of peace. On 15th March, 1919, the Congress of Soviets ratified the peace between Russia on

one side and the four Allied Powers Germany, Austria, Turkey and Bulgaria, on the other. By the Treaty of Brest Litovsk, in spite of Lenin's determination to have a peace without annexation, Russia had to surrender Poland, Finland, Esthonia, Bessarabia, Livonia, Lithuania, Ukrania, Courland and Trans-Caucasia. Thus Russia lost three-fourths of her iron and coal mines, one-third of the general industrial fields, one-fourth of her population and agricultural land. But the Revolution was safe at least for the time being. That was the chief thing from Lenin's point of view.

Lenin argued, "The position of the Germans in the Islands of the Baltic is such that in an offensive they could capture Revel and Petrograd, with naked hands. By continuing the war under such circumstances we strengthen German Imperialism. We will have to conclude Peace in any case, but the terms will be worse if they will not be signed by us."

Lenin's marvellous political genius gauged the situation quite correctly. Our age has not produced a man with a greater political sense than Lenin. He knew that he could not wait for a revolution in Germany to stop the War. He knew that he could not risk the suppression, by the enemies, of the Russian Revolution in the hope of a revolution in Germany or other countries. Trotsky and all others failed to appraise the situation correctly. They expected a revolution by the German proletariat which did not come. It has not come upto the present day. On the contrary, quite a different kind of revolution has come there. Lenin told them, "Germany, you see, is only pregnant with a revolution, but here in Russia, a perfectly healthy child—the Socialist Republic—has already been born, and we may kill it if we start a war." Lenin was right; Trotsky was wrong. By accepting German Peace terms the Socialist Republic was saved. Lenin's genius triumphed.

It is not that Lenin did not expect a revolution in Germany or elsewhere, but he thought the peace itself would give time to the Revolution to develop. He said, "In expectation of the hour, which we hope is near, when the oppressed working classes of all countries will seize power as have the proletariat of Russia, we are taking our army and our people out of the war."

He further thought that it was not right for the Bolshevists to continue to take a part in an Imperialist War. He said, "If the war was ever waged for self-defence (that was the plea for the war on the part of Belgium and her Allies) it has long ago ceased to be that for both sides. When Great Britain conquers African Colonies, Baghdad and Jerusalem, it cannot be a war of defence. When Germany occupies Serbia, Belgium, Poland,

Lithuania, Roumania and the Moon Islands, it cannot be a war of defence: This is a war for the division of the world . . . . We no longer wish to participate in this purely Imperialistic war where the designs of the propertied classes are being effected with human blood. Our relation to the Imperialism of both camps is equally irreconcilable."

Lenin insisted on peace at Brest Litovsk because he thought that the hour of decision had arrived. Others also later accepted the terms because a prolongation of the war could give the Russian people nothing but new victims, humiliation, disaster—nothing but an increase of domestic and foreign slavery. Lenin never feared creating an impression of weakness by trying to end the war. So the Peace, although humiliating, was signed at Brest Litovsk.

Islam also had to sign a humiliating Peace at Hudaibiah. It has been related thus by historians:—

After six long years had passed since the Prophet and his dear followers were exiled from their homes in Mecca, and had to take refuge in Medina for the sake of their religion, a keen desire arose in the minds of the exiles to visit Mecca. To all the Arabs, from long, long ages, Mecca was a sacred place. Every Arab was free to visit it. But the Prophet and his adherents had abstained for six years from visiting it. Six years after the *Hijrat* (exile) the Prophet, with fourteen hundred of his Meccan fellow-*Mohajerin* (exiles) and their Medinite *Ansar* (helpers) left Medina, all unprepared for any war, for the Holy Shrine at Mecca. But the Meccans would not let them enter the precincts of the Sacred City. They even ill-treated the envoy whom the Prophet had sent to them to get their permission to enter the City. They sent a number of Quraish to assault a party of pilgrims. Eighty of those Quraish were caught but released by the Powerful Prince of Peace who was on his peaceful, sacred mission. Although it was not the regular time of *hajj* the Prophet and his companions put on the same *hajj* dress called Ahram (unsewn garment which the King and the Peasant all have to put on to demonstrate human equality), for *amara* to confirm his peaceful intentions.

The party stopped at Hudaibiah. The Meccans made preparation for war on a big scale and sent emissaries to collect men to fight against the Prophet. Arva, who was an experienced and respected man came, from the side of the Meccans, to the Prophet and gave out the terms of the Quraish, the principal condition of which was that in no case would the Prophet be allowed that year to enter the town of Mecca. After a conversation with the Prophet, Arva returned and told the Meccans that it would be best for them to come to terms with the Prophet. He said, "I

have been to the courts of Caesar, Kaiser and the Negus but I have not seen anybody so much loved and respected as is Muhammad by his people. They would do anything for him." But the Quraish, like the Germans in the case of the Bolshevik's peace efforts, remained adamant. Then the Prophet sent Osman to negotiate terms with the Quraish. They interned him and it was announced that he had been killed. This was too much for the Prophet who loved his generous-hearted companion. He determined to fight for Osman, and sitting under a tree, took the pledge from all present to fight till death. Be it noted that women also readily gave the pledge. Such were the women in Islam. But the Quraish sent Suhail, son of Amru, who was a very eloquent and persuasive speaker, to negotiate peace terms if possible. He presented, German-like again, very harsh and unfair terms. Those were as follows:—

1. The Muslims would not advance any further and would return to Medina.

2. They would be allowed to come next year but only with sheathed swords as their travelling weapon and only for a three days' stay in Mecca.

3. Any tribe may choose for alliance either the Meccans or the Muslims without any hinderance from either.

4. All hostilities between the Muslims and the Quraish would cease for ten years.

5. Muslims were not to take away with them any Muslim who may have been residing in Mecca from before their arrival at Hudaibiah and if any Muslim were to desire to stay behind Mecca and not to return to Medina he should be allowed a free choice.

(But the most invidious and humiliating to Muslims was the following clause:—)

6. If any Meccan, even if he were a Muslim, were to go to Medina he should be sent back but if any Muslim were to go to Mecca he would not be redelivered.

"The Distinguisher between right and wrong" was not satisfied at all with these terms. Nor were the Prophet's other followers who had pledged to give up their life for his cause. But Muhammad was not only a moral and spiritual Reformer—a Prophet, he was also the greatest statesman known to History. In spite of all the disappointments of the Muslims he accepted the harsh terms.

The noblest characteristic of the Prophet was that he put all his preachings to practice. In this case the ink of the Treaty was not even dry before the test came.

Abujandal, the son of Suhail himself, who had come as a plenipotentiary on behalf of the Meccans, had been converted to Islam but the Meccans had imprisoned him. Somehow he got away and arrived at Hudaibiah with shackles on his feet and marks of violence and bruises all over his body, just at the time that the Treaty was being written by the Prophet's own Companion Ali, on behalf of the Muslims. The hearts of all Abujandal's Muslim brothers were moved by the pathetic scene. So was the heart of the "Mercy for the Worlds,"—the Great Prophet himself. But to him a Treaty was a solemn document. He did not treat it as "a scrap of paper." He said to Abujandal, "Patience Abujandal, have your trust in God. He will yet work out for thee and others in the same plight, a way of deliverance." Poor Abujandal had had to go back to Mecca with his non-Muslim father. On the return of the Muslims to Medina other test cases occurred but the Muslims remained firm and true to every clause of the Treaty however disadvantageous to them.

The motive behind the Brest Litovsk Treaty was to save the Bolshevik Revolution at any price. If the Peace had not been signed, the Germans would have reached the Capital of Russia and the Bolshevik Regime would have been smashed up. So the Bolsheviks were compelled to accept the Brest Litovsk Treaty. There was really no alternative.

This was not the case with the Muslims at Hudaibiah. They could fight or they could return to Medina without signing the humiliating Treaty. The Prophet was no despot in politics. But his followers loved and respected him as no other mortal has ever been loved and respected either before or after him. They had complete trust in him as a Prophet of God. They had implicit confidence in the inspired wisdom which proclaimed:—

Inna fatahnalaka fathum mubina:

"We have granted thee a manifest victory." (xlviii—1.)

And it *was* a veritable victory as it turned out soon.

Before this Hudaibiah Peace, the Meccans kept completely aloof from the Muslims of Medina. The Treaty at Hudaibiah opened out opportunities of intercourse between Muslims and non-Muslims. Truth attracts people voluntarily. Islam was the Truth. It had made a revolutionary change in the characters and morals of the converted Arabs. So when the non-converted Arabs met their converted relatives in Peace they could not but notice the difference between their own habits and characters and that of those who had accepted Islam. Every Muslim was a personification of sincerity, truthfulness, honesty, courage and a

personal sacrifice. The result was that prominent men like Khalid Bin Walid (later the conqueror of Syria) and Amru Bin Aas (the future victor of Egypt) and host of others accepted Islam. Besides this, those tribes who had begun to like Islam but for some reason or other did not dare to declare their adherence to it, now took courage to do so publicly. The Prophet's inspired mind had perceived all these advantages when those of his followers could not do so. Therefore he had accepted the humiliating terms of the Peace at Hudaibiah.

Brest Litovsk gave Bolsheviks the much-needed "breathing time" to organise their forces. Hudaibiah gave an opportunity to the Muslims to propagate Islam peacefully and the Prophet discharged his Prophetic duty by sending letters, inviting to Islam, the Roman Emperor, the Persian Monarch, the Rulers of Egypt, Abyssinia, Yamamah, the Syrian districts and to all near about Mecca and Medina. Hudaibiah also paved the way for the unprecedented peaceful entry of the Prophet in Mecca, only two years afterwards, accompanied by thousands of Muslims, when the Great Prophet, treated as his brothers, those Meccans who had ostracised him and his clan for three years stopping even food and water, who had relentlessly persecuted him, stoned him and all but killed him in cold blood, simply because he had taken upon himself to reform and remodel their religious, political and social conditions of life and thought. It was a glorious and unprecedented act of forgiveness of his deadly enemies by the "Mercy for Worlds." Hudaibiah paved the way for the unusual triumph and success of the Prophet in his own City and for the thrilling scene " when the assistance of Allah and victory comes and thou seest people entering the religion of Allah in troops." (CX. 1.).

Only two years after the Hudaibiah Treaty the whole of Arabia became Muslim through peaceful propaganda and mission work. This success was indeed unique after a humiliating Treaty. *It remains unique upto the present day.*

All political and social Reformers will do well to study the life history of that Man who was an exemplar in different walks of human life. They are sure to profit by that. They will be saved from many mistakes and unwise decisions.

In the case of Russia all credit should go to Lenin for not misjudging the Russian situation and for obtaining the breathing time which the Brest Litovsk Treaty, although very humiliating, offered him to save the Revolution and save Bolshevism from collapse. But for the Peace at Brest the rise of Bolshevism would have become almost impossible. Trotsky and others had not properly understood the situation—only Lenin did. The rise of

Bolshevism owes Lenin a good deal indeed. What wonder then that the Bolsheviks are devoted to the very name of Lenin ! Only they must not exceed the limits, and human self-respect must not be lost by the worship of a human being. Man can only be a fellow-man to others, *not a god*. Because the Bolsheviks do not believe in a soul, Lenin should be to them now nothing more than a dead cat or a lizard. He is finished. They may go to his books but not to his tomb unless they come now to believe in the "after life" as do most of the people in this world—as do Muslims.

But, let the Bolsheviks think that, maybe, Lenin had a soul—he is *not* quite as dead as the proverbial door-nail. Why ! Even a piece of iron can be expanded by the heat ; even the door-nail is not so dead as to be unable to do some work, to serve some object. It helps in keeping two planks of wood joined together.

Maybe, the man who felt so much for the poor, who did so much for the toilers and labourers, is still in a position to inspire, by his soul force, those thousands of people who visit his Mausoleum, with that love for the poor and distressed which he himself possessed. Surely, when a dead door-nail does some service, why should it not be expected that a man of the genius of Lenin is not so dead as to have become utterly useless—more useless than even a door-nail. The Quran appropriately asks :—

"Thinketh man that he will be thrown away as an object of no use ?" (LVII : 36.)

A Muslim has to be charitable. ظن الموسنين خيرا — A Muslim would not only believe that Lenin had a soul but also that "not an atom's weight of good he did has been lost," and that the Founder of the System of Bolshevism, *with its key-note of social service*, is enjoying his full reward where his soul is at rest now.

IV.—The Aims and Objects of Bolshevism.

There is a saying that there is nothing new under the Sun. This is quite true. Even the most miraculous Reformer did not claim to have brought any new religion. Every child, he declared, was born in the *Natural* Religion—the Religion of Law and Order (Peace)—Islam. Every *good* man, in whatever age he may have been born, to whatever country or race he may belong, is a Muslim.

The Bolshevists also did not claim to have introduced anything new.

Joseph Stalin, the present head and Dictator of the Bolshevist State, defines Leninism or Bolshevism thus:—"Leninism is the Marxism of the epoch of Imperialism and of the Proletarian Revolution. To be more precise, Leninism is the theory and tactics of the Proletarian Revolution in general and the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular."

In his life of Lenin, D. S. Mirsky writes: —"Leninism is related to Marxism as species to genus. And Lenin did nothing but to awaken the revolutionary soul of Marxism that had been lulled to sleep by the Second International and his teaching is nothing more than Marxism as opposed to pseudo-Marxism."

This means—that Leninism and Marxism are almost the same.

But nobody turned a hair when Marx put forward his Communistic *theories* in his monumental work—the *Capital*. Lenin's Bolshevism, although based upon the same Marxism, stirred up the whole world. Marx himself had dreamt the dreams of Plato, Coubert, Owen, but very few paid any serious attention to those as long as they remained mere dreams. It was only when the Bolshevists, taking full advantage of a military Revolution, changed those dreams into actualities, and took possession of the whole of the Russian Empire from the hands of Czar Nicholas II and sent that unfortunate autocrat with his family to Ekaterinburg—not far from the place where that monarch had exiled thousands of revolutionaries, to die miserable deaths, and when they introduced the Marxian principles of communism in the Government of Russia, that European Governments became fear-stricken. The items which were most frightening in the Bolshevists' Programme were their determination to initiate a world-revolution, to destroy despotic Imperialism and Capitalism and the degenerated Parliamentary system. The Bolsheviks raised the cry, "Bread to the

workers, land to the peasants and peace to all." This was a challenge to all the Governments and all the systems—to both the groups then at each others' throat—the *Entente* Group and the Central Power Group. Bolshevism was based upon the immediate reforms advocated in the Communist manifesto given by E. H. Carr—"Karl Marx," pp. 52—53, as follows:—

1. The expropriation of landed property and the use of rent from land to cover State expenditure. 2. A high and progressingly graded income-tax. 3. The abolition of the right of inheritance. 4. The confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels. 5. The centralization of credit for the needs of the State by the establishment of a State Bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly. 6. The centralization of transport in the hands of the State. 7. An increase in the State ownership of factories and instruments of production and the redistribution and amelioration of agricultural land on a general plan. 8. Universal obligation to work and the creation of Labour armies specially for agriculture. 9. The unification of agriculture with industrial labour and the gradual abolition of the difference between town and country. 10. The public education of all children. Abolition of factory labour for children in its present form. Unification of education with economic production.

The manifesto ends with the famous peroration:—"The Communists consider it superfluous to conceal their opinions and their intentions. They openly declare that their aim can only be achieved by the violent overthrow of the whole contemporary Social Order. Let the governing classes tremble before the Communist Revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have the whole world to gain. Proletarians of all countries unite."

The "Declaration of Rights" of the labouring and exploited masses in the 10th July 1918 Manifesto was as follows:—

"Russia is declared a Republic of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. All central and local authority is vested in their Soviets."

"The Russian Soviet Republic is established on the basis of a free union of free Nations, as a federation of National Soviet Republic."

"The fundamental aim" was announced to be "of suppressing all exploitation of man by man, of abolishing for ever the division of Society into classes, of ruthlessly suppressing all exploiters, of bringing about the Socialist organisation of Society, and of establishing the triumph of Socialism in all countries."

The third "All-Russian Congress of Soviets" abolished "Private ownership of Land"; declared all land to be *national property* to be "handed over to the Worker" carrying with it "the right of use only." It ratified "the Soviet Law of Workers' control of industry."

"As a first blow" at international financial Capitalism, "it repudiated all debts, transferred all Banks to the Workers' and Peasants' Government," to ensure "the emancipation of the toiling masses from the yoke of Capitalism," it made "work useful to the community obligatory upon all."

Expressing "its firm determination to deliver humanity from the grip of financial Capitalism and Imperialism" it repudiated "secret *treaties*," it insisted upon securing, "by revolutionary means," a peace "without annexation or indemnities, on the basis of free-determination of nations." With the same objects it further insisted "on the complete repudiation of the barbarous policy of Capitalist civilization which built up the prosperity of the exploiters in a few privileged nations on the enslavement of millions of labourers in Asia, in the colonies and in the small nations."

An "I. C. S." propagandist against Bolshevism, on behalf of the Government of India, bitterly criticises Bolshevism but ascribes to it the following aims. He writes :—

"Bolshevism aims, firstly, at a world revolution for the overthrow of Capital, secondly, at the nationalisation of property, thirdly to establish the universal brotherhood of labour . . . In this ideal State the political barriers that divide nations will be done away with, there will be no wars, separate fatherlands will cease to exist. The whole of humanity without distinction of nationality will be bound together in all its parts and organised into one united whole. Money will disappear. Finance will become extinct. There will be no more taxation. There will be no capitalists, landowners, property-holders, speculators, private traders. The whole population will receive the necessaries of life without paying for them save by the contribution of labour. In the end there will be no State, all will become equal comrades and the very memory of the division of Society into classes will fade away."

The "good features" of Bolshevism viewed from another angle of vision, that of a Hindu scholar, who is a great believer in the legal genius of Manu, have been given as follows from comparatively recent books like a *Scientist Among the Soviets* (1932), *Twelve Studies in Russia* (1933) and *Modern Russia* (1933) :—

"Planned agricultural and industrial production and distribution for consumption rather than profit, vocational as well as cultural education for every boy and girl, planned medical help,

parks of rest and culture for all, cheap and expeditious adjudication, dozens of new-planned towns, occupational or functional representation in the Soviets and Legislatures, and abolition of illiteracy, unemployment, prostitution and beggary." The writer, being a Hindu, has obviously not considered the Bolshevists' aim of the abolition of Capitalism and their endeavour to form a classless Society to be among the "good features" so he has not included those in the above given list. Manu too, probably, would not have included those. A Hindu, with his own caste system, naturally prefers the "guild system" of Society approved of by men like Bertrand Russell, to a communistic, classless Society.

On the other hand a Muslim propagandist against Bolshevism in India applauds only such objects of Bolshevism as, "the establishment of complete liberty and equality among men of different races and colours and countries, the formation of a classless Society and the abolition of Capitalism." This anti-Bolshevist Muslim writer goes to the extent of saying that those objects, mentioned above, were inspired by the association of certain Bolshevik leaders with Muslims in Turkestan and Siberia. He writes:—"When Nihilism and Communism got hold of the minds of Russians and invited peoples to revolt against the Czars, the Muslims in Asiatic and European Russia also wanted to cut off the fetters that had bound them, and introduced in the Russian Communism the essentially Islamic ideals of complete human equality and liberty and anti-Capitalism, to make it attractive for Muslims." He thinks that they failed to introduce a religious element because the Russian Christian priests under the Czars had prejudiced the Communist reformers against not only Christianity, but against all religions. He gives the irrationality of Christianity itself, as preached in Russia, to be the chief cause of the prejudice.

It has been said before that Communism or Bolshevism was not quite new in this world. In its worst form it had been tried by Mazduk in old Iran before Islam when Mazduk abolished marriage and proclaimed that "all should share women as they shared air and water."

In the *best form* it was practised under the Prophet Muhammad's immediate successors, more especially under the Great Omar. *Anyone who wants to find a model for the best possible Government, the best possible State, the best possible Nation and the best possible Society, must study and study deeply the period of Omar the Great and the account of the large, extensive State or Empire, with its headquarters at Medina, under him.*

In recent years also Communistic Society was tried at a small scale at several places but never before at such a large scale as it is in Russia. The fact is that although more than fifteen years have gone by, the Russian Bolshevism is still, more or less, in its experimental stage. Plan after plan has been prepared. At first the "five years' plan" aimed at the industrialisation, at a break-neck speed, of the whole of Russia, then *Kolhozy* (collective farming) became the rage.

Authors like Marcus Hindus, the well-known American writer on the Russian conditions, have described *Kolhoization* in detail. It is somewhat on the following lines:—

There are three types of *Kolhozy*. Only two are of consequence:—(1) Commune, (2) Artel.

Commune is the highest Social organisation. All individual income-yielding property disappears and all productive resources —land, implements, stock and buildings, are held in common.

In a Commune no member owns house, garden, cow or hen. The only personal possession a man has are his immediate personal belongings, such as clothes, sometimes house-furnishings and what savings he may have made out of his wages and out of his share of profit that may at the end of the year be disbursed among members.

In the Artel (which is more encouraged by the State) peasants pool their land, work, stock, implements, farm-buildings, accumulation of savings in money or in kind.

But they may maintain their individual homes, and may keep a cow, hens, geese, ducks, pigs, sheep and goats, though in numbers which must bear a fair proportion to their personal needs. They may also cultivate their own gardens and orchards. They may dispose of the produce preferably to the co-operative but also in the open market.

All the property that a newly-admitted member brings to the *Kolhozy* is appraised in terms of values that obtain in the co-operative market. The resulting sum is divided into three parts—(1) entrance fee, (2) indivisible fund, and (3) membership dues. The first runs from 2 to 10 per cent; the second from one-fourth to one-half; and the balance is reckoned as the membership dues. The first two shares remain the permanent possession of the *kolhoz*. For the present only the membership fee remains the individual investment of each member. It bears dividends and on departure is subject to withdrawal.

All members of *Kolhoz* receive wages which are tentatively mapped out in the beginning of the year.

Members may draw in cash or kind to the limit of sixty per cent.

Wages at present are scaled according to the type of work a member performs and the degree of skill with which he performs it, though in no case the highest wages should be more than double of that of the lowest. But exception can be made in the case of specialists, engineers, high grade mechanics and agronomists.

But this difference in wages being against the basic Communist theory of equality of income for all, it is difficult to say how long this violation of principle will be practised.

As is well-known, the Bolsheviks in Russia are working on fixed plans. After finishing the five-year plan of industrialisation in four years or so they have taken up a new plan.

On 14th October, 1935, while commenting on W. P. Coates and Zelda K. Coates' book, *The Second Five Years' Plan of Development of the U. S. S. R.*, a correspondent of an Indian daily, under the initials S. K. R., wrote :—

"For any one desiring to have access to facts and figures of the Soviet experiments in the regeneration of the economic life of Russia, especially in the First and Second Five-Year Plans, this book may be recommended. How far the statistics given are to be relied upon it is difficult to estimate. But the authors, who have first-hand knowledge of Russia, have spared themselves no trouble to arrive at accurate results.

The results of the First Five-Year Plan are given and the scheme of operations in the Second Five-Year Plan is indicated and reviewed. All branches of industry, commerce, agriculture, transport, labour, education, and health are brought under survey and a mass of figures is marshalled out and presented in very compact and convenient form and tables.

The year 1926-27 is taken as the basic year, because this was the year when the restoration of Soviet industry was completed. So progress can be reliably measured against the price index of 1926-27.

"Having gained much experience in working the "Godro" (the 1920 Soviet Electrification Plan) by 1927, the First Five-Year Plan was evolved and put into operation, from October 1, 1928, to September 30, 1933. But as the "tempo" increased, it was endeavoured to finish it one year earlier.

"The volume of large-scale industrial output in 1932 was 218.5 per cent of the industrial output of 1928, and 334.5 per cent of the output of 1913.

"The chief concern of the First Five-Year Plan was to develop the heavy industries like coal, oil, metallurgical industry, electrification, and transportation. In the Second Five-Year Plan 1933-37, apart from a consolidation of the accomplishments of the

First Five-Year Plan, special attention was paid to lighter industries and to agriculture. But even during the First Five-Year Plan agriculture was not neglected. Industrial holdings which averaged 4.5 hectares (hectare=2,471 acres), occupied 97.3 per cent of the total area cultivated. Modernisation of agriculture could not be possible with such small holdings. In order, therefore, to create large-scale farms Soviet State Farms (Sovkhozy) and the formation of Collective Farms (Kolhozy) were much encouraged. So that in 1932 State Farms and Collective Farms supplied 84.2 per cent of the total marketable grain, 83 per cent of cotton, and thus have played a decisive rôle in the food-supply of the country and in the production of technical crops.

"Under both Plans, and particularly under the Second Five-Year Plan, much attention has been given to the improvements of the technical skill and general well-being of the workers and peasants, men and women alike. Unemployment has been completely eliminated. A vast population of Workers is now on a 7-hour day. Wages are said to have more than doubled.

In addition to monetary wages, Soviet workers have many other advantages. They are paid wages for all normal holidays: they have a statutory summer holiday of at least two weeks and are enabled to spend their holidays in rest-homes free and travel free. Rents are graduated and Social Insurance benefits are secured on a non-contributory basis.

"In the cities the number of hospital-beds have increased by 58 per cent and in rural districts by 90 per cent. Sanatorium and health resorts for workers have increased by 100 per cent.

"Housing conditions are, however, still far from satisfactory, but much progress has taken place.

"Phenomenal progress seems to have been achieved in the spread of literacy and educational advancement. Literacy has been raised from less than 35 per cent of the population in 1913 to 53.9 per cent in 1928 and to 90 per cent in 1932. The number of children in elementary and general secondary schools has increased from less than 8,000,000 in 1913 to 11,600,000 in 1928, and to nearly 22,000,000 in 1932. Truly a remarkable accomplishment for any Government.

"While we may not be prepared to place unqualified faith in those arrays of figures we cannot but admit that great and almost revolutionary changes have been achieved by the Soviet Government in all spheres of the Russian national life. Work of generations has been accomplished within little more than a decade. It only suggests that modern Governments are capable of astounding works, if only the necessary objective is provided and the requisite

drive and energy is infused into the various departments of the administration."

Will those Britishers who are proud to call themselves Trustees of the masses in India ponder over some of the facts given above ?

On 31st March, 1936, details were published in another Indian daily regarding the National Economic Plan of the Social Union for 1936 thus :—

AGRICULTURE.

An increase of 42·2 per cent compared with the year 1935 has been proposed in the domain of agriculture. This includes 23.6 per cent in produce and 26.1 in live-stock. The total area set for winter as well as spring crops is over 334 million acres out of which over 40 millions are to be sown under State management and the rest by the Collective Farms.

Among the main commodities, the production of which is to be increased, are grain, cotton, fibre, flax, sugar-beet, sunflower seeds, potatoes, tobacco and *makhorka.*

The area for ploughing summer fallow lands in Collective Farms is to be raised to 68 million acres.

As many as 575 new machine tractor stations are to be provided, bringing their total number to 4,951. It has been decided to supply proportionately more tractors and great number of mineral fertilizers through those stations.

An amount of 911 million roubles has in all been sanctioned for equipment of new agriculture machinery.

INDUSTRY.

In the field of industry, the total output planned is 23 per cent greater than that fixed for 1935.

The branches of industry in which an increase has been planned are electric power, coal, oil, pig iron, steel, locomotives, freight cars, tractor combines, motor cars, bicycles, radio receivers, cotton and linen fabrics, timber industry including paper, as, also, meat, fish and sugar industries.

The amount fixed for chemical branches of heavy industries is 4,282 million roubles.

A sum of 28,797·2 million roubles has been sanctioned for all new constructions out of which as much as 7,565 million roubles will be allotted to construction of heavy industries. Among other things, it has been proposed to complete the Ufa Nickel Combinate to develop the construction of the Northern and Orsk Nickel Combinates, as also to prepare for the launching in 1937 of the first unit of the Balkash and Blyava Copper Swelting Combinate.

In order to effect developments in the oil industry, it has been decided to bore over 2 million metres out of which nearly 1½ million would be in the Azerbaijan Republic. The establishment of eight cracking plants, two pipelines and the first unit of the Ufa Oil Refinery is another addition to the long list of new constructions.

Besides, a number of power stations, rolling mills, hearth furnaces for Tin Plants are also to be built.

The Stalin and Morotov Motor Works are to be extended during the year, while a new Ural Car Building Plant is also to be established with an annual output of nearly 29 thousand four-axle cars.

As regards light industries, an amount of 1,228 million roubles has been allotted for establishing a fine linen Combinate in Kostroma, linen Combinates in Smolensk and Orsha, for developing construction of four linen Combinates in Kostroma, Bezhistn, Volgoda and Vyazma and for starting four silk mills, two woollen mills and two leather-substitute factories.

Transport and Communication.

It has been planned to increase the length of railways to 52,000 miles out of which about 725 miles will be electrified.

A sum of 4,495 million roubles has been fixed for capital construction of railways and of 1,363 millions for water transport. About half of the latter amount will go to the construction of the Volga-Moscow Canal.

It is asserted in official circles that the realization of this 1936 project would mean the completion of the Second Five-Year Plan in four years.

The working Bolshevik constitution is somewhat on the following lines :—

The Union of Socialist Soviet Republic (U.S.S.R.) has been formed of six Republics but as every nation has a right to withdraw or to join it as it likes therefore the component parts of the Union may increase or decrease any time. The present component parts are :—1. The Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic. 2. The Trans-Caucasia Socialist Federal Soviet Republic. 3. The Ukraine Socialist Soviet Republic. 4. The "White" Russia Socialist Soviet Republic. 5. The Turkoman Socialist Soviet Republic. 6. The Uzbeck Socialist Soviet Republic.

The status of all these units is exactly one and the same. No distinction of any kind is made.

In each Federal Republic there are ten departmental commissariats. Each is controlled by its own Republic, the Central Executive Committee, the Soviet Congress and the Praesidium.

Any citizen not less than 18 years in age, irrespective of sex or race or creed, *who gains his livelihood by work or labour* has a right to elect or to stand for election to any Soviet.

Monks and priests, criminals, insane people, private shopkeepers, and those who do not earn their living by their own work or labour are ineligible, both for the franchise and the election.

Each local Soviet is administered by its own popular Assembly elected annually. Each Assembly elects its own representatives to the body immediately above it. Representatives to the Executive Council are elected by all the Assemblies.

The Soviets of the rural Commissars have one member for every hundred inhabitants elected on the principle of universal suffrage. The local units or Soviets send as their delegates one member for every three hundred inhabitants to the Cantonal Soviet which sends up its delegates to the district Soviet. Those district Soviets also have delegates from town Soviets elected by extra urban groups such as factories and mills. In Leningrad and Moscow, for every four hundred electors, there is one representative and where the population does not exceed 10,000, every fifteen hundred electors have one representative. To the district Soviets, for every 1,000 inhabitants, the Cantonal Soviets send one representative and the town Soviet for every 200 . . . To the provincial Soviet the town Soviets send one delegate to every 2,000 electors and the district Soviets to every 10,000 inhabitants. The supreme Executive, Judicial and Legislative authority of the U.S.S.R. is the Pan-Russian Congress of Soviets. It is formed of two Chambers, one is the Union Council composed of 400 members elected from the six constitutional Republics on the principle of proportional representation. The other Council of Nationalities, consisting of 136 members, elected on the basis of five members from every independent and autonomous Republic and one member of every autonomous region. Like the British constitution all legislation must be adopted by both the Chambers. The Government of the U.S.S.R. consists of a Union Central Executive Committee elected every third year by the Pan-Russian Congress of Soviets and a Union Council of People's Commissaries.

We give below the latest changes proposed in the Constitution of Russia as given by Professor H. J. Laski in the *Manchester Guardian* in June, 1936. He writes:—"The observer who compares the draft of the new Russian Constitution with the documents of 1918 and 1933-35 will find signs of fundamental changes. Economic success has brought a new sense of internal security, the Government of a class is being transformed into the Government of a community. The dictatorship of the proletariat (significantly, save for a passing reference, it does not figure at all in the new

document) is replaced by that of the "toiling masses," and the basis of the new authority seems to be a new conception of the right of the worker as such to determine the character of the government under which he lives. Fundamental to the new proposals is the safeguarding of the rights of individual personality -there are guaranteed freedom to speak, freedom of association and meeting, and freedom of election by secret ballot. The Legislature is made supreme over the Executive, and by an ingenious device it is given authority over the Executive even when it is not in full session, while the independence of the judiciary appears to be fully protected. Every one of these points is an immense advance over past technique. It represents a real approach to the classic principles of representative government.

Only One Party.

An Englishman's main difficulty will be concentrated on the limitation of party organisation to the Communist Party. There will be independent candidatures and to spare—from trade union, collective farms, co-operatives, and so forth. But, in our own sense, there will be no political parties save that which made the Revolution in 1917. The Russian view appears to be that a Party can only be formed for the fundamental purpose of calling the basic principles of the U.S.S.R. into question, and this is not to be permitted. So far the régime is to remain a dictatorship. But it is to remain one which takes pains to organise criticism of itself within its Legislature upon what may prove to be, on matters of significant detail, a pretty comprehensive scale. And Russians point out that in fact no State permits an attack on its basic principles. Political parties in Western democracies have been allowed freedom either because they agreed, like Republicans and Democrats, Liberals and Conservatives, on the fundamentals of the régime, or, as with the Labour Party in England or the Socialist Party in the United States, they were not regarded by their rivals as a serious threat to the existing Order. Western democracy, in fact, seems to the Russians a uni-party system in which Capitalism was safeguarded not less essentially than their protection of Socialism. They provide the check upon dictatorship by their independent members of the Legislature in the same way as an Opposition voices criticism in a Parliamentary régime.

The new Legislature is to be a very different affair from the old. The All-Russian Congress of Soviets met, on the average, about once in two years for a week, and its main business was to receive, with uncritical enthusiasm, a body of reports (which it could hardly discuss) from the Communist leaders. The new body (based in the Lower House on geographical and equal suffrage)

is to meet annually for two months. It is to have two Chambers, the Upper representing the constituent republics, with equal powers. In the intervals between sessions it is to be represented by a joint committee of 37 members with the rights, first, of declaring peace and war, secondly, of issuing emergency decrees, and thirdly, of acting as a Supreme Court where acts of the Executive may be declared *ultra vires*. Members of the Legislature enjoy Parliamentary immunity save where this is suspended by agreement with the Praesidium. The latter may also, where a dispute occurs between the two Chambers which cannot be solved by agreement, arrange for a dissolution. It has the right, further, not only to conduct a referendum on the initiative of one of the constituent republics of the U.S.S.R., it may also, subject to legislative confirmation, dismiss Ministers from the Executive Council. The members of the latter are appointed by the Legislature and must act under its direction. Provision is also made for interpellation of Ministers in the legislature, and questions addressed to them must be answered within three days.

Social Rights.

No one, I think, who compares these provisions with the present situation can doubt that they represent an immense step forward. They are to be read in the framework of a remarkable body of social rights (rest, work, education, racial and sexual equality, religious freedom) which are guaranteed to the citizen. Invasion of these rights is prevented by entrusting their protection first, to the elected Legislatures and, secondly, on the Judicial side to Judges who in the Courts of Appeal are elected for a five-year period by the Legislature, to whom alone they are responsible

Provision is made for the amendment of the Constitution by a two-thirds majority of both Chambers of the Legislature. The local government system of the country is at the same time to remain broadly unchanged.

Students of written Constitutions will be aware that they work less according to the formulæ they announce than by the parallelogram of social forces which gives them their living reality. It is, therefore, too early to do more than emphasise the direction in which these proposed changes seem to move. They are a limitation at every point of Executive discretion such as Russia has never known. They offer a wide and significant prospect to individuals who are not members of the Communist Party to embark upon a political career. They compel Ministerial responsibility in a sense which appears to stand midway between the system of Great Britain and the United States. They give a constitutional protection to the substance of social freedom which, if validated in the

event, will mean, granted continued economic progress, a civil status such as few peoples enjoy in Western democracies.

There is indeed much that only further discussion and experience can elucidate. It is not easy for the outsider to see how a two-Chamber system can work easily unless the Communist Party retains a predominant hold upon both. It is not easy either to visualise an effective relation between the Executive and the Legislature unless the members of the former are in a position to direct and guide the latter. It may be doubted also whether a two-monthly session of the Legislature will give it an adequate primacy; effective power seems more likely to reside in the praesidium, which will be in continuous session. The Legislature itself is clearly conceived as a body laying down general principles the details of which will be worked out by the Executive under the scrutiny and control of the Legislative Praesidium. The composition of this latter body will, therefore, be fundamental to the whole scheme.

Independent Judges.

But, on any showing, once this Constitution is in being, Soviet Russia will enter into a new and vital epoc of its political life. It will move into that region where the State as supreme power still exists but where also the idea of a classless Society is envisaged in a not remote future. A period has arrived in which the Communist Party, while maintaining its vigilance against the danger of counter-revolution, is willing to offer an important share in shaping political directives to men of all opinions. The universal and secret ballot is a great advance as is the equalisation of the peasant unit with that of the urban centre. It is important also that the judiciary is given a new and independent status. Above all, the place of the individual in the Soviet scheme receives an emphasis and an importance he has not previously possessed. One is tempted to summarise the evolution here presaged by saying that the era of dictatorial evolution is to be replaced by the era of liberalising revolution. It would be a heartening thing if the leaders of the Soviet State were to emphasise that view by a wide and generous amnesty to political prisoners. The contrast between what they are here attempting and the conditions of Italy and Germany is already striking. To enforce its meaning by opening the political prisons would give heart to the enemies of Fascism all over the world.

As the changes proposed are very important and if rightly acted upon they may remove many of the most criticised aspects of Bolshevism we will quote another author—Sir Bernard Fares,—on the subject. He writes:—"The new Constitution of

Soviet Russia, first promised by the Prime Minister, Molotov, on February 6 last year, and now published in full, is so far the climax of the whole period beginning in 1933, which I discussed in a recent book.

Let us take a few dates out of the legislation of these years:— December 11, 1933, exemption from taxation of the population of the Far Eastern provinces. February 27, 1934, remission of arrears of grain deliveries. March 17, 1934, calculation of wages in correspondence with the quality and quantity of work done. April 23, 1934, legislation on the overburdening of schoolchildren and pioneers with civic and political training. November 29, 1934, abolition of rations. February 17, 1935, revision of the statutes of collective farms with a wide extension of rights of property. April 7, 1935, re-establishment of discipline among the young. June 1, 1935, legislation on the liquidation of homelessness and neglect of children. September 4, 1935, legislation on the organisation of instruction and internal order in schools. December 29, 1935, legislation on the abolition of all restrictions of births and origin on admission to the universities. February 29, 1936, revision of currency in the direction of greater stability. April 11, 1936, legislation on the abolition of State subsidies and on selling prices in heavy and timber industries.

The Government has also appealed for a greater *consolidation of the marriage tie, has interposed certain delays in the divorce law,* and has asked for the co-operation of parents in the discipline of children. The revised instructions of the Communist League of Youth are directed in the main to educational activity and a general promotion of public effort in the national work of construction.

Work of Stalin.

The new Constitution is, in the main, the work of Stalin himself, who has presided for a year past over the Committee which drafted it. The draft has now been approved by the Central Executive Committee, and was published on June 12, with an invitation to the public to study it carefully and suggest any alterations. In November it will be laid before the existing Supreme Assembly, the All-Union Congress of Soviets, and, on adoption, that body will be superseded by a Supreme Council elected by universal suffrage. Let us take the main provisions as published. The State admits three kinds of property. The major means of production all belong to the State itself. Minor or indirect means of production are guaranteed as property to collective farms or their units; land under occupation of the farms is secured to them in perpetuity. Members of the farms can possess as property the house, the allotment, and livestock up to three cows and an unlimited number

of pigs and poultry, as well as the household implements of farming. Individual farming is also recognised as lawful, though there is no provision against excessive taxation. Earnings of workers of all kinds are recognised as personal property and guaranteed by the State.

The Supreme Council, which will supersede the All-Union Congress of Soviets, is definitely established as the Sovereign of the country. It will consist of two Chambers, one elected from the whole Union by universal, direct, equal and secret vote; the other representing in fixed proportions all the Federal Republics; all elections of local bodies will be conducted under universal and secret suffrage. The two Chambers are equal in authority and can sit in joint session. They will elect a praesidium, a governing body, which will enjoy the authority of the National Assembly during vacation. The Council will normally sit for four years in two yearly sessions. In any case where it is not able to come to an agreement new elections will be ordered within two months, and a new Council will meet a month later. Provision has also been made for a referendum where required.

Independent Judges.

The Supreme Council is responsible for all appointments, both of Commissars, or Ministers, and of the higher judges. The judges of the so-called people's courts will be directly elected by the population. The higher judges are elected for five years. All judges are declared to be "independent and subject only to the law." The law officers of the State are given control over all administrative officials in the carrying out of their duties. All citizens have the right to give evidence in the law courts in their own language.

All citizens, male or female, over the age of eighteen have the right to vote or to be elected, with the exception only of imbeciles and those condemned by a law court to the loss of the franchise. These two exceptions appeared also in the extremely liberal first law for the elections to the Duma in 1905, but others who were then excluded were soldiers, officials, and women. The right of suffrage is declared to be "independent of race, creed, educational status, place of dwelling, social origin, property status, or past activity." Much of this wording is reminiscent of the liberal Duma law, but it includes extensions which are peculiarly interesting in view of the earlier Constitutions of Soviet Russia. Special attention may be directed to "social origin" and "past activity." The last-named might almost be taken to indicate a possibility of a general amnesty, even including Russians of the emigration. Candidates will be proposed by social units of almost any kind—the Communist Party, trade unions, co-operatives, youth organisations

and cultural societies. The deputies will be responsible to their constituents, and means will be found by which, if necessary, they can be revoked. Deputies of the Supreme Council, as in the case of the Duma, are personally inviolable—that is to say, they cannot be arrested without the consent of the Supreme Council itself. They also have the right of presenting interpellations to the Government, which must be answered within three days.

Most striking of all is the summary of the rights of citizens. They are entitled to work, to holiday with pay, to social services such as free medical attendance, and to free education of all stages, according to attainment. The next clause reads literally like a repetition of the never-observed Constitution of 1905. It includes freedom of conscience, of speech, of press, of meetings and demonstrations, and of the forming of associations. It is here that the Communist Party is mentioned and its absence from the draft might have appeared suspicious to some,—and it is described as a kind of leading nucleus or vanguard to stimulate public effort in all fields of endeavour. The Constitution forbids all arrests except by order of a law court, and the dwellings and even the correspondence of individuals are declared to be only subject to the same authority. It is, however, here that the draft reminds the population that the socialised property of the State is inviolable and that any attack on it is criminal. At the same time the defence of the "fatherland" is declared to be a sacred duty of all.

"Workers" Only.

Changes in the Constitution can only be made by a majority of two-thirds in each of the two Chambers.

The two most notable echoes of the famous programme of Liberal Russia before the Revolution are the so-called "four-tailed" formula of the suffrage—a reference to the four epithets, universal, equal, direct, and secret—and the famous "freedoms." It is, of course, still to be seen how the "freedoms" will be interpreted in practice. An Englishman naturally asks whether freedom of speech includes a right to criticise the Communist system—details of the working of Communism have all along been open to criticism—and it would so far appear from official interpretations that this is not included. The Constitution takes account only of those described as "workers". This is, of course, consistent with all its previous practices, and the question which remains is the proportion of the population that is not included in this category. However, it would hardly be claimed now that this is more than 2 per cent., and no doubt the Constitution has in view its complete elimination by the extension of work to all.

Englishmen will be inclined to compare the new Constitution with their own existing institutions, and from such an angle many questions will naturally be asked, but it is certainly not within our power or competence to fix conditions in Russia. It is more to the point to note the very great advance which it offers on preceding principles and practice, and judged in that way, it may certainly in general claim our sympathy and approval. In any case it is unquestionable that by declaring the principles contained in it the Constitution sets up a standard by which the Government of Russia is ready and must expect to be judged.

Under the Constitution as it existed the Council of the Peoples' Commissars legislated as well as governed in Russia. Each Peoples' Commissar was the head of a Collegium responsible for the work of the Peoples' Commissariat under its care.

The five Commissariats, (1) for War and Navy and Air, (2) for Foreign Affairs, (3) for Trade, (4) for Posts and Telegraphs, and (5) for Communications, exercised power of the Central Government.

Thus the criticism that Russia was governed really by an oligarchy was not far wrong and a change towards republicanism was certainly needed.

From a democratic point of view the proposed changes will indeed improve the Constitution. But it is not the form of the Constitution but the spirit in which the Constitution works that counts chiefly. Even the worst form of Constitution monarchist and personal—is sometimes more benevolent than the best republican.

In the working of the Bolshevist Constitution in its present form what was most objected to was its too much regimentation or the mechanisation of man himself.

Man was treated as if he lived to work only to fill his stomach, unconcerned with the fate of his family and children— as if he had no heart, no mind, no soul—as if he was only a beast of burden or an ox of an old-fashioned Indian oil-mill which was blindfolded and urged to go round and round and round to run the mill, or, in the case of Russia, to work out periodic Plans.

Although Bolshevist leaders did not believe in an after-life but they expected that every individual would work with his eyes fixed upon the future—and future only.

The proposed changes in the Constitution, if worked with the proper spirit, may give more hope, more liberty and greater security and happiness both in the present and future. Be it so. If it is so, Bolshevism will come nearer to Pan-Islamism. Every other religion, except Islam, concentrates all its attention upon the future while Islam deals with both the present and the future.

V.—The Systems Attacked by Bolshevism.

Europe, for centuries past, had been priding itself on having introduced a democratic, representative, parliamentary system of Government which was supposed to be the best system.

England is said to have given birth to it and is still proud of her "mother of Parliaments". England is still proud of her "democratic constitution" although that constitution is over-lorded by an upper chamber—an aristocratic House of Lords; and although ecclesiastics make a class by themselves and sit in the House of Lords, England is still proud of her "democratic constitution" although it is burdened with a hereditary king—a king who can do no wrong.

Even after the two last general elections England is proud of her "democratic constitution" and of her "representative Government!" In the first of the two the public was bamboozled by the cry of nationalism and the Dictatorship of the Conservatives was established. The result was that the Liberal Party in England was almost annihilated and the Labour Party broken up. The Conservatives became supreme in England. They crushed the rising nationalistic and democratic spirit in India with a ruthlessness worthy of none but Dictators. Thousands of people were sent to prison, many even without trial. The Governor-General issued Czarist ordinances. People on the Frontier who could not defend themselves were bombed from the air.

England had been foremost in denouncing the Bolshevik repudiation of the debt. But the "National Government" of England did the same. And although the Labour Party was nearly smashed to pieces and the Government was overwhelmingly Conservative yet the head remained the same—Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, who was the leader of the dethroned Labour Party. As the head of the Conservative Government, Mr. MacDonald behaved in such a way towards India as to justify the remarks of Trotsky when he said:—

"In the face of the Indian revolution the 'socialist' MacDonald will find no other methods but those with which Nicholas II opposed the Russian Revolution."

And just as the autocratic Czar succeeded in crushing the Russian Revolution (not of 1917) of 1905 the "democratic" MacDonald succeeded in crushing the Indian revolution. It so happened that the autocratic Czar and the democratic MacDonald employed the same methods. Both adopted a dual policy. The Czar Nicholas II gave Russia a Duma. The Prime Minister MacDonald promised an "Autonomous Government" to India. But both

employed the "mailed fist" first proving that there is only a difference of a few letters in the words "autocrat" and "democrat" but not much in their meaning.

The shamness of the representative system of Government in England has been exposed by the results of the election of 1935. The Conservative Government has come in with an overwhelming majority again but if the votes cast in favour of each are counted, each minority representative represents twice as many people as each member of the majority (Conservative) Party.

This is not the only undemocratic thing in this connection. Mr. Baldwin, the Prime Minister, has shown his disregard for the verdict of the voters and has taken more than one member into his Cabinet who was thrown out in the general election.

His own Party punished Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, and also his son for their betrayal of the Party. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald was defeated at the polls from his own constituency by no less than twenty-thousand votes yet he was taken into the Cabinet, as was his son, even before "safe seats" were found for the father and son. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald has got in from a constituency which he never favoured and in which his Party (whether he still belongs to the Labour Party or not, nobody knows) had hardly any strength. It is the Conservative Party which has got him in. But which Party does he represent in the British Parliament now ?

The truth is that the power in Britain is in the hands of a few and the Government is neither representative nor quite parliamentary. It is really oligarchic. But all Englishmen are proud of it. And in their conceit they do not think others like Indians, or even the Muslim Nation, to be fit for the supposed democratic and parliamentary system of Government which they possess in their own opinion. The resignation of Sir Samuel Hoare on the Abyssinian question as well as the speech of Mr. N. Chamberlain denouncing, before the decision of the British Cabinet, sanctions against Italy, both indicated that even the system of collective responsibility in the British Cabinet had lost its hold. Critics say that if occasion had arisen Mr. Baldwin would have thrown overboard Mr. Chamberlain as he had Sir Samuel.

Thus, recent incidents have shaken more heavily the claim of the British Parliament to be a really representative body. The Prime Minister had shown complete disregard for the verdict of the people at the polls and the idea of the collective responsibility of the Cabinet Ministers had also been demolished. No wonder that the Bolsheviks attack the British system of Government.

Americans, who took the system from the English and the French, are even more conceited than are the natives of Europe.

Mr. Cameron Morris of North Carolina claims that "the Government of the United States and the constitutional principles of the Representative Government upon which our fabric of free government rests are final and ultimate truth about the government of the earth."

But under this "final and ultimate truth" the colour bar is supreme. America treats her own negroid citizens worse than untouchables. All "coloured" citizens have restaurants and hotels *separate* from those the *discoloured* ones have. Intermarriages between the "coloured" and "discoloured" (so-called "whites") are not allowed. There are "Grafts" and "Gangsters" and "Racketeerings," besides periodic lynching of the negroid citizens of America under that "final and ultimate truth." What wonder then if other peoples, particularly the Bolsheviks, thought of making a little improvement upon so defective a "final truth" in order to make it *more* democratic to allow men of all races and colours, even if they were not all millionaires or capitalists, to be treated fairly as citizens of the same country under a *really* free Government.

Although Nazi-ism and Fascism both are the antagonists of Bolshevism, but Nazi-ism, Fascism and Bolshevism, all the three, are united in condemning the democratic parliamentary systems of England, France and America.

Lenin in his "Thesis" against the proposed "Constituent Assembly" said that the Soviet system was more democratic than the bourgeois Parliamentarianism because it established a "closer and more concrete link between electors and elected and it implied the right of constituents to recall and replace their representatives at any time."

Chechcrin, whose recent death is an irreparable loss to the Bolshevist cause, wrote to the American President that Capitalist States were based on "brutal force" and that they were dominated absolutely by "organised parties which were completely subservient to the leading financial groups."

What a shock this message must have given to the head of the "final and ultimate truth about the government of the earth!"

Bolshevists of every country seriously questioned the representative and democratic character of the American, French and English systems.

Prof. Laski wrote in his *Communism*, "it is evident that Legislatures have declined either in authority or prestige. Either like the British Parliament they become the creatures of the Executive or like the Legislatures of France and America their conflict with the Executive prevents them from making an effective policy.

The *boss* in America, and the *caucus* in England, these simply organise masses of voters to carry out the choice upon which they have determined. An American President is not made by the people, they merely collect one out of the two men whom a handful of organisers in either Party has decided upon as a satisfactory figurehead. The voter cannot be influential in the electorate of modern size, the deputy is little better off. Power in the modern democratic States passes to a small number of official wire-pullers who understand how to control the machine. And every Legislature is so overwhelmed by business that it has no time to discuss adequately any important question."

In this condemnation of the Democratic Parliamentary System as known to Europe, the deadly enemy of Bolshevism, Herr Hitler, joins hands with M. Chechcrin and Prof. Laski and contributes the following biting words:—

"It is not the aim of our present-day Democracy to form an assemblage of wise men, but rather to collect together a crowd of nonentities who can easily be led in certain definite directions, especially if the intelligence in each individual of them is limited. Only thus can the game of party politics be played in its unhealthy present-day sense. But it also makes it possible for the real wire-puller to remain safely in the background with no possibility of even being made personally responsible."

It may be said that Hitler hates all Democracies and therefore he runs down the present Democratic System. But Lafarque supports Herr Hitler's views thus:—

"In proportion as the mass of citizens who possess political rights increases and the number of the elected rulers increases, the *actual power* is concentrated and becomes *the monopoly* of smaller and smaller groups of individuals."

Mr. Carter, the author of *The Constitutional History of England*, has traced in his book how gradually in England parliamentary authority has been usurped by the Cabinet. That means that all power is being concentrated in the hands of a few bureaucrats who are headed by a single individual called the Prime Minister who, in his turn, is moved by the hidden hands of the "wire-puller." And this all-powerful "wire-puller" is often a financier, or a group of financiers, who mostly uses the power to serve capitalist and exploiting ends. Thus the poor masses in Europe themselves suffer. But the greatest sufferers are the exploited populations of the East.

The fact is that the greatest corruptive factor of the European Democracies has been the possession by them of Eastern dependencies which have raw materials to supply to the factory

owners and exploiters of the West. In those countries all democratic notions are thrown to the winds. The Government is guided only by one motive, how steadily and completely to milch the Eastern country for the benefit of the European exploiters? In all such countries the administration is always top-heavy because it has to be carried on by foreigners who have to be supplied with fat salaries. And every foreign official, although he costs large sums to the poor taxpayer, is a little tin god whose prestige has to be kept up among the millions of people given under his sway. This corrupts the individual mentality and as governments are formed by individuals the mentality of the whole Government is corrupted. This corruption then does not remain confined to the exploited country only. It reacts at home as it increases the wealth and power of the Capitalists, and financial and social conceit does not allow justice to be done to the weak. Thus the moral tone is lost.

In India, the Britisher, in whatever capacity he may be, even a servant of an Indian State, loses his democratism and his good qualities and becomes a snob.

If he is in the Government services he forgets that his salary is paid by the people and he is a servant. He becomes a boss. The Executive is supreme in India. It is celestial– far above the Indians of highest rank and of the greatest ability. On its prestige depends the prestige of the whole Government– in fact the existence of the whole Government, which is there to serve alien and minority interests, *i.e.*, the British interests and the interests of the few Europeans in India.

The Head of the Executive in India is the Governor-General who possesses a power and prestige which the King himself may well envy, although he in reality is a paid servant of India—a servant whose salary is the most sumptuous in the world. In the New Constitution he will have power to enact laws on his *personal* responsibility and discretion *overriding the Parliamentary Legislation* at his sweet will even against the opinion of the Ministers. What a Democracy! and what a Representative System! Yet Indians are expected to be proud of all this and thank the British, day and night, for this great boon of the New Constitution.

The same is the case with Republican France. It was France which developed a Republican System of Government. It was France which destroyed monarchism and established the sovereign rights of the people. It was France which uplifted the banner of Equality, Fraternity and Liberty, that has now become probably the most autocratic ruler of the mandated and protected States and weak nations. France's Imperialism is probably now a shade *deeper in autocracy* than that of England, which will

damage the interests of France itself in the long run. France has always been less far-sighted than England. It was because of this shortsightedness that England has always scored against France itself. She scored in India, Canada, Egypt in fact everywhere and every time—even in the last War, as a French Journalist admitted to the Author.

The greatest bane of the so-called democracies of Europe is, as said before, their tyranny over the weak and the poor, particularly if they are Eastern peoples and nations. The weak Eastern people do not count with them when liberty and equality are the proposition. Well did Lenin, Chechcrin and Radek say, to that personification of European democracies who was during, and just after, the War the keeper of the European conscience (if Europe has a conscience), in a note, "unique in diplomatic correspondence," "you demand the independence of Poland, Servia and Belgium . . . but strangely we do not notice in your demand any mention of freedom for Ireland, Egypt, India or even of the Philippine Islands."

They might as well have said that the Wilson group was depriving the Syrians, Palestinians and Iraqians of their liberty by placing them under the rule of aliens who had nothing not even religion- in common with them.

One of the greatest evils with the Governments of the Western countries was the control which the financiers had got over them. The financiers—the "wire-pullers," as Laski and Hitler call them, got their millions through those Governments. It was this control by the Capitalist which made the Western systems of Government the chief target for the Bolshevists.

Mr. John Strachey, in his latest book *The Struggle for Power*, writes :—

"The very basis of modern Capitalism, without which great empires, such as the British, could not exist for a single day, is super-profits derived from the exploitation of colonial and subject peoples."

It is alleged that the Great War was also the handiwork of Capitalists and Financiers. Anyway, several of them flourished during the War and through the War. Who has not heard the name of at least one of them—*Zaharoff*?

It was men like him who held the destiny of nations and empires in the hollow of their hands. He was described once in the Press thus :—

"Sir Basil Zaharoff, G.C.B., Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour, Honorary Doctor of Law in the University of Oxford,

close friend of Mr. Lloyd George, the late M. Clemenceau, and all the statesmen and crowned heads of Europe, reckoned to be one of the richest and most powerful men in the world, possessor of a fortune estimated at anything between ninety and a hundred million pounds, now living quietly in a Chateau in France with the death of some millions of men upon his conscience."

The Turks owe a special "debt of gratitude" to this man because it was he who encouraged and financed, in 1921, an attack by the Greeks on their homelands.

Sir Basil is gone now to give an account of his doings. Where is all his fortune and what purpose does it serve now for him ?

As regards the democratic nature of the Western Parliamentary System it is now confined only to the extension of franchise. Franchise has indeed become very general. But the Parliamentary work is managed in such a way that the general voters have no control left over the State—after once they have voted for a person. They are not consulted even in the most important matters. Mostly they are offered a *fait accompli* and no option is left to them but to ratify what the Cabinet has already decided. The most glaring case of this was the beginning of the Great War. Although the matter involved the question of the life and death of millions, although it was so important that the very existence of the Empire depended upon it, but the question was put before the Parliament *after* the entrance of Britain into the arena of the Great War. The Cabinet sent the ultimatum to Germany on its *own* authority—not on that of the elected representatives of the people—the "assemblage of Parliamentary chatter-boxes."

As regards the new Indian Constitution also much is being made out of the increase in the number of voters. But thoughtful Indians must be excused if they consider this enfranchisement of a larger population (the proportion to the whole population is still infinitesimally small) as adding an insult to injury. When the opinions of the representatives of the people were flouted before, by the Executive —in fact by every alien in India—it was said that those Representatives had the votes of only a few at their back and that the Assembly and the Council were not really representative. Now that personal discretion and judgment of the head of the Executive will have power, under the Constitution itself, to set aside even the unanimous verdict of the Representatives of many millions of people, the insult not only to the Representatives themselves, but to the voters will be greater indeed.

It has been said by responsible persons that the notorious "Balfour Declaration," which has permanently upset the peace of the land where the "Prince of Peace" was born, was also the

work of the "wire-pullers," the Jewish financiers (and who has more money than the Jew) and the views of the general electorate of Britain, which is far from being pro-Jewish, were not taken into account at all. Probably if that had been done and if the dull and ignorant (in spite of its being able to sign its name) electorate had been made to understand all the implications of the step taken it would never have allowed the brutal Declaration to be made on its behalf. But the Jews had money and the Jews have votes also in Britain. .

Nor would it have allowed the antagonism of a large part of the population of the British Empire for the sake of Venezelos or even Zaharoff by asking the Greeks to land troops at Smyrna just after the Great War and to perpetrate inhuman butcheries. Nor, again, would the British electorate have allowed the "baby killing" aerial operations on the Frontier of India or the repressive and autocratic rule in India in the name of the British Constitutional King and the British democratic people. The British people, particularly the better half, are *par mal*. But the trouble is that the electorate of Britain is not consulted on very important matters and if it is consulted the Cabinet Ministers find it not very difficult to lead "in certain definite directions," as Herr Hitler says, "the crowd of subservient nonentities."

It is unfortunately easy to lead or mislead "the crowd of subservient nonentities" in Europe everywhere. An Italian Minister led it to commit the outrage in Tripoli a few years ago and has now led it to do the same in Abyssinia. These wars of conquest are far from being unpopular. They are acclaimed and fêted by the nation, more so if they are successful.

In short, all over Europe, excepting Russia, where the Czar, the Dukes and the Priests possessed full sway, it was the Capitalist who held all the power in his hands, although it was acquired, in places like Britain, under the camouflage of a Parliamentary system.

Everywhere the poor workers and labourites were ill-treated and sweated to supply the exploiters with their millions when Bolshevism rose in Russia to alter the whole scheme of Government and to create a new world of its own.

VI.—Why Masses Welcomed Bolshevism ?

Man is a social animal. He likes to live in herds—families. He desires to make up for his natural weakness by the help of his fellow men.

Whether man has evolved from the genus of monkeys may be a doubtful theory but there is no doubt that of all animals those nearest to men are monkeys. Just hurt a monkey and he will make a noise that will collect all those monkeys which are within hearing distances. They will come to help the individual in trouble. In the same circumstances man must have done the same when he lived in his natural condition. The most powerful or clever man would have taken the lead of the family in his hands. Then the circle of the individual's power would have increased and he would have become the head of the village, then of towns and of cities and of kingdoms and of empires. This must have been the time of absolute despotism. That, however, might have been somewhat softened when the King had his Councillors, Ministers, and Vazeers. By stages and stages Parliaments must have been invented and a representative system of Government established.

This Parliamentary System was, up to recently, thought to be the best system to ensure the happiness of the majority of the people. It was called the Democratic System. It was supposed to be the best system of Government until Socialism arose. According to the European view, Socialism arose in the nineteenth century. Its highest form—Communism—arose, they say, in the present century, which in the year 1918 took a practical shape—Bolshevism.

Socialists (and Bolshevists) hold the view that *the crowning discovery of the nineteenth century was that democratic Government made no difference to the ordinary man—nominally self-governing, he remained in bondage.*

Mr. Gilbert Stone questions the above view and he has written a *History of Labour* to support his own view. The conclusions he has drawn from his history are these:—"We have seen in the past that until the beginning of that epoch which we have described 'the present' a man has been ruled by a minority, a minority representative of the noblest born, the best educated, and frequently the most cultured of men. *We have seen that the exercise of such power by the minority has resulted in the repression of the masses and the continuance of long-endured wrongs.* Little by little the minority has become larger and larger, the wrongs have become less and less. We shall now see that slowly the minority has yielded power

to the majority, which has won that power after constant struggle. That power is founded on the right residing in the majority of the people *irrespective of class or wealth to decide how the country shall be ruled, what laws shall be made, and how obedience to those laws shall be secured. That is a priceless heritage. It constitutes at present what we call our liberty* . . . The whole question, indeed, seems to be concluded if once it appears that *in fact our present parliamentary system, as a system, does offer to the people of this country the power to rule according to the will of the majority.*" When Mr. Stone "holds on the strong opinion that it does" he forgets that British Parliament has taken the responsibility of ruling over not only the small group of the British Isles but also other huge countries, like India, in which it imposes the rule of a microscopic minority upon an overwhelming majority. Of course in the opinion of a self-centred and conceited Englishman, non-Englishmen have no soul—they do not count, but to the mind of a Socialist, and more so to that of the Bolshevists, the whole State, if not the whole of humanity, forms one fraternity. If the British Parliament had not taken over the responsibility of the Government in India, or if she had allowed the people of this land to have full self-government or Home Rule, then she might not have been blamed for the disgraceful poverty of the masses who hardly get one coarse meal a day, who live in dens and thatched houses and who suffer by devastating epidemics and with appalling infant-mortality; the percentage of whose education is the lowest of any civilized country and the industrial development is poorest. Even though agriculture is the mainstay of the poor, starving, sickly population in India, it is in its rudimentary condition still.

How can the people of India then bless the system which is responsible for such a state of affairs? For Indians the British Parliamentary system is not much different from the Czarist rule in Russia—the Parliament quietly sanctions all those methods which were used by the Czars to keep the people of the land deprived of self-government. In one respect the Parliamentary rule is worse in India—it is absolutely alien to the land and its people, while the Czarist rule and power were after all indigenous. Because the British Democratic Parliamentary Government takes no notice of the other parts of the British Empire except of the little group of the British Islands, which are in a hopeless minority, the masses of that Empire naturally cannot be satisfied with that system which gives the destiny of the great majority into the hands of a very small minority. And the masses would naturally welcome that system which treats all parts of the State as one, which does not make distinctions of race or colour, and which vouchsafes a majority Government—a truly peoples' own Government, for the whole State or the integral parts of the State.

In the new Soviet system which has been brought into existence in Russia, all the different parts, whether European or Asiatic, Muslim or Christian, have been given *absolutely equal status* and the Russian State has been given the name of the United Socialist Soviet Republic (U.S.S.R.). So in this respect at least the masses could not but welcome the Soviet system and give it a preference over the so-called Democratic Parliamentary System which has not up to the moment given to India a majority democratic rule.

What is the reply which Mr. Stone can give to this Declaration of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, issued on 13th December, 1922, as follows ?—

"Since the formation of the Soviet Republics the world has been divided into two camps—the Capitalist and the Socialist. In the Capitalist camp reigns national hostility and inequality, colonial slavery, chauvinism, national suppression, pogroms and imperialist brutality. Here, in the Socialist camp, is to be found mutual confidence and peace, national freedom and equality and the tranquil community and fraternal co-operation of peoples."

As far as principles go can there possibly be any two opinions as to which system or "camp" the masses would or should prefer ?

The rules framed for the Union make not the slightest possible difference between one unit or the other of the Union and the last clause No. 26 runs as follows:—

"Each of the united Republics retains its full liberty to leave the Union if it so desires."

What a vivid contrast the last clause presents between the mentalities of the framers of the Soviet Constitution with that of those who sat for years and years to frame the Constitution for India as a part of the so-called commonwealth of Britain. The latter raged violently when the Indian National Congress included in its demand the right of secession from the British Empire which represents the only world-wide Imperialism of the day.

No wonder that the depressed masses and weak peoples liked the rise of the Bolshevik system of Soviets.

We do not say that in later years the Bolsheviks have been able to achieve all their objects. But there is no doubt that the defects which they pointed out in the old systems of Government were there and the ideal of their system which they put forward was so attractive that the masses of Russia itself heartily welcomed

it with the result which the Bolsheviks themselves have pointed out in the same Declaration in these words :—

"Thanks solely to this fact (that they rallied the majority of the population, routed out national persecution and laid the foundation of fraternal co-operation) were the Soviet Republics able to beat off the internal and external attacks of world-imperialism, to bring Civil War to a successful conclusion, to render their existence safe and sure and to proceed to the work of peaceful economic construction."

For the future the Declaration says, "The very structure of the Soviet Power, which is international in its class character, urges the working masses of the Soviet Republics along the path of Union into one Socialist family."

It was the promise of creating one *international* "Socialist Family" which drew the masses of the whole world—of Asia and Africa as of Europe, towards Bolshevism. It was because of that that they extended to it a welcome in their heart of hearts.

Perhaps Mr. Stone, who is so proud of the British system, is not aware of the fact that under the Democratic Parliamentary British rule of India the poverty of India is appalling. The following paragraph was published in an extremely pro-British paper—"The Indian States Bulletin," of 2nd September, 1935, published by J. D. Jenkins, Director and Proprietor, under the bold type heading, *India's Appalling Poverty*. It ran :—

"When the Madras Government's Famine Commissioner, Dewan Bahadur N. Gopalswamy Ayyangar, visited Sarmadugur, a village in Chittoor district, where acute distress is prevailing, women showed him some dried leaves and barks which, they said, they had been seeking and eating to keep themselves alive. Others told the Commissioner that now even leaves and barks are not available in some places.

"The Commissioner asked those who complained of unemployment whether they were willing to work for 1½ or two annas (less than two penny) daily if the Government started special works. The distressed villagers replied that they were willing to work, but only under Government supervision, not under contractors. It is expected that road-building work will be shortly provided."

Even when there is no famine the poverty of the people is shocking as the same paper points out thus :—"In 1930 Dr. Bentley, the Director of Public Health, Bengal, said that the peasants of Bengal lived on a diet that even rats could not survive upon for five weeks."

Compare these figures with those given in the same paper on 10th August, 1935, under the heading "Prosperous England."

"England," it writes, "spends roughly £120,000,000 on tobacco, £60,000,000 on beauty parlours' peparations, £43,000,000 on cinemas and £50,000,000 on sweets, employing 750,000 work-people in 250,000 sweet shops."

While in less than five years Russia has been industrialized to a very large extent and her agriculture has also been immensely improved, India under the rule of British industrialists and under the supervision of the British Parliament, of over 150 years, has still a wholly undeveloped agriculture, although 80 per cent. of her population lives upon the land. They get only one meal a day of coarse grain without meat or fats. And only ten per cent. of India's people are employed in industry. In England only 8 per cent. live on the land, 4/5th of the population dwells in towns and 58 per cent. makes its living by industry.

Even if we leave alone, and we, as Asiatics, have no reason to do so, this condemnable effect of the Parliamentary System that it has left millions of people—6 or 7 times more than the population of Britain—in bondage and poverty, the Parliamentary Democratic Government cannot escape censure as it has failed, in Europe itself, to divide the wealth of the countries evenly and has also failed to give equal opportunities to all its European citizens.

The *majority* in all European countries, and Mr. Stone's own country of which he is so proud *not* excluded, are comparatively very poor while a *minority* is rolling in wealth.

If Mr. Stone is right and the Parliamentary Democratic System has given England the "majority rule" then cursed be that majority which has failed, notwithstanding the power in its hands, to give to the majority of the population the means of good living and good lodging while the minority live in luxury in palatial houses. The East-End in London and the poor peasants and workers and factory labourers in the country are living monuments of the defects of the Parliamentary System and lend their support to the view that "*the democratic government made no difference to the life of the ordinary man,—nominally self-governing, he remained in bondage.*"

From his own mouth Mr. Gilbert Stone stands condemned when he says:—"Such matters are not to be settled by any man's opinion, they will be settled by the facts of the case." "The facts of the case" undeniably are that the majority, even in European countries under the Democratic Parliamentary System, are ill-housed, ill-fed, ill-kept when compared to the minority in the same countries. Who dare deny this in Europe unless he is utterly blind? But the fact that the majority is worse off than the minority means that either the majority has no real power, or it is

so perverse and its political sense is so undeveloped that it cannot assist itself. In both the cases the system must be considered defective.

Besides this, American, European and British statesmen themselves proclaimed the failure of their systems of government in the preamble of the Covenants of the "League of Nations" which they formed as a counterpoise to the Bolshevik system that was attracting the masses of Europe towards it.

The preamble to Part XIII of the Peace Treaty with Germany begins as follows:—

"Whereas the League of Nations has for its object the establishment of universal peace, and such a peace can be established only if it is based upon social justice; And whereas *conditions of labour exist involving such injustice, hardship, and privation to large number of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperilled.*" What an admission of the disgraceful failure of the Parliamentary Democratic Systems of Government is contained in the words italicised by us when those have admittedly produced such a staggering condition of the millions of people!

And when this was the case under the Governments which had Democratic Parliamentary Systems how awful must have been the condition of the poor, toiling masses under such an unredeemed autocracy as that of Czarist Russia? How welcome the change to Bolshevism must have been to the rack-rented serfs—the peasants, and the starving workmen and labourers!

It was not only that the European rulers—Kings, Presidents, Ministers—had failed to attend to the needs of the poor and depressed millions in the past, they turned down all those solemn promises for the future which they had held out under the stress of the circumstances during the War. Thus there was no hope, even in the future, for the weak and the poor. A powerful microscope could not reveal the Wilsonian fourteen points in the Treaties or in the dealings of the victors towards the depressed peoples and nations.

For instance, in one of the fourteen points it was declared that there would be no annexations of territories as a consequence of the Great War, but when the time for settlement came there was not one prominent member of the winning group, except America, which did not acquire fresh territories under one pretence or other.

Then there was to be no indemnity. But what amount of reparation was exacted from the defeated group?

The fact is that these proclamations of no annexations and no indemnities were taken from the Bolshevik declarations and there was no sincerity behind them. They were meant to lure the enemy

to accept peace. Nor was it imagined that the defeat would be so crushing that the other side would be completely at the mercy of the victors. So when the War ended in the collapse of the Central Group all those promises were utterly repudiated. Turkey was so helpless that the victors transgressed even the terms of the Armistice.

Besides these pledges of no annexation and no indemnity there was another pledge of very great value to weak nations. It was that of *self-determination*. But like the others this was also completely repudiated. It was boldly said during the War not only by President Wilson but also by the prominent Ministers of all the Powers, most particularly by that great babbler—the then Prime Minister of England, that every nation was assured of her own national rule as determined by herself, but what happened was that there was not one nation in the East which was given the choice of self-rule. While the War was on, it was proclaimed from the house-tops all over the world that in future all the small or weak peoples would be protected from the powerful bullies and earth-grabbers, but the weak peoples and nations are preyed upon to-day as they were ever before. Poor, weak Abyssinia is the latest victim of the European hounds and the "League of Nations," which ensured world-peace, is a helpless spectator of the revolting scene. Worse still is the slow but sure destruction of the Arab Nation in Palestine under the very supervision of the League itself. At least in the East there is *not one weak nation* which has profited to any appreciable extent through those high principles which were loudly enunciated during the course of the Great War by the war-lords. On the other hand the Bolsheviks expressed their full sympathy not only by words but also by deeds with all weak nations, particularly those of the East. Lenin deliberately championed the cause of the weak Eastern nations. He personally wrote an encouraging letter to the King of Afghanistan. He advocated Russian co-operation with Mustafa Kemal Pasha and helped Persia. He was sympathetic towards China and India. He went to the extent of declaring that "the aim of the Soviet Government must be to group around itself all the awakening nations of the East and fight together with them against international Imperialism." These were bold and attractive words. What wonder then that all the "awakening" masses welcomed most heartily the advent of Bolshevism in the arena of the world, to fight shoulder to shoulder with the down-trodden peoples and nations and as the Muslim Nation had suffered most by the mailed fist of the European giants and as the Muslim Nation was just then shaking off its long drawn sleep and drowsiness, that Nation was more enthusiastic in welcoming the rise of Bolshevism.

And who can deny that if the Muslim Nation made a common cause with Bolshevism in right earnest it would form a formidable and invincible *bloc*—an all-conquering *bloc*, which could give a lesson to the European bullies that would not be forgotten in a hurry ?

The popularity of Bolshevism or Communism can be gauged by the fact that there are very few countries in the world -even distant China not excluded—where a Communist Party on the same Bolshevik lines has not been formed that has frightened the ruling class everywhere. In every country Bolsheviks or Communists are persecuted. All over the world Capitalist Governments are frightened of Bolshevism and do their best to stop Bolshevik propaganda because they feel sure that the masses everywhere will be captivated by Bolshevik principles and will take the rulers to task. European exploiters and tyrants are more particular in taking every care to stop Communist propaganda in Eastern countries, because the masses in those countries are more tyrannised over and more exploited and there is a greater likelihood of their being drawn towards Bolshevism. Although now there is a Pact between France and Russia and a kind of *rapprochement* between England and Russia yet in the Eastern possessions of both France and England—in India itself -the Communist Party has been made unlawful. It is not so in Europe.

A very interesting coincidence occurred the year before last—the very year when Russia degraded herself by joining the League of Imperialists at Geneva.

The Writer of these pages had himself an opportunity of sitting at the same table with the polished representative of the U.S.S.R., M. Litvinoff, who is one of the leaders in the Communist Party, when both of us were the guests with others, including Englishmen themselves, of a very hospitable world-renowned Prince of India, well known for his loyalty to the British, *on the very date when the autocrats of India*—"the chattel of Britain"—*proscribed the Communist Party*. In the flash of this news from India the Writer almost heard the ironic laughter of the Fates and pointed out the irony to the Right Honourable host of the evening.

Whatever the reactions of the changed policy of the leaders of the Bolshevik movement may now be, the fact remains that at the start, Bolshevism was welcomed by the masses everywhere because they expected an amelioration of their grievances which no political system so far, neither the Monarchical System of Government nor the Democratic Parliamentary System, had succeeded in removing. The majority of the people in every country in the world remained poor and distressed and unlooked after even

though the much boomed Parliamentary System had had its trial carried on for centuries past.

The best political and social system invented by man to protect himself and his Society from tyranny, injustice, exploitation, class gradation, is Communism. Communism, when it becomes international and is generally adopted by all nations and when it develops into a universal brotherhood, will also kill Social or National antagonisms, check self-seeking aggrandizement, and will stop wars.

We strongly recommend Communism, on Pan-Islamic lines, to India and all the States, particularly Muslim States, as Islam itself has a Communistic Constitution and has established the most commendable and practical Universal Brotherhood.

Writer after writer in England used to blame the Bolsheviks for having forced people to work and for having curtailed the liberty of the citizens. We ourselves have deplored the interference by the Turkish Dictator in the way people dressed themselves or addressed each other in the Turkish "Republic". Now, when our book is still in the press, has come the news on 12th November, 1936, that a Bill has been put by the Government before the British Parliament which "forbids the wearing of a uniform signifying association with a political organisation."

There is no doubt that just as the Dictator Ataturk outraged the civil liberty of the Turkish people by his orders, the Dictator Baldwin will, probably for the first time in British history, regulate the dress of the Britons and "the crowd of subservient nonentities" will humbly submit to it. Thus a new fetter is being put on the civil liberty of the "Free Briton". He could not do any business or even play the innocent game of tennis, in a public place, on a Sunday before. Now he cannot put on a uniform (the word has been left vague and undefined) on a public occasion. Next time probably he will be stopped from eating mushrooms or oysters, if not his favourite beef steak, in a public restaurant, and so on.

But even then he will continue merrily to sing:—

"Britons never, never shall be slaves," and he will continue to be proud of his Democratic Parliamentary System. Will he not ?

VII.—Why Muslims Particularly Hailed Bolshevism ?

The reasons why Muslims all over the world hailed the rise of Bolshevism more than any other people did were several others besides those incidentally given in the previous chapter. The chief reason was that as Islamic Social and Political organisation was itself Communistic every Muslim applauded and approved of Bolshevism. There were other reasons also of which the most important were two.

(*a*) *The Bolshevists destroyed anti-Muslim Czarism.*

The destruction of Czarism by the Bolshevik régime was liked immensely not only by the oppressed masses of Russia, which consisted of both Christians and Muslims, but by the Muslim Nation as a whole all the world over.

Every nation has its rise and fall. The Turkish Nation also had seen its rise and fall. But in the fall of the Turkish Nation, Russia has undoubtedly played a very prominent part. As the Turkish Empire was the only Muslim Empire left in Europe after the downfall of the glorious Saracenic Empire in Spain and because the Turkish monarch had acquired the Islamic Khilafat, the Muslims of the whole world took keen fraternal interest in the well-being of Turkey and naturally disliked its most prominent enemy—the Czar of Russia. In fact, the whole of the East had a lurking sympathy with the Turkish Nation because it was the only Eastern nation ruling a large portion of European territories.

History has recorded the fact that every nation has a term, as the Holy Quran had pointed out. Nations like individuals are born, they grow up to manhood, to their full strength and stature, and then they begin to decline. Take the history of any nation and the same process will be found to have prevailed.

The Osmanli Turks continued their rise for ten successive generations of their Founder. The Empire grew and grew like the Crescent—the emblem which it had adopted.

It reached its zenith in the reign of Sulaiman the Magnificent who had an ultra capable minister called the Grand Vizier Sokalli by the European historians.

Under the Prime Ministership of Sokalli the Empire extended from the centre of Hungary in Europe in the North, to the Persian Gulf and the Sudan in the South. It extended from the Caspian Sea in the East, to the Province of Oran in Africa in the West. The Southern shores of the whole of the Mediterranean Sea, except the Moroccan territory, were included in the Turkish Empire

of the day. So were all the shores of the Black Sea and the Red Sea. Turkey was as large a continental Power as a maritime Power. All the islands of the Aegean Sea, except Crete, which was conquered later, belonged to Turkey. These extensive territories were inhabited by twenty different races.

Besides the actual possession of large territories, vassal States were spread on all sides.

In Arabia, on the shores of the Persian Gulf, was Al Hasa, towards the Caspian Sea and Persia were Daghestan, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Hamadan. On the Black Sea were the Crimea and other ports ; on the European side were Moldavia, Transylvania, Buda and others. Conquests were made even later. Ahmad Kiuprili conquered Crete from the Republic of Venice in 1667 and refused the offer of a large sum of money by proudly saying "we are not money-lenders."

The first conflict between Turkey and Russia took place in 1672 when the same Prime Minister Ahmad Kiuprili undertook a war against Poland to help the Cossacks of Ukraine who had risen against their Polish oppressors and had sought the help of the Sublime Porte for protection against the invasion of their country by Sobieski. The Czar of Russia joined with the King of Poland in protesting against Turkey's intervention in Polish affairs to which the Sublime Porte replied in these words :—

"God be praised, such is the strength of Islam that the union of Russian and Poles does not matter to us. Our Empire has increased in might since its beginning and all the Christians that have leagued against us have not been able to do us any harm. With God's grace it shall even be so and our Empire shall endure to the day of judgment."

Yes, it could endure to the "day of judgment" if those who came to possess the power in their hands had performed their duty properly, had followed Islam faithfully and had taken steps later to bring even the Sun and Moon under their subservience by their mastery over the laws of Nature as the Quran had desired. But accursed be the autocratic personal system of Government that degenerated rulers came on the Osmanli throne and while Europe advanced in scientific and technical knowledge and began to possess a better organised Navy and Army, the brave Turks had to give in not only before Russia, but also before the Concert of Europe. Heroically the Muslim Turkish Nation had to fight and fight and fight to keep off the fateful day but at last the Empire which had had her sway on the three Continents was reduced to a small State of only six or eight million souls,

Ahmad Kiuprili defended his action of helping the oppressed Cossacks in a letter written in his own hand which he gave to the Polish envoy. He wrote:—

"The Cossacks, a free people, placed themselves under the Poles, but being unable to endure Polish tyranny any longer they have sought protection elsewhere and they are now under the Turkish banner. If the people of an oppressed country, in order to obtain deliverance, implore the aid of a mighty Emperor is it prudent to pursue them in such an asylum ? When the most mighty and most glorious of all Emperors is seen to deliver and succour from their enemies those who are oppressed, and who ask him for protection, a wise man will know on which side the balance for breaking peace ought to rest. If, in order to quench the fire of discord, negotiation is wished for so let it be. But if the solution of differences is referred to that keen and decisive judge called the "sword", the issue of the strife must be pronounced by God by whose aid Islam has for a thousand years triumphed over its foes." (Von Hammer. Ch. XI.)

From this first conflict between Turkey and Russia -Russia always took the leading part in weakening the Turkish Empire and in cutting it into pieces. Sometimes it joined hands with Austria, at others with Greece and Servia and so forth. For the greater part of the eighteenth century Britain also had been allied to Russia. It was in 1790 that the younger Pitt changed that policy. On 28th March, 1791, he declared in the British House of Commons that "the Turkish Empire is of great weight in the general scale of European Powers and if that Empire is diminished or destroyed, or even rendered unstable and precarious, the situation of Prussia (with which Britain was then in alliance) would be seriously affected." Pitt further said, "Could any one imagine that the aggrandizement of Russia would not materially affect the disposition of other Powers ?"

But who could rely upon the "perfidious Albion"? In spite of the speech of the younger Pitt, in spite of the vote of the House of Commons, Britain did not give any help to Turkey against Russia. On the contrary, it was the British Admiral, Sir Edward Codrington, who destroyed the Turkish fleet at Navarino on 20th October, 1827, with a combined fleet of Britain, France and Russia. From that date the Turkish Navy was crippled for ever and Turkey lost its maritime position. But the irony of it was that the Duke of Wellington who was the Prime Minister in England declared in the House of Lords:—

"The Ottoman Empire was an essential part of the balance of power in Europe. Its preservation had been for many years an object for the whole of Europe." And the King of England

himself said in his speech from the throne early in 1828, "His Majesty deeply laments that this conflict should have occurred with the Naval Forces of our ancient Ally."

And it has so happened that even in the last struggle for her existence, Turkey was involved in a war in which Britain fought side by side with Russia which has been the chief cause of the destruction of the Ottoman Empire. Nor can anybody deny that England has profited the most, not only by the destruction of the Ottoman Empire, but by the whole dissolution of Islamdom. The whole Empire of Britain in the East has been built up on the ruins of Islamic Empires and States in Asia and Africa both. But to the Muslims, Czardom was the greater enemy because it was more coloured by religious bigotry against Islam. While the chief actuating motive behind Britain was Capitalism and trade interests that behind Russia was religious fanaticism combined with Imperialism.

By the treaty of Kaniardji, 16th July, 1774, Russia had acquired preferential right of protecting Christian subjects and religion in the Turkish Empire which no other Christian power possessed. This was a constant menace to Turkey and a standing challenge to Islam by Czardom. Also millions of Muslims under the Czars were very badly treated. This was so even during the Great War.

On 26th August, 1915, M. Djaferoff (the leader of the Muslim group) in his speech in the Duma said:—"Behind the roar of battle horrible things have been, and are being, perpetrated on the utterly helpless, peaceful Muslim population. Its life and property are in jeopardy. The extortion, robbery and murder of Muslims have become a matter of everyday occurrence. Wholesale expulsion of the male population, molestation of the unprotected women left behind, ruined and devastated villages, an impoverished hungry, terror-stricken, and unprovided for population—this is the position of Muslims in the country"

M. Djaferoff added:—"At a time when the liberation and protection of the nationalities beyond the frontiers of Russia were declared to be the aims of the War, at a time when our sons and brothers are shedding their blood for these aims (obviously the same fraud which was perpetrated in all other countries subordinate to the *entente group* as to the noble objects of the War was perpetrated in Russia also. M.H.K.), their helpless co-religionists at home, and on the Caucasian frontier, are being terrorised."

Poor Djaferoff! he reminded those heartless tyrants that in numbers "Muslims occupy the second place in the Russian Empire," but all in vain. The massacre of the Muslims continued,

After the Armistice the Sublime Porte circularised all the Great Powers (as we pointed out in *The Sword Against Islam* in 1919. M.H.K.) that after inquiry it has been established that two million Muslim Kurds were massacred by Armenians and Russian, till the time that the Turks recovered Erzerum.

British correspondents who had visited those parts confirmed the reports that numbers of the Kurdish villages had been destroyed with all their inhabitants—men, women and children.

Besides this kind of cruelty and the conceit of race which European Russia's autocracy shared with its other European compeers, to whom non-Europeans have no soul (perhaps the Russians were less prejudiced than others in this respect), the Russian priests were fired with the same antagonism against Islam with which the Crusaders were, and tried on every possible occasion to humiliate Islam which they called an anti-Christ, heathen religion. Many Christians of other countries also have been taught, even in their prayer book, to include among infidels the Turks, who worship the One and Only God and who respect Christ and Moses and Abraham, in fact all the Biblical Prophets, as well as all other religious Teachers of every race and country, not less than Muhammad, who himself repeatedly proclaimed that he was only a man. What an insult was this to Islam to call it a heathen religion! Insults like these were more severe and most general in Russia because there the dark "Age of Faith" still continued to blind the people. Christianity of the Middle Ages prevailed in Russia in this twentieth century. The priests held the same sway which they did in mediaeval times. The Writer of these pages noticed in the cosmopolitan town of Geneva, which is by no means Russian, a Russian Church over the top of which Crosses had been deliberately put over the Crescents to demonstrate, as it were, the domination of the Cross over the Crescent -Christianity over Islam—Russia over Turkey!

Muslims cannot but be thankful to Bolshevists who have finished together with Czardom also the Crusaders' fanaticism and the supreme power of the Russian priests. Bolshevism has thus, with one stroke, removed three thorns from the side of Muslims:— (1) Czardom—the enemy of the Muslim States of Turkey, Persia and Afghanistan; (2) Priesthood—which had made it a matter of conscience to try to humiliate and insult Islam; and (3) Imperialism —which tyrannised over millions of Russian Muslims and which incited Turkey's Christian subjects to be rebellious.

Bolshevists have thus performed Muslim's own mission. What wonder that Muslims hailed Bolshevism which saved the life and property of millions of Muslims! What wonder if Muslims blessed Lenin when he was alive and bless him now when he is dead!

Whatever may have been the personal belief or motives of Lenin the fact remains that he was a benefactor of Muslims and that at a time when they were in great distress and when even many of those who called themselves Muslims could not or did not help them. For this help at a critical time Muslims must bless Lenin even though he is no more on this earth. Surely a Bolshevik, of all persons, can have no quarrel if a Muslim refuses to believe that a man of the calibre and mentality of Lenin is, after a very short span of benevolent activity on this earth, now nothing more than a heap of dust or only a mummied corpse and that all the good he did to his fellow beings had no consequences for him at all. On the contrary, Bolsheviks who love and admire Lenin and his work should share the Muslims in their belief that there is a continuity of life in which "God may give them the best reward of what they have done and give more out of His Grace." (xxiv: 38.) And that because of the services Lenin did or meant to do to humanity at large and particularly for Muslims, because he acted as a staunch Pan-Islamist encouraging Muslims to unite and advance and because he helped them to defend their hearths and homes and lives, the God of Islam, the Rabbul Alamin who has imposed mercy upon Himself, has forgiven Lenin's sins, if he had committed any, and that his soul is happily resting now in the *Garden of Peace*, the *Abode of Bliss* where all noble desires are fully realised and the transcendental pleasures of which nobody can guess in this earthly life and which can only be described in similes or allegories or parables.

Certainly such a belief in accountability can do no harm to anybody while it undoubtedly does good to every person and every Society inasmuch as it is a preventive of evil deeds in this life even if concealed from the eyes of peoples, that may be harmful to Society, and an incentive and an encouragement for good deeds even if they are not appreciated in this world or if success does not come to the worker in his life-time.

There are peoples even among non-Muslims like Mr. Bridgeman, the head of the Anti-Imperialist League, as there are many Communists, who hold the view that if the European National Imperialism could be checked it could only be by the strengthening of the hands of the Muslims and the power of the Muslim States. It was for this reason that the greatest Indian Communist, the late Comrade Saklatvala, one of the dearest friends of the Author, although himself a non-Muslim (probably a non-religionist), supported, throughout his political career, the cause of all Muslim States—Turkey, Morocco, or Egypt, like a Pan-Islamist. Of all the Eastern nations it was the Muslim Nation alone (both the Arabs and the Turks), which had brought the mightiest Imperialism of

Europe low down upon its knees before, and Europe itself is not sure that a Muslim Nation, if solidified on truly progressive Pan-Islamic lines, could not perform the same feat again and yet again. What is lacking in the Muslim World is only a good leader or a combination of good leaders. But for a few shortcomings Mustafa Kemal himself would have been the missing leader. With a little more tact and statesmanlike sagacity and a little more self-control and broad outlook and *the necessary Pan-Islamic spirit* he can yet take the lead of the Muslim World. Bolshevists have paved the way for him. They have destroyed the greatest Imperial anti-Muslim Power. Hence Bolshevists are liked by Muslims. *They are also liked by the Muslims because they have created in the minds of the Muslims themselves an aversion against that Imperialism which Muslim potentates themselves had acquired and which was essentially un-Islamic.* The Model Nation which the Arabian Shepherd created had nothing of national or racial Imperialism in it. It was Communistic and thoroughly Internationalist. Like the Bolshevik Russian nation it was anti-Imperialist—it was anti-personal- it was anti-despotic it was in its essence really and truly Communistic and Socialistic. Pan-Islamists liked Bolshevism because there was a community of political objectives and ideals.

The destruction of Czardom itself served the objects of both Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism.

Bolshevist leaders have been clever enough to take full advantage of that destruction ; the Muslim leaders have not. But this is not the fault of the Bolshevists. Lenin himself prompted Muslim leaders to take advantage of it and to effect the solidarity of Islam but they have not been able to do so because they themselves behaved as autocrats and adopted a narrow nationalist outlook—not an *internationalist* one—not a Pan-Islamic one.

Muslim States and the Muslim Nation must remember that they can prosper only with a Pan-Islamic outlook—healthy, vigorous, advancing and victorious.

(*b*) *Bolsheviks Helped Muslim States.*

At the time that Bolshevism arose the condition of Muslim States gave very great cause of anxiety through the aggressions and greed of the European Powers. Every Muslim shudders to think what would have been the fate of the two biggest Muslim States—of Iran and Turkey—after the Great War if Bolshevism had not risen and if Czardom had been left to take its share in the victory of her Allies in the Great War.

On the other hand, how can any Muslim with eyes to see and with any knowledge of the world-events feel unthankful to the

Bolsheviks for having helped, not Iran and Turkey alone, but all the Muslim States which they could possibly help or encourage. Naturally, therefore, Muslims welcomed Bolshevism.

(1) *Iran.*

Let us take the case of Iran first and see to what condition she had fallen down, how dark were her prospects and how Bolsheviks helped her in attaining that hopeful position which she is enjoying to-day. We need not take our readers beyond that period which has been very accurately described in *The Strangling of Persia.* That book is worth reading by all those who want to know how blood-thirsty beasts had preyed upon their victim and divided it up into parts to devour it.

The Imperialists of Russia and Britain came to an agreement in 1907 to divide up Iran into two zones or "spheres of influence," —One in the South to be reserved for the British "Lion" and the other in the North for the Russian "Bear". This caused the greatest heart-burning and depression to every patriotic Iranian and to all his brothers and sympathisers. An Englishman, the late Professor E. G. Browne, personally known to the Author, who knew the *situation in Persia* well, wrote in the *English Contemporary Review* of November 1912 thus:—

"For such broken spirits and shattered hopes as for the anarchy now existing in Persia, Russia and Great Britain are directly responsible." Then he said:—"The wolfpack of financiers, and concession hunters and land-grabbers presses ever harder on the exhausted victim whose struggles grow fainter and fainter."

Yes, Iran grew weaker and weaker between the two parts of the stone-mill of Imperialism which began to grind her.

Brutal but blunt-headed Russia did not lose much time in dominating and domineering over her sphere of influence. Clever and cunning Britain found out other means to suck the blood of Iran from her zone.

Who has not read the history of the East India Company which eventually made the natives of a remote, bleak and foggy Island with dirty weather, unproductive soil and a beer-sodden population, the autocratic rulers of over 350,000,000 people who, three centuries ago, possessed a more civilized government than the Islanders had.

On the same lines, and probably with the same Imperialist design and expectations, the Persian Oil Company was floated in 1908 with Lord Strathcona, of the Burma Oil Company fame, as chairman and William Knox D'Arcy, who had taken the conces-

sion of over 300 miles belt for 60 years from Muzaffaruddin Shah, as the Director-Secretary.

In 1917 the British Government acquired shares to the value of £750,000 which formed more than half of the total stock of the company. The conditions of exploitation by the company were so strict that they deprived the Iranian Government of sovereign rights over the belt. The payment which the Iranian Government received was only 16 p.c. annually of the net profit of the company. This Persian Oil Company was one of the British stranglcholds over the throat of Iran before the Great War.

During the War, Iran was nominally neutral, but she was so utterly helpless that she became a battle-field of the belligerent Powers. Trotsky in his needlessly lengthy and rambling *History of the Russian Revolution* says that the objects of Russia's entering into the Great War were two-fold. He further writes, "Russia paid for her right to be an ally of advanced countries, to import capital and pay interest on it—that is essentially for her right to be privileged colony of her allies—but at the same time for her right to oppress and rob Turkey, Persia, Galicia, and other countries weaker and more backward than herself. The two-fold Imperialism of the Russian bourgeoisie had basically the character of an agency for other mightier world Powers." This is a prejudicial view of Czardom. Russia was not an agent in Iran. She was more dominant than England before the War. In those days she dictated to England. When the War began even then Russia was powerful in Iran and used Iran territories as she liked. Gradually however as Russia had to exert her power and energy to the ultimate limit elsewhere, England's occupation of Iran extended. It extended on until, as Lord Ronaldshay, in his life of Lord Curzon, admits "Persia was picketed on all sides with British forces." As early as 12th March, 1915, Sir George Buchanan, the British Ambassador in Russia, in his second memorandum of the same date in reply to the Russian demand for Constantinople, asked for, among other territorial adjustments, that portion which was left of Persia as the neutral zone. He said that that part should be included in the southern zone which was recognised by Russia to be the British zone of influence before the Great War. This Russia accepted with only one condition that Yezd and Isfahan be included in the Russian zone. On the request of the British Government M. Sazonov agreed to keep the whole transaction secret so as to hide the Imperialistic aims of Britain, France, and Russia—the three parties to the transaction. When the Czar took in person the command of the main Russian armies, Grand Duke Nicholas was given charge of the Caucasus Campaign. In 1916 he sent an army, under General Baratoff

which swept the Turks out of Western Iran and forced its way from Kermanshah and Hamadan reaching Kerind on 11th March on its way to Baghdad which it never reached. When Russia turned Bolshevik, Iran became, for all practical purposes, a colony or protectorate of Britain, run over by Indian mercenaries, under their British officers and masters.

Mr. Louis Fischer in his well-authenticated, valuable book gives, in fairly good detail, the condition of Iran during the Great War.

He also describes the treatment meted out by the Bolsheviks to Iran when they replaced Czarism in Russia.

As early as 14th January, 1918, Trotsky, in whose charge were the Russian Foreign Affairs, himself informed the Iran Government at Teheran that Bolsheviks did not consider the Iranian agreement binding upon Iran as it was one-sided and they were prepared to annul all the privileges and concessions granted by Iran to the old Russian Government. The British Government took no notice of the letter sent by the Shah's Government in February, 1919, demanding a revision of the customs agreement of 1903 and the annulment of that of 1907. Instead of withdrawing themselves from Southern Iran which was allotted to them in 1907, the British audaciously began to occupy even the northern part of Iran which was agreed, in 1907, to be the sphere of Russian influence. In fact British Imperialists began to dream of an overland route to Iran. Iranian territories and ports were occupied, strategic railways were laid down and military roads were built.. Iranian territory became the "spring board" for Britain for her attack on Bolshevik Russia. Efforts were made to take possession of the Caucasus and Azerbaijan to secure good oilfields and to find "a bridge" from Europe to Iran. This would have secured two Imperial objects—one of gaining the firmer grip over Afghanistan and Iran and the other of realizing the old, old dreams of Lord Curzon, who had acquired the long-coveted position of the Minister for Foreign Affairs in Britain and was expecting to become the Prime Minister. It was the British control over Iran which made it possible for Denikin's flotilla, under the supreme command of Admiral Norris, to operate in the Caspian, which became practically a British sea. A small Anglo-Indian army under General Malleson had advanced from Meshed into Transcaspia and set up the Menshevik Government at Askabad on the Iranian frontier.

General Malleson became notorious when he summarily hanged over two dozen Bolshevik officials delivered to him by Dunsterville.

Brigadier-General Dickson writes in his *East Persia* that "Commodore Norris had taken charge of the Imperial (Russian) Navy and on behalf of General Denikin's anti-Bolshevik Government held command of the Caspian Sea." The British ruled supreme all along the Iranian coast of the Caspian Sea and in Transcaspia.

The "Dunsterforce" established itself in the Iranian port of Enzeli. In August, 1919, an Anglo-Persian agreement was made which conceded military and financial control to Britain. In the December of the same year a British military mission arrived in Iran, and three months later the Armitage Smith and Balfour mission came to take charge of the finances of Iran. The Turks and Germans had tried to induce the Shah to go with them but he had refused. A few months before August, 1919—to be exact on 26th June, 1919—Kolomietzev had delivered a note from Kara Khan to the Iranian Minister which categorically announced that (1) All Persian debts to the Czarist Government were annulled, (2) Russian interference in Persia's income from customs, post and telegraph was at an end, (3) All official and private Russian concessions in Persia were void, (4) The Russian Bank in Persia with all its inventory, land, branches, etc., was declared the property of the Persian people, (5) all the roads, electric stations, post and telegraph equipments, railway lines, etc., built and owned by Russia in Persia, were transferred to the Persian Nation, and (6) Capitulations ceased to exist. Could Czarist impositions have been reversed any more radically than by this note? If the Bolsheviks had done nothing else to win the gratitude of the Iranians specially and Muslims generally, this note alone would have been quite sufficient for that purpose. But look at the irony of the situation. Poor Iran had been tied up hand and foot at that very moment by the Imperialism of Britain: she was helpless. She was not even in a position to take advantage of this grand magnanimity on the part of the Bolsheviks. Poor Iran had no voice in her own foreign affairs. In June, 1919, Iran was completely occupied by England. How painful this helplessness must have been to all patriotic Persians! How happy Curzon, Milner and even Montagu, who had been won over by the two Imperialists, must have felt at the success of their scheme which had brought Iran so completely under their clutches that it could not even be rescued by another Power! On 10th July, 1922, Arthur Moore wrote in the London *Times*:—"After Armistice we poured troops into the Caucasus which is largely Mussalman. Far across the Caspian we had troops even in famous Merv. At first these had a stabilising influence and we announced that we had come to keep the Bolshevists away. But as soon as the Bolshevist menace began to materialize, it was we who faded away. Why, then, did

we go there at all ? Islam knows the answer." Yes, Islam knows the answer. If that Imperialist scheme had not been frustrated —frustrated by the Bolsheviks—Islam to-day would have been a slave. The Imperialists went to those Muslim regions to enslave Islam. Iran had been occupied. Turkey too was under the heels of the Imperialists at the moment. If Caucasia, Georgia, Azerbaijan and all the Caspian Sea zone had also remained under the control of the Imperialists, the enslavement of Islam would have been complete. Who saved the situation ? The Bolsheviks, and again the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks defeated the instrument of Imperialists in that quarter—Denikin. The Red Army pushed down into the Caucasus. It entered Baku on 29th April, 1920. Denikin's flotilla fled to the Iranian port of Enzeli. Raskolnikov closely pursued it. After the due warning the military positions of the British and Denikin squadron were shelled and victory obtained. This victory gladdened the heart of nobody more than that of the Iranian Government. The sounds of the guns in Ghilan pleased nobody more than the Shah. On 26th May, 1921, Theodore A. Rothstein, who was the Soviet Ambassador in Teheran, was told that it was the Bolshevik victory which emboldened the Iranian Medjlis to refuse the ratification of that treaty of enslavement which was called the Anglo-Persian Treaty. Only when Caucasia was free from the British forces and Raskolnikov drove them away from North Persia did Iran regain its breath of life.

Iran felt helpless no more. An Iranian envoy came to Moscow on 25th October, 1920.

On 21st February next year Raza Shah, who was the Minister for War, formed a new Cabinet which immediately abrogated the Anglo-Persian Agreement of 1919 and on 20th February, 1921, Iran's Moscow representative signed the Soviet-Persian Treaty. This Treaty reproduced almost word for word the note of Kara Khan of 28th June, 1919, which Iran had then had to leave unacknowledged. Now, those terms were hailed with ecstasy by the Iranians. They restored the freedom of Iran after ages. A new Iran arose. Long, long, long may the new Iran live! May she live with her old, old glory! Iran under Islam was, once upon a time, the most cultured and civilized country in the world. The Nation which could produce a Hafiz could not be surpassed in culture. Even in those days when Iran had fallen from her glory it was difficult to find (and this the Author says from personal experience of the Persian representatives at St. James's Court who were one and all the Author's personal intimate friends) more polished and more cultured gentlemen than the Iranian representatives at the European Courts. Their sweet language spoken with a melody of its

own and their charming manners produced an unforgettable impression upon every mind. In India the Moghul civilization was of a very high standard indeed. But in speech, in literature, even in dress and in food, it was beholden to Iranian culture and civilization.

It was that unique poet-teacher of Iran, Saadi, who formed the characters of Indian youths. It was the unique Epic-poet Firdausi who energised Indian manhood and it was that most unique Poet-Laureate of the world who pushed Indian civilization to its highest pitch by such verses as :—

آسائش دوگیتي تفسیر این دو حرفست
بادوستان تلطف بادشمنان مدا را ——

And who taught Indians تاج شاهي طلبي گوهر ذاتي بنما

And who warned them thus :— درره منزل لیلی که خطر هاست بسي
شرط اول قدم آنست که مجنون باشي

And who inspired them with an all-conquering courage, energy and enthusiasm so as to :—

فلک راسقف بشگافیم و طرح دیگر اندازیم

Break open the vault of heaven and to build it up anew.

The new Iran undoubtedly owes much to the Bolsheviks in many respects, but what she owes most is the rejuvenation of the spirit of freedom. That old lethargy, that love of luxury and that indifference to duty are all gone : that corruption is gone. Those "mirzas," "mujtahids," and "aghas," who had lowered their moral standard and had degraded the ethics of their religion by having made it synonymous with the filthy swearing at the most exalted personages in history, with hypocrisy, falsehood and even temporary marriages, have all lost or are losing their demoralising avocations. They disgraced themselves, disgraced Iran and disgraced Islam. Those street women who pestered every visitor with the question *agha mutaa mikuni* have been removed even though approved by the religious heads ! And His Imperial Majesty Raza Shah is blamed for having removed such evils !

Far be it from us to say that Mullas or Mujtahids have done no service to Islam. Some of them had indeed reached the height of the Prophets of *bani Israil*. We do not even say that Mullas and Mujtahids are not needed in our times or their need will end in the future. The Holy Quran itself is a mine of knowledge and there is need, and there will remain need, of researches in it as well as in the Traditions of the Prophet or in other Islamic literature; for all time. There will be need of such men as would devote themselves heart and soul to those researches. There will be the need of men to demonstrate by personal example the

excellence of the teachings of Islam and this mostly learned in the theology of Islam should do. Yes, in truth we need Ulema. The more learned they are the better shall they be for Islam and the world as Islam has not only a marvellous literature but it has also its own sciences to enrich the world which need thorough sifting researches. But the greatest curse of the half-educated Shia Mujtahids or Sunni Mullas or "Hodgas" as they were called in Turkey, who abounded in all Muslim lands, was that they had developed too narrow a mind and too limited a vision for Islam. They wanted to convert Islam to Buddhism expecting every Muslim to spend all his time in meditation, or self-annihilation: or to Brahmanism to follow innumerable rituals all through the good, or rather bad, offices of Brahmans themselves and to consider himself as polluted if any non-Brahman "untouchable" touches his little finger although the Brahman himself would hold even the dung and the urine of a cow as sacred, even purifying (!): or to Judaism which is too rigid, too exclusive, too self-centred to allow a social life of universal brotherhood among mankind; or to Christianity to be priest-ridden and absolutely irresponsible for all his actions simply because another man was crucified to atone all sins of those who believe in him, the rest to be condemned to eternal damnation. *But Islam is Islam; no other religion is like it.* It is a religion no doubt—but a perfected (*akmal*) Faith (*Din*). The belief of Allah is indeed its basis (*tuminun billah*) but that Allah Himself has brought out for all mankind (*ukhrijat linnas*) the best nation (*khairun ummatan*) to acquire such a commanding position by studying the laws of Nature and by making subservient to itself all that is in heaven and earth, even if it be by making aeroplanes or submarines, so as to be able to order (*tumarun*) all that is good, and forbid (*tanhun*) all that should be rejected, to all nations—all men.

But how can those mullas and mujtahids, who are helpless on this earth, be expected to bring the sun and moon under their subservience? How can they be expected to be in a position to dictate to the whole Muslim Nation to be a benefactor of the *Federation of the World.* To these mullas and mujtahids the best gift of God—science, is a sin. To these mullas and mujtahids the earth is stationary. Although it was a Muslim who invented the clock, they do not believe in measuring time. They stick themselves to old ideas and do not like progress of others. They do not appreciate the continuous changes in the social and political outlook of man, although the Prophet they love and his successors whom they admire anticipated changes over thirteen centuries ago and made due provisions for them. Who can blame him if Raza Shah does not help the mujtahids in converting Islam into another religion and if he believes in changes and progress.

It must never be forgotten that while there may be room for different schools of thought in Islam and of different legal interpretations of the Quranic injunctions or of the traditions of the Prophet, there might even be found room for political differences that who should have been the closest successor of the Prophet, although that controversy has become much too out of date, meaningless and ineffective one way or the other after a lapse of not less than thirteen centuries, but there is *no room whatever* of different quarrelling sects in Islam.

For all Muslims without a single exception Allah is the God, Muhammad the Prophet, and Quran the uncorrupted Guide Book.

So now that Raza Shah has taken very bold steps to effect closer solidification by removing the causes that kept two permanent schools of Islam at loggerheads with each other, he has put Iran in a position to take the lead of the Muslim world. In fact he should take the lead, and the first step should be to always send very strong, courageous and Pan-Islamic representatives with the Islamic superiority complex to Geneva and to European Courts to assert Iran's position as the leading Muslim Eastern State, now that Turkey pretends that she is a "lay" State.

The Arab civilization itself is beholden to Iranian genius.

It so happens that Iran has a very good fighting case at the moment in respect of the misuse of the Mandate over Palestine.

Unfortunately Russia, though Bolshevik, though internally stronger and safer and even externally less assailable than what she was at the close of the Great War, is not the Russia of Lenin's days nor is there a Lenin at its head now, yet on such matters as that of Palestine where a small nation is being deliberately strangled to death for the sake of Imperialism and Capitalism, Russia should be expected to back up Iran at all lengths besides the help Iran should get from all Muslim States excepting probably from the "lay" representatives of Mr. Ataturk (who do not represent the people of Turkey as they are Muslims and not "lay.") Even in the case of Turkey, if its "lay" representatives have any regard for national freedom and for constitutional system they might be expected to condescend to help another State even though she is an Eastern State proud of her Eastern culture and civilization.

Let every Muslim of the Shia School as also of the Sunni School remember that the example of Hosain—the greatest and the most glorious martyr known to the world—*is not to sit and cry and curse* but to gird up one's loin to fight and defy the tyrant, the despot, and the corrupt even unto death, not only at the sacrifice of one's single life, but also that of all those who are dear

and near, not by passive submissive non-resistance but by active defiance and fighting. Those who weep for Hosain, insult him. They do not glorify his deathless martyrdom. He is *not* dead. He lives. No Mujahid ever dies as the Quran assures us.

Now the old, drowsy, weak, wicked and weeping Iran is dead and a new Iran, active, advancing and so far more Islamic and more imbued with the spirit of Hosain has indeed been born. The present Shah is her father.

As a Minister first and then Prime Minister, Raza Shah's first and most difficult task was to organise a brave and loyal army with a love for its country. The Anglo-Persian Treaty had imposed upon Iran the duty of engaging foreign military instructors. In 1921 Raza Shah dismissed them. Not content with that he disarmed and disbanded the Southern Persian Rifles. By 1923 he, as War Minister, had succeeded in subduing the Khans and Shaikhs of Southern Iran who had grown rich and powerful on the subsidies from the Anglo-Persian Oil Company and by the arms supplied by foreigners. All this Raza Shah was able to do only due to the Bolsheviks and specially to Lenin's great political genius and his towering personal influence. Lenin would not have been Lenin if he had not possessed quite a unique genius of gauging the situation exactly to the point and adapting himself to every emergency. Lenin has been called a demagogue who had spent a great deal of his time "in cheap London lodgings" but our reading of his character is that far from being an unpractical demagogue, he was the most practical man of his time and a remarkable tactician with wonderful determination to carry through his objects in spite of a thousand and one obstacles. Lenin's strength lay in his forceful character not like Hitler's or Mussolini's in their almost brutal driving power. By slow and steady and painful efforts Lenin came on the top. He did not float upwards by immediate luck like Kemal or Hitler. He rose by perseverance. Mussolini is a brainy man but Lenin was brainier. He adopted a policy regardless of the verdict of others and not afraid at all of any possible misunderstanding even on the part of his own friends. He was also ready for compromises on all possible details and did not hesitate to change his mind sometimes twice and even thrice. In the case of Iran itself he changed his mind on a very critical occasion. When the question of Sovietising Iran was raised Lenin wavered with other Bolshevik leaders but he did quickly overcome the temptation. If he were only a doctrinaire he would have at once taken the opportunity offered to him twice of pushing Marxism in Iran. When Raskolnikov entrenched himself in the province of Ghilan and a Soviet republic was established by a few hot-heads, who, later on, in company with

prominent Georgians, commenced to march on Teheran, it was Lenin's foresight that stopped it. Then again, when British policy favoured the stay of Red battalions in North Iran, Lenin as well as Checherin and Rothstein were wise enough to rise above the temptation. In May and June of 1921 Sir Percy Lorrain, the British Minister at Teheran, suggested to Mr. Theodore Rothstein that Russia may again divide Iran with England into the "spheres of influence"—the North under Russia and the South under England, but Rothstein ignored the offer. On 6th July, 1921, a British agent in Iran wrote to Sir Percy Cox:—

"I was sent to Persia by the F. O. (Foreign Office) in January when it looked as if the withdrawal of our troops would be followed by a Bolshevik armed incursion and the establishment of a Soviet which would free our hands to take action in the South. The forecast proved incorrect. Instead of advancing the Bolsheviks have retired. They consider it premature to force the situation. Their policy is to hold Persia together and thus to prevent at all costs our starting a Southern Federation." On the same subject Mr. Fischer has rightly said: —"The Ghilan episode proved conclusively that the Bolsheviks did not intend to promote their own brand of revolution in neighbouring countries."

It was this tact and foresight on the part of Lenin and his colleagues which made Russia popular to the extent that her representative in Teheran, Theodore Rothstein, became a *persona grata* with the Shah and his ministers and on 21st August, 1923, the London *Times* had to lament in an article under the heading "Lost Influence in Persia" that "it is an unfortunate but undeniable fact that the British are unpopular in Persia at present." It was undoubtedly because of the remarkable self-restraint on the part of the Bolshevik leaders that the British had also to leave, against all their past traditions, every inch of Iran soil. But even when, due to the victories of the Bolsheviks and the political self-restraint and foresight of Lenin, British military hold was loosened, their economic and political grip remained through the Anglo-Persian Oil Company. H. I. M. Raza Shah took the matter into his own hands. In 1921 an arrangement was made by which the Company paid £1,000,000, to square up the arrears. In 1928 a further discussion took place. In 1929 Sir John Cadman, the Chairman of the Company, and other Directors themselves visited Teheran. The Company, with the British Government at its back, continued to ride the high horse. His Majesty Raza Shah on his side was determined to assert the sovereign rights of Iran. Negotiations were opened again in 1931 and a formal draft royalty agreement was framed and sent on 29th May, 1932, to Teheran for ratification. The Iran Government refused to

accept it. On 27th November, 1932, the Government of Iran rescinded the concession itself and issued the following *communiques*:—

"The Anglo-Persian Oil Company has been repeatedly informed by the Persian Government that the D'Arcy concession of 1901 does not protect the interests of the Persian Government and that it is necessary to place the relations between the Imperial Persian Government and the Company on the new basis which will provide for the real interests of Iran. The defects and shortcomings of the D'Arcy concession and its disagreement with Persian interests have been repeatedly pointed out and of course the Persian Government cannot legally and logically consider itself bound to the provisions of a concession which was granted prior to the establishment of a constitutional régime in view of the manner in which such concession was obtained and granted at the time. However, the Persian Government, in the hope that the Company would take into consideration the needs of the present position of Persia and secure her interests in accordance with those needs, has so far refrained from exercising its rights to cancel the D'Arcy concession. Unfortunately, in the face of the patience displayed by the Persian Government the Company took no practical steps to protect the interests of Persia and Persian interests were endangered.

"Therefore the Persian Government has lost all hope of achieving the object by means of negotiations with the Company, hence the only way to safeguard its rights is by cancellation of the D'Arcy concession. The Ministry, in accordance with the decision of the Persian Government, notifies that from this date it has cancelled the D'Arcy concession and will consider it void. At the same time, as the Persian Govenment has no other intention except the safeguarding of the Persian interests, should the Anglo-Persian Oil Company be prepared, contrary to the past, to safeguard Persian interests, in accordance with the view of the Persian Government, it will not, on principle, refuse to grant a new concession to the Company."

This was a bombshell for the Company and also for the British Government. But they did not yield. They bluffed and bullied. The Persian note was couched in a courteous (and who can excel Iranians in courtesy, whose language is probably the richest in words of politeness and who are masters of sweet words) but firm language. In the matter of diplomacy also not even a British statesman would have done better. However, the reply sent by the Resident Director of the Company was unyielding. The note was sent by telegram to London and the Resident Director was in

a position to reply on the very next day—28th November, 1932, thus:—

"I am instructed respectfully to inform your Excellency that the Company does not admit that the terms of the D'Arcy concession do not protect the interests of the Persian Government, nor do they admit that even if that were the case the Government has the right to cancel the concession. I may remind your Excellency that the validity of the D'Arcy concession has been recognised by the successive Persian Governments before and after the establishment of the constitutional régime not only by acceptance for many years of the royalty permitted for therein but also in many other ways. You will understand that the Company cannot recognise the right claimed by the Persian Government to cancel the agreement. Such contentions have no foundation either in law or equity. I am instructed to remind your Excellency that, relying upon the good faith of the Persian Government and the rights conferred upon the Company by the concession, the Company has expended in Persia many millions of pounds sterling. The profits received by the Persian Government from this expenditure cannot be ignored in considering whether the terms of the concession are fair to the Government nor can they be ignored in any discussions between the Government and the Company which are to be based on equity and justice.

The Company takes the strongest exception to the statements in your Excellency's letter that the Company has failed to take into consideration the needs of the time and the present position of the Persian Government. The Company has at all times shown itself willing by friendly negotiation to endeavour to meet the views and the needs of the Persian Government, and so far as accord has not been reached, the failure has certainly not been due to any want of effort or goodwill on the part of the Company. The Company must point out that the publication of the Government's announcement in the Press will have most damaging repercussion on the Company's business and the Director ventures to hope that, on further consideration, the Government will immediately withdraw the announcement."

This reply did not satisfy the Iran Government, nor was the Company willing to give up colossal incomes. The yield in the year previous to this stage of controversy (*i.e.*, in 1932 alone), was 5,750,000 tons, *i.e.*, five times the yield of 1918. The Masjid fields, which are of fifty-six square miles, gave 5,250,000 of the total, so rich are they. The British Government took the matter to The Hague Court for Arbitration. This in itself showed that Iran was not weak otherwise an ultimatum would have at once been sent to her followed by Dreadnoughts instead of the

appeal to the arbitration at The Hague. The Government at Iran even then remained firm. It could have never been so firm if its neighbours were not the Bolsheviks who had cancelled all those concessions and privileges which the Imperialist Czar's Government had obtained in the North as Imperialist Britain had obtained in the South. The British must have felt the strength of Iran which no doubt had at its back the support of the Bolsheviks. It is a characteristic of the British that they, like Lenin, do not persist in their mistakes. Who can deny that they are the best diplomats in the world? They might be beaten easily on the battle-field but it is almost impossible to beat them at a Conference table. They appraise, like a good chess-player, every move of their opponent correctly and correspond their own move according to it. When they find out their own weakness or the strength of the opponent which they feel that they cannot counter by force, they yield at once. This is the case in their internal politics as well as abroad. So when they found the Government at Teheran to be strong and unyielding they themselves suddenly gave in. A new agreement with the Anglo-Persian Company was drawn up and ratified. The Iran Government got all she wanted from the Company. She got more. She got her complete economic, as she had got already her territorial, freedom.

When Czardom was drunk with its overwhelming military, despotic power; when even the "British Lion" was seen to wig-waggle his tail before Russia; when Russian Cossacks invaded North Iran; when the sacred Shrine of Meshed was bombarded (by the way, it was repaired afterwards at the expense of an Indian philanthropist) somebody in India took an omen, as is often done, from the Divan of the saintly Hafiz.

The responsive verse was

دیدی که خون ناحق پروانه شمع را - چندان امان نه داد که شب را سحر کند

Didi ki khune nahaqe perwana shama ra
Chandan aman na dad ki shub ra saher kunad.

It was not long after that the whole family of the Czar was ruthlessly murdered. It was not long after that the destructive flame of Imperialism in Russia which had nearly burnt Iran to ashes was permanently extinguished. It now lies with the Shah to see to it that the new rise of Iran is on *right lines*—strong, smooth and steady—based upon the good-will of all the peoples and contributing to the progress, prosperity and happiness of all the citizens of Iran, *i.e.*, the rise must be on true Pan-Islamic lines, neglecting neither the mental and physical nor the moral and spiritual aspects of human life. Even Lenin respected the spirit of Islam. He understood something (alas! only a very little)

of the inherent power of Islam in engendering a fighting spirit—the spirit of *Jihad*, and a Socialistic spirit bridging over the gulf of racial and colour and country differences.

In September, 1920, a "Congress of the peoples of the East" was called at Baku. About two thousand delegates (1,891 to be exact) from thirty-seven nationalities attended. Muslims from different countries, particularly Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan and India and even distant China, predominated. Like Lenin many other Bolshevik leaders were pro-Muslim. When Zinoviev, the President of the Congress, announced:—"The Communist International turns to-day to the peoples of the East and says to them, "Brothers! we summon you to a Holy War first of all against the British Imperialism" a cry of 'Jihad, Jihad' went up to the heavens."

The Writer of these lines was told in Paris in 1934, that Lenin had sanctioned Russian help to Halil Pasha after the Great War and when the Turkish question was very acute and but for the timid appeal by a non-Muslim Indian apprehensive of Muslim supremacy which dissuaded him from that help the situation on the Indian frontier would have taken a sinister turn for "British Imperialism."

Lenin, however, did not desist from seeking the co-operation of Muslims. He sent encouraging and very kindly letters to Muslim kings and rulers. His Majesty Raza Shah himself will probably confirm the view that Lenin was by no means anti-Muslim. We think that if Lenin had known true Islam—not that pseudo-Islam which was preached by the Muslim "Mullas" and "Hodgas" of the old and obsolete school, then he would have probably taken much more interest in Islam and the course of events in the world history which brought Bolshevism into prominence would have taken a more fateful and world-wide turn. The world would have been shaken to its foundation once more.

We would on this occasion take the liberty to suggest to H.I.M. the Shah of Iran that European progress and domination over the East has not been acquired by the way that Europeans dressed or danced, but by the progress in science and mechanism and by the spirit of self-sacrifice for the cause of Country and Nation and the discharge by each individual of his or her duty. Hereditary despotic monarchism can never guarantee the progress of a people to be National and continuous. Who knows that Raza Shah's son, or son's son or son's son's son will be like the present Shah and will be able to continue the work so masterfully taken up by H.I.M. Raza Shah. The Ottoman dynasty produced for ten generations successively great Sultans, but it did degenerate afterwards. The great Raza Shah should do all he humanly

can to perpetuate his noble work for Iran, for the Iranians and for the Muslim Nation. Even Bolsheviks cannot be expected to be always at the beck and call of Iran. Much more reliance can be put upon a friendly combination of the Muslim neighbours. An understanding must be arrived at with those without any delay. The present is just the time. But Iran must not forget, as no other country must forget that self-help is the best help—*aides toi et le ciel taidera* as the French say. God Himself helps those who help themselves.

Innallah la yughiyyaru ma bi quamin
hatta yughiyyuru ma bi anfusahim.

Surely, Allah does not change the condition of a nation until its individuals change it themselves. (XIII. II.)

Iran has produced world-renowned geniuses before in all walks of life—military as well as civil, and there is no earthly reason why it should not do the same again if those factors which have contributed to its degeneration are removed and if the old genius of its people is restored.

Of all the nations the Iranian Nation should be the last to be ashamed of its past or of that Eastern culture and civilization of which, together with her sister Arab Nation, she has been the founder. The culture of the Afghan Nation is a child of the Iranian culture, so the cultural affinity, besides the religious solidarity which exists, and has existed for centuries, should be strengthened and all the three Nations should advance hand in hand as the *integral part* of the Glorious Muslim world-wide Brotherhood. While developing to the fullest extent their own resources, talents and capacities, no Muslim Nation should give up that international spirit which Pan-Islamism creates. Pan-Islamism and Pan-Islamism alone can guarantee their security collectively. The League of their enemies and exploiters very often join hands to suck their life-blood. If they remain isolated not one of them *can be secure—Surely Not One.* "Collective security" is needed by no Nation more than the *Muslim Nation.*

(2) Afghanistan.

Like Iran, in fact to a greater extent than Iran, Afghanistan was used by the two Powerful Imperialist Nations, ambitious, inimical and jealous to each other—as a buffer State. Both had a design on Afghanistan. At one time there was actually a tug-of-war to pull Afghanistan on either side—the side of Russia or Britain. Britain won and Abdul Rahman Khan came on the throne. For eight days or so Prince Musa Khan was on the throne of Kabul but Lord Roberts arrived and he was dethroned. Up to the

present day he lives in India with his Princess—a most remarkable lady, every inch a princess, and his most polished and cultured daughters and son. His brothers and father were exiled to India and were not allowed to go back to Kabul. But since Nadir Shah came on the throne, ex-King Musa Khan has not only been allowed to visit Kabul but also to contract marriages of his daughters and son to his relatives in Kabul, though they themselves prefer to live in India,—in Delhi and Naini Tal mostly, and are respected by all. The British do not now consider them to be dangerous and probably are not afraid that Russia will even now use them as pawns to further her interests. Although Abdul Rahman Khan came to the throne by the help of the British and used to get a subsidy from them when on the throne, he was not very submissive and with a proud touch he called this subsidy *Khiraj*, tribute. He also began to call his country, though he was not recognised as a King, "the God-given Kingdom." *Daulate Khuda dad.* He proved himself a very clever and strong ruler and grasped well the selfish policy of both Russia and Britain. When he was on the throne the Author suggested an alliance between the three Muslim States—Turkey, Persia and Afghanistan, but alas the advice fell on deaf ears excepting on those of the Amir. The Author's own countrymen then called Pan-Islamism "Kidwai's Mania," although some of them became staunch Pan-Islamists after the War when it became a little too late. Then Turkey extended on three continents and had on its throne an astute ruler who knew how to play one European Power against the other. But even he had other pre-occupations. Nor did he give his Government that Islamic tone which alone could have given encouragement to Pan-Islamism as a practical proposition.

On the death of Abdul Rahman Khan his son Habibullah Khan came on the throne of Kabul. He was a weak man. He had no statesmanship in him. He visited India but did not make a very favourable impression. It was unfortunate for Afghanistan that Abdul Rahman Khan was dead when the European War came on. If Abdul Rahman Khan had been on the throne when India's practised soldiers had gone to European fronts and raw recruits were sent hurriedly from England—just clerks from their desks and shop-keepers from their business—Britain would have had to pay a heavy price for the neutrality of Afghanistan. Habibullah Khan contented himself with only an increased annual subsidy. Abdul Rahman Khan would have most probably got a sea-port to make Afghanistan self-sufficient. We do not know what authority Mr. Fischer has for saying that Habibullah Khan had sentenced his third son Amanullah Khan to death because he was anti-British and had favoured the German military

mission that came to Kabul in 1916. It is true that young Afghans disliked Amir Habibullah. So did Indian young men. He was killed in his camp while on tour. Nobody knows who killed him. Amanullah Khan, the third son, came on the throne. He is a man of simple ways and democratic habits. He was imbued with the lofty notion of uplifting his people. He desired to give Afghanistan a place in history. He had in him a National spirit. As usual Europeans called it the Pan-Islamic spirit. *But it was not Pan-Islamic.* It is a pity that it was not Pan-Islamic. Europe understands what Pan-Islamism can do She has seen what Pan-Islamism did do. Because she is all awake she realizes the possibilities of Pan-Islamism much better than the degenerated East does. Muslims do not themselves realize the value of Pan-Islamism. The Muslim East is fast asleep, she is not fully conscious. She does not realize all the possibilities of Islam with its Pan-Islamism. But Europe dreads lest any leading Muslim may succeed in infusing in the people even of one country the true spirit of Pan-Islamism. If that is done at any one place it may be catching. In her fear Europe attributed Pan-Islamism to Sultan Abdul Hamid Khan. She mistook Anwar Pasha's Pan-Turanianism for Pan-Islamism. This was excusable as is Kemal's Nationalism up to a certain point. Turanians being mostly Muslim, Pan-Turanianism may have converted itself into Pan-Islamism. Europe also took Amir Amanullah's Nationalism for Pan-Islamism. Amanullah Khan's father-in-law, Mahmud Tarzi, had created in him the spirit of Nationalism. His wife Queen Suraiya, Tarzi's daughter, was a first-class "modernist," She loved all the frivolities of an European "flapper." King Amanullah was probably a sincere believer in Socialism. He was very simple in his life and desired to elevate the Afghan Nation. He became popular with the Nationalists. But because he, and his Queen more than he himself, over-Europeanised themselves and were in a hurry to do the same with their people all at once, punishing and humiliating those who disapproved the sudden and sharp change, or who were not charmed by everything European, they both became unpopular with masses in Afghanistan. There was a sort of a young Afghan "party" which however welcomed King Amanullah. The Nationalists of India also were glad when he came on the throne. We understand that there is a party still both in Afghanistan and India that likes Amanullah Khan. Who can deny that the ex-King has a sociable, unpretentious character. His desire of uplifting his Nation was considered to be very laudable and was appealing to all freedom-loving people.

In those days India also was seething with discontent. For the first time in India the agitation was percolating to the masses and repression was being resented by the people. King Amanullah

Khan began extremely well for Afghanistan. His first step was to get the *complete independence* of Afghanistan recognised by the world including Great Britain of course. On 21st April, 1919, he sent a letter to Moscow to the President of "the Great Russian Republic," to which Lenin replied on 27th May, 1919, congratulating "the Independent Afghan people heroically defending itself against the foreign oppressors." Lenin also suggested the establishment of diplomatic relations between Russia and Afghanistan to open "wide possibilities for mutual aid against any attack by foreign bandits on the freedom of others." But when the same month the third Anglo-Afghan war began, such are the promises of all these Godless Powers, *Afghanistan had to fight alone.* England, however, was weak in those days. The Great War had exhausted her. Ireland, Egypt, and India were in a state of fermentation. The British army and the people were tired of War. The rise of Bolshevism had also disturbed the equanimity of their mind. They thought that India should defend, if needed, her soil herself. They did not choose, at that time, to give their own lives to deprive others of their liberty. (Now they are doing it in Palestine and that for the sake of whom they call the "dirty" Jews.) The Author heard later from reliable sources that if England were not exhausted and the British army in India not disinclined to enter into a new war the condition of the Afghan army was such that it would have not been possible for it to get a decisive victory—although the army had the valiant Great Nadir Khan at its head. But even he lacked modern expert knowledge and the army was ill equipped for modern warfare. Fate, however, favoured the young King and his General. It was related to the Author that at one time the General had himself to fire a gun with the help of an Indian mathematician and as luck would have it, the ball fell on the magazine of the enemy's forces causing not only great destruction but also demoralisation.

On 8th April, 1919, a preliminary Peace Treaty was signed which accepted complete freedom of Afghanistan. This was what Amanullah Khan wanted. It was really a Victorious Peace. He was recognised by the British as an Independent King and was addressed as His Majesty. Lenin lost no time in establishing diplomatic relations between Russia and Afghanistan. Mr. Fischer says that "*Lenin wished to encourage Pan-Islamic tendencies of Amanullah Khan.*" On 27th November, 1919, he wrote a letter to Amanullah Khan addressed "His Majesty the Amir of Afghanistan." In his letter drafted by Kara Khan, so Mr. Fischer informs us, he said, "At present flourishing Afghanistan is the only independent Muslim State in the world and *Fate sends the Afghan people the great historic task of uniting about itself all enslaved*

Mohammedan people and leading them on the road to freedom and independence." This was a great object put before the young King by the Bolshevist leaders. In this lay the real Pan-Islamic spirit. To unite and expand Islamdom for *freedom* and *progress*, mental, moral, and even territorial, if necessary, *is Pan-Islamism.* It shows how correctly Lenin and his colleagues understood the situation. It also shows how free from demagoguish adhesion to only one idea those leaders were. It mattered not to them that they were addressing the letter to a Muslim Potentate. It also shows that they knew at least some of the inherent powers of Islam and advised the young Muslim ruler to try his best to unite all the Muslim people "about himself," and "to lead them on the road of freedom and independence" which Islam has always inculcated. In his heart and mind a Muslim can never, never, never be a slave. Not the Afghan King alone but *all* the Muslim Rulers should have got that message from Lenin inscribed in letters of gold for their guidance.

That message was a positive proof of the mighty genius of Lenin. How we wish that King Amanullah Khan had been able to act upon that Bolshevik advice ! It was a noble advice. If acted upon, it would have had an effect not only upon Afghanistan but the whole of the East and probably also the West. But instead of acting upon that advice, alas ! the inexperienced King, being overenthusiastic for Nationalism as many unthinking young men usually are, made himself unpopular with his own masses and with Muslim peoples of other countries also by his forcing upon the Afghans, European *fashions, dresses and dances, etc.*—only superficialities of the European civilisation. The neighbouring masses of India also got suspicious of him and lost confidence in his shrewdness and statesmanship. Instead of *uniting the Muslim peoples* and inspiring them with their old "fanaticism" for "freedom and independence," he foolishly took steps to kill that enthusiasm and to create parties and differences among his people by his impetuous actions. It is true that most of the Mullas of Kabul, as of other places, were undoubtedly unworthy of the influence they wielded over the masses. But for a statesman it was not wise under the current circumstances to ignore the facts as they stood and to disregard that influence which the Mullas possessed on the ignorant masses and to ill-treat the Mullas themselves in a way as to give the impression upon the mind of the masses that the Muslim King had become irreligious. Great tact indeed was required to diminish the influence of the Mullas on the Afghan masses, but the young King showed that he lacked tact, statesmanship, and foresight. Even the irreligious Lenin was wise enough to have tried to "encourage Pan-Islamic tendencies" in Muslims. If Amanullah had acted on that

occasion as a Pan-Islamist and responded to the call of "Fate," which, as Lenin had warned him, *had sent the Afghan people the great historic task of uniting all Muslims*, then the course of the Afghan history would have undoubtedly been so glorious as to reflect a brilliance all over Asia and would have also ensured the Afghan throne to Amanullah Khan. Alas ! by his inexperience King Amanullah Khan not only lost the throne for himself but also a great opportunity to help the East—at least the neighbouring East. Other portions of the same letter from Lenin confirm the fact that Bolshevik Russia was fully prepared at that time to give the Afghan King every help. The letter said, "In a conference with her extraordinary Ambassador—the worthy Mohammad Wali Khan (the Writer of these pages had long conversations with him in Paris when he was on his diplomatic mission) I learned that you are prepared to enter into negotiations in Kabul on the question of a Treaty of Friendship and also that the Afghan people wishes to receive military aid against England from the Russian people. The Workers' and Peasants' Government is inclined to grant such assistance on the wider scale to the Afghan Nation, and what is more, to repair injustice done by the former Government of the Russian Czars." The Bolsheviks even expressed their readiness to readjust Soviet-Afghan frontiers in a way as "to add to the territory of Afghanistan at the expense of Russia." The letter also said, "The Workers' and Peasants' Government of Russia instructs its Embassy in Afghanistan to engage in discussion with the Government of the Afghan people with a view to the conclusion of trade and other friendly agreements, the purpose of which is not only the buttressing of good neighbourly relations in the best interests of both Nations, but, together with Afghanistan, the joint struggle against the most rapacious Imperialistic Government—Great Britain—the intrigues of which, as you correctly point out in your letter, have hitherto disturbed the peaceful and unhindered development of the Afghan people and separated it from its closest neighbours."

Because the Afghan King had rejected the subsidy, which Afghanistan had been receiving from England as a mark of subservience of Afghanistan, since the time of Abdul Rahman Khan and which was increased during the time of Amanullah Khan's father as a price for neutrality in the Great War, the Bolsheviks even went to the extent of substituting a financial help (though not as large as that which Afghanistan got from England) from Russia in place of British subsidy. Shakespeare has said that there is a tide in the affairs of men. The tide in the affairs of Afghanistan came. Alas ! it was missed. A glorious opportunity for Amanullah Khan, for Afghanistan and for the East, was lost. If intead of devoting all his attention to the head

garment and the toilet of his people (Amanullah Khan insisted upon the Afghan people wearing hats and shaving off their beards) the needs of the Afghan army had been taken care of, an Afghan free-booter, an unknown water-carrier, would not have been able, in spite of the aid and the intrigues of the enemies, to possess himself of the throne of Afghanistan after having caused the Afghan King to fly away from his country in a disgraceful manner to save his skin. Far too much importance was laid upon the unnecessaries while the necessities were neglected.

Another great blunder which Amanullah Khan made was to leave his country for a trip to Europe.

Although he knew that he had hurt the most sensitive feelings of his own masses, and although he himself had complained to Lenin "the intrigues which have hitherto disturbed the peaceful and unhindered development of the Afghan people and separated it from its closest neighbours," Amanullah Khan left Afghanistan. It has been said that the gods first make mad the people whom they want to destroy. It was something like this which made the young King leave his kingdom at the most critical moment when everything was in a state of flux in Afghanistan. A man of the unprecedented personal prestige of Mustafa Kemal Pasha has not been able, after a lapse of fifteen years since the Great War, to satisfy his desire of visiting European countries, but in 1928 Amanullah Khan left Afghanistan for Europe giving a free hand to the intriguers in his absence. The Author himself warned His Majesty on 14th November, 1927, in a very frank leading article in a paper published in those days under his supervision that it was *not* wise for him to think of leaving Afghanistan at that time.

Yet another mistake was made when the inexperienced and impetuous King adopted a provoking anti-British policy on his arrival in Bombay *en route* to Europe. The Author was present in Bombay in those days at the invitation of H. H. the Agha Khan to discuss some public matters concerning India. He said his prayers standing just behind the Afghan King when His Majesty led the prayers. It was a sight worth seeing. It presented the most unique feature of the Islamic religion and a particular phase of the greatest of the World's Brotherhood. Amanullah Khan was a stranger. He was far from being on very good terms with the British who were temporal rulers of India. But every Muslim, young or old, was filled with feelings of brotherly affection for the "stranger" and did not give even a thought to the fact how the British would take this brotherly homage to a resurgent monarch of a neighbouring country. Enthusiasm is contagious. Not the Muslims alone but the whole of Bombay gave a hearty welcome to the stranger King. When Juma (Friday)

came, Muslims invited the "Muslim Padshah" to lead the Juma Prayers and he led it. It was an enlightened and inspiring Khutba (sermon) that he delivered. So popular and really Islamic that Khutba was that the Writer noticed that every one of the thousands who were present really felt an affection for the man whom they saw for the first time in their lives. They felt as if he was one of their own. He inspired love in the minds of all. Later on, the King was entertained by an Islamic Association at a party where high British officials were present. In reply to the welcome address presented by the Association the King said words to the effect that he had gratefully appreciated the enthusiasm and the hearty welcome which the people of Bombay had extended to him and he would stimulate that enthusiasm. After saying this he vociferously cried, "Allah-o-Akbar" three times before he delivered the reply to the address. The cry was echoed and re-echoed not only by the dead walls of the reception hall but by the tongues of thousands of enthusiasts. The knowledge which Amanullah Khan showed of the characteristics of Islam was a little re-assuring. It was felt that after all he might be able to resist the irreligious atmosphere of the places he was going to visit. But the wretched Mullas seemed to have got on the brains of the young King at whom he threw jibes on all occasions and used strong words which were among those which were broadcasted in Afghanistan to prejudice the people against the Sovereign in his absence from his country. An almost nude photo of Queen Suraiya, taken in Europe, was also issued secretly to all the influential men and women in Afghanistan when the King and Queen were enjoying merrily their holiday in Europe. King Amanullah, while in Bombay, paid compliments to the Hindu leaders also calling one of them his 'best friend," although he knew that the British hated him most at that moment. This also provoked the British who made up their minds quite naturally to adopt all such measures as they could to make Amanullah Khan as little harmful to them as possible on his return from his tour, which was going to include the two enemy places for Britain—Bolshevik Russia and Kemalist Turkey. We have reason to believe that the British, in those days, were contemplating two alternative Imperial Policies. One was to make friends with the Muslim States of Afghanistan, Iran and Turkey and to put a check upon "the Bolshevik menace." The other was to come to terms with Bolshevik Russia on somewhat old lines when Russia was under the Czars to suppress the Muslim States. Amanullah Khan's attitude in Bombay inclined them to the second policy but the Bolsheviks did not respond to it. Every European country, which an Afghan King visited for the very first time in history, welcomed him most heartily. England also, to all

appearances, offered a great welcome. The British are always hospitable.

The Author was told, when he visited England later, that there were indications that Amanullah Khan was inclined during his visit to England to make some compensation for the anti-British attitude which he had adopted earlier in Bombay. But when he arrived in Russia he became too friendly with the Bolsheviks to leave any trace of conciliatory feelings with the British. In Russia, the Afghan King became very friendly with Kara Khan. He spent most of his time in factories and workshops without any ceremonies or formalities, often driving his own car.

We will let Mr. Fischer describe the visit of the Afghan King to London and Moscow. He writes:— Whatever else it accomplished, Amanullah's trip did not improve his standing with the British . . . . . Neither his interview with the British Foreign Secretary, nor his stay in London produced any favourable practical result or made any friendly impression and although the Emir undoubtedly carried away a feeling of Britain's wealth and military power, he could not envisage them as leading to security or longevity of his own régime. He had irritated the English. Leaving Kabul, he entered India amid popular jubilation. India received him as one of her own . . . . . British dailies warned Amanullah when he was in London that he had best hasten home, as insurrections had broken out in his provinces. The report was premature. Other publications informed the King that the trip from Kabul to England had been very strenuous for his wife, he should not, therefore, take the long route over Russia, but he decided he would. To omit the Soviet Union was obviously impossible. Amanullah Khan had got nothing in Britain, nor had the English anything from him. "In Moscow, the simplicity of President Kalinin, the expansiveness of War Commissar Voroshilov, the directness and learning of Foreign Commissar Chechcrin, the engaging frankness of. Kara Khan," who accompanied him throughout, impressed him. "He saw an East that was yet of the West— his ideal for Afghanistan." Industrialisation, science, art, sports, military powers, the Lenin Institute—all were displayed to him.. In Italy he was presented with military aeroplanes: elsewhere with tanks. "But Kalinin made him a gift of two agricultural tractors of Soviet manufacture."

The fact is that Amanullah Khan's visit to Russia, although disliked by the British, did not do him any harm with his own people. The most unfortunate incident was the visit of the Afghan King to the Dictator of Turkey. It has been alleged that Mustafa Kemal impressed upon the young King the desirability of doing exactly all that

he himself had done in Turkey as regards the religious persecution and secularisation of the State. The Bolshevik Leaders were more clever and far-seeing. They were better statesmen. They were clever tacticians. They were sagacious. They understood better the circumstances that prevailed in Afghanistan than Kemal Pasha did. Lenin and his friends were wise men. They advised steady, cautious steps towards social and political reforms in Afghanistan so as to avoid their becoming too unpopular. But Kemal Pasha advised otherwise and Amanullah Khan unwisely accepted the advice of a brave, unthinking soldier, in preference to the saner advice of the Bolshevik politicians and revolutionaries. Amanullah Khan failed to realize the difference between the two personalities—that of Kemal and himself. The personal prestige of Mustafa Kemal was such that his people submitted to his autocracy like children. The Turks have many good qualities but they are not a thinking people. They are also a disciplined soldierly folk. They submit to the word of command of the superior without argument. A Turkish friend of the Author said that they have meekly submitted to the austere dictatorship of Mustafa Kemal because they have "no civil courage." But the chief secret of Kemal Pasha's extraordinary power remains in his personal prestige. The poor Turks had been deprived of a peaceful life for generations. Lately they had been subjected to autocratic misrule on the one hand, and severe military trials on the other. When the Writer of these lines visited Turkey in 1906 he mixed there with all classes of people and on his return he wrote a little pamphlet called *Pan-Islamism*. Therein he foretold that in a few years time there would be a change in the form of Government and H. I. M. the Sultan Abdul Hamid would become a "*Constitutional Monarch*." The secret of this prophecy which proved correct to the very letter only three years after, was that the Writer could see that the prevailing situation was impossible to last. His friends there had told him that the condition of the Muslims was much worse than that of Non-Muslims as the latter had all the European Powers to take care of them and to have even the least wrong done to them redressed immediately under the pressure of foreign gunboats.

There was nobody to put in a good word for the Muslims.

All the business in the cities was in Non-Muslim hands. The agriculturists were mostly Muslims but agriculture was in a very primitive condition and there being conscription all the able-bodied men and mostly young bread-winners had to do the fighting in distant Yaman where there was always a rebellion, if not actual wars with foreign

Powers. Since the Balkan States formed a Union of their own and declared war upon Turkey, the Turks had been almost continuously engaged in fighting. Even rich and resourceful Powers found their finances ruined only after four years' war. The Poor Turks had to fight about a score of years and unfortunately they were engaged in losing battles in all recent wars—the Balkan War, the Tripoli War, the Great War and the Greek War until Mustafa Kemal turned by his marvellous military genius the last defeat into a victory. There would hardly be any Turk who would not remember the miseries caused by these Wars and specially the butcheries committed by the Greeks when they landed in Smyrna and devastated all the towns—smashing up villages as far as Sakaria. What the Turkish masses also cannot forget is that Mustafa Kemal not only saved them from the Greeks, he has also given them opportunities to do all the business that is going on in their Country now. Most of the Non-Muslims have left Turkey. Kemal Pasha has been trying to develop land and industry in Turkey. He has given peace to the Country. The Turks, therefore, can excuse him many things half of which they would not excuse others. Nor would any other nation excuse its leader like that. As compared to Mustafa Kemal Pasha what were the services of Amanullah Khan to his people?

How did he dare expect that he would carry the same prestige with the Afghans which Mustafa Kemal carried with the Turks. Mustafa Kemal was himself a brave General who had faced many dangers with his army at the risk of his own life for the sake of his Country. He was a victorious commander and Field-Marshal. He had proved himself to be the Saviour of his Country. He was a forceful speaker and a wonderful organiser. What was Amanullah Khan as compared to him in these respects? When the crisis came the Afghan King bolted for fear of losing his life. On the contrary, at a critical moment Mustafa Kemal deliberately entered into the danger zone to reorganise the shattered army and his disspirited people to save their homes and their liberty. Mustafa Kemal had defied his own Sovereign and had plunged himself into the fire of war to defend the independence of Turkey. He had sacrificed all. He had risked all. Mustafa Kemal's glorious victory at Sakaria will remain memorable in History for ever as one of those victories which have changed the destinies of Nations. It was a remarkable display of military genius and was sufficient to raise the prestige and honour of Mustafa Kemal all over the world. It was unfortunate for

Amanullah Khan himself and for Afghanistan that he took it into his head to follow the footsteps of Mustafa Kemal. It was in fact a great mistake on the part of Mustafa Kemal himself not to handle the Turkish situation in a better way after the victory. Not only the Turks, but every Muslim to whichever country he belonged, felt proud of the victory. To every Muslim, Kemal was a hero. Alas! he could not keep up his world-position for long. It was a mistake on the part of Mustafa Kemal not to introduce all the reforms in Turkey under Islam. It was a mistake to declare Turkey a "lay" republic instead of an Islamic Republic. It was a colossal blunder to antagonise Muslims of the world and his own people. Only lucky circumstances have saved Turkey so far from the dire consequences of those mistakes. How much greater was the mistake which Amanullah Khan committed in alienating the feelings of not only his own people from him but of millions of others. Before Amanullah Khan made himself unpoplar *The Muslim Outlook* of Lahore proudly wrote: "Afghanistan is the most vigorous of the Eastern Islamic Powers and the Muslim peoples of Egypt, of Persia, of Arabia, look to this young and vigorous State for a lead in world-policy." It very significantly added: "The future of the Pan-Islamic movement will depend largely on the policy His Majesty the King of Afghanistan will elect to pursue." Naturally for all Pan-Islamists the policy which King Amanullah Khan adopted later came as a very unpleasant shock.

All the Muslim papers in India and also the Nationalist papers were elated to see Afghanistan rise under Amanullah Khan. The East felt proud of Amanullah Khan. All the Eastern people wished Amanullah Khan well. All welcomed his reforming spirit as long as he did not antagonise Muslim masses. His mistakes were nothing but bad luck. He miscalculated the situation. He misjudged his power. He knew Islam. He believed in Islam. Anybody who knows Islam cannot but love Islam. Amanullah Khan must have loved Islam. But he was misled and he misjudged the situation. He was young. He was inexperienced. He became over-zealous, and impetuous. He could not restrain his anger against the old-fashioned Mullas. Nor did he realize the full weight of the hold they had over the masses.

It is a fact that most of the Mullas do not *really* know Islam. In their ignorance they paint it in colours which do not suit the taste of the people of modern times. In their zeal they block the way of legitimate and necessary reforms. They are too old-fashioned. They do not represent the true spirit of Islam. They lay too much stress, like the Jews, upon the letter of the Law as read by them, upon rituals, upon formalities. They read the

Quran every day but they really do not understand it. They read يريد الله بكم اليسر ولا يريد بكم العسر "Allah desires ease for you and does not desire difficulty" (ii : 185). They do not, however, take into mind all the benevolent implications of the verse. And they read, لا يكلف الله نفسا إلا وسعها "Allah does not impose upon any one a duty but to the extent of his ability" (ii : 286). But they do not feel ashamed themselves in laying upon a human being a duty which is beyond his ability. The Quran says:—

إن تجتنبوا كبائر ما تنهون عنه نكفر عنكم سيئاتكم

If you avoid great things (sins) which you are forbidden we will cleanse your fault, *i.e.*, your evil inclination will naturally be stopped (iv : 31).

The Quran says, every consideration should be given to the natural weakness of man. يريد الله ان يخفف عنكم و خلق الانسان ضعيفا

IV. 28

The Mullas and "Hodjas" must know that no person on earth can withdraw the great Charter of Mercy and Forgiveness contained in the verse:—

قل لعبادي الذين اسرفوا على انفسهم لا تقنطوا من رحمة الله ان الله يغفر الذنوب جميعا انه هو الغفور الرحيم

Say, O my servants who have transgressed against your own souls, despair not of the mercy of God, certainly Allah forgives faults (sins) altogether—Verily He is forgiving, Merciful. (xxxiv : 53.)

This means that man has to be more careful of sins and crimes against Society than of those against "his own soul," or self. God has ordained mercy upon Himself but man or Society has not. One may neglect his prayer but not his duty to his fellow being. These unlearned "learned" do not understand one part of Islam at all—the Constitutional part of Islam upon which Pan-Islamism is based and which assigns to every Muslim social and political obligations and duties on this earth. They look only towards the appearances and mere words and forms but not to good deeds—*amale saleh*—the duties imposed by God Himself on every Muslim to do Social Services to all mankind, particularly to those who stand much in need of help and service. *Haqqul ibad* is as if nothing to our Mullas.

We do not blame Amanullah Khan if he disliked those semi-educated Mullas. But this lack of proper understanding of Islam on the part of the Mullas should not have been an excuse for the lack of statesmanship on the side of Amanullah Khan himself. He should not have irritated his own people.

He should not have given cause of suspicions against himself and any opportunity to his enemies, Mullas, and others, to have their own way and to mislead his people. If his motive was right he should have taken greater care that his actions should not be misunderstood and misinterpreted by his opponents. Even when Amanullah Khan arrived in Herat on 22nd June, 1929, after his European tour he did not realize what mischief had been wrought in his absence, how the intrigues of his enemies had worked up his own people against him. He denounced the Mullas in his very first speech to his people on his return. That confirmed their suspicions that their King had become quite anti-religious. Thus the struggle and the tug-of-war between the old-fashioned and narrow-minded Mullas and the rash and defiant King went on. In Turkey the personality and the military prowess of Kemal overwhelmed the "Hodjas" (Mullas). Nor were in Turkey such vile intrigues against the Ruler in those days of change as were in Afghanistan. Here the Mullas got the upperhand not only because the ignorant people in Afghanistan were more "fanatical" than the Turks. The Author himself had had an experience of the "fanaticism" of the old Turks when he visited Brusa and tried to take a photo of a mosque there. The Mullas got the better of the King in Kabul because Amanullah Khan gave them and the mischief-mongers a free hand and absented himself from the country *at the most critical moment.* Amanullah Khan gave an opportunity to his enemies to incite the people against him and to his enemies whose anger he had provoked against himself to "intrigue." Foreign money and foreign rifles were collected at his back and were used against him on his return. While Kemal continues to rule with a despotic authority, Amanullah fell. And what a cowardly fall it was! Amanullah Khan at the critical moment was found to lack courage. He lacked money. He lacked an efficient army. Above all he lacked friends. Mustafa Kemal also, at one time, lacked all these. The Author himself was appealed to by him through his agent, when he arrived in Rome in early 1921 for some financial aid from India to establish a wireless station in the Country. The Turks then lacked money to this extent. Their army also was disorganised by the victorious Powers. Mustafa Kemal at that time had more enemies than friends specially in the Government at Istanbul. But Mustafa Kemal managed to get money, army and friends. While Amanullah Khan could not. He had given up the substantial British subsidy of his own account. The 500,000 dollars promised by the Bolsheviks he did not get regularly. Sometimes he got some of it in cash (gold), sometimes in kind. The irregular contribution continued upto 1922 when trouble arose between Afghanistan and the Bolsheviks over Anwar Pasha and Bismarchi in

Bokhara. Afghanistan was pro-Anwar Pasha, the Bolsheviks preferred Kemal Pasha. The story of Anwar Pasha is interesting but sad. It will be told later in this Book. It should be enough to say on this occasion that for a little while the relations between Afghanistan and Bolsheviks became rather strained. This was due to Anwar Pasha. But when Anwar Pasha was killed that chapter closed. The Bolsheviks again became friendly towards Afghanistan and began to give the subsidy also to Amanullah Khan. However, that was not much, Reforms on European lines needed a large sum of money. Money spent on useful Reforms was justified even if the expenditure was high but not that spent on the whims of the denationalised and Europeanised King or Queen. At that moment the army needed money badly, and the money that was spent on hats for the King and his Court, his ministers and the civilians and on the Parisian dresses and gowns for his Queen would have been most usefully spent, if it had been spent on buying boots for the army and supplying it with other military equipment. The army was however hopelessly neglected.

As to friends Amanullah found none when he needed them most.

It is said that even those betrayed him upon whom he had placed his best trust when he had left Kabul on his European trip of six months. His Bolshevik friends also did not, or they were so placed *at that moment* that they could not help Amanullah Khan when he was in dire distress. An ugly rumour says that even the "worthy Mohammed Wali Khan" was found wanting. When the "Water Carrier" expelled King Amanullah Khan from Kabul the latter sent his Foreign Minister to Moscow in an aeroplane for help. But help did not come. Mr. Fischer thinks that "a small Red army push would have saved Amanullah." But it was never given. It is said that Raza Shah sent a messenger to tell the Afghan King that Iran was willing to help at a price. But it should be said to the credit of Amanullah Khan that he refused to barter his country for his personal safety and his throne. He fled, nobody knows why, to Italy via India. It was not till November, 1929, that his uncle and victorious General of the third Afghan War crushed the "Water Carrier" and reconquered Kabul with very poor resources in money and men. Nadir Shah managed to conduct the State on steady, progressive, but not un-Islamic lines until a senseless, impetuous student's bullet killed him. His premature death was a very great catastrophe for Afghanistan. Nadir Shah had to borrow money from somewhere. The nation of "shop keepers" is always ready to lend any amount of money on such occasions. Nadir Shah is said to have been favoured with a loan of money *without* interest. Nadir Shah was

a man not to allow the obligation of being lent money without interest to mean slavery. So he kept up his friendly relations with Bolshevik Russia. Nadir Shah appointed his own brother Mohammad Aziz Khan to represent Kabul at Moscow and to cultivate friendly relations with the Soviet Union as the nearest and the most useful neighbour of Afghanistan. The Author has met statesmen in Europe who are inclined to think that Afghanistan has, to all practical purposes, reverted to the pre-Amanullah Khan's position of subservience to England. The Author is not prepared to go to that extent. He has means of knowing the real situation and he has reason to believe that Afghanistan's position is undoubtedly much weaker. The relations of the Author with H.R.H. Shah Wali Mohammad Khan, who was till recently the representative of Kabul at Paris, were more than friendly. They were like those among relatives. The Author knows that Mr. Hashim Khan, the uncle of the present young Afghan King is a strong man. Now Shah Wali Mohammad Khan has also returned to Kabul. With those men at Kabul the Government of the day should not be weak. It should be able to hold its own against anybody. Truth, however, must be told and the truth is that Afghanistan is not as free now as Amanullah Khan had made it. But it was Amanullah himself who had caused the weakness of Afghanistan. It would be necessary for the experienced statesmen at Kabul now to use all their skill and statesmanship to save Afghanistan from losing her independence. The British are masters in diplomacy besides having also a financial bait in their hands. It is far from easy to nonplus them in diplomacy. They twisted even Wilson between their fingers. But Mussolini has lately "trumped them." He is getting a grip on their throat—the very key of their Eastern Empire—their glory—*i.e.*, the Mediterranean. But the British have buttressed themselves well in India. They have built new forts. They have laid out new roads. They have taken over from their vassal-chief a strategic district on the Kashmir frontier. They have almost abolished "no man's land" on the frontier. Besides this, they have no reason to fear Bolshevist Russia more than they did Czarist Russia. Despotism can be a greater military power than Communism. Therefore as far as external trouble to India goes, Britain in India is more assured of her position than she was ever before. Afghanistan must take a note of this. As far as the internal agitation and unrest in India goes, the movement was so grossly mishandled by the leaders that in this respect also the British for the time being are on surer grounds than they were within the last fifteen or twenty years. Our friends, the responsible Afghan Ministers, must take a note of this also. It must also be acknowledged that Afghanistan has not got very

many able, experienced, and tactful diplomats. Therefore the few it has will have to be ultra vigilant. The first thing needed for Afghanistan is a good, well-equipped, well-talented, efficient, and well-mechanised army and air force. Alas ! it can have no Navy at present. Afghanistan also needs industrialization and full development of her resources. New factories must be built, new sources of income, new mines of coal and oil wells must be tapped. Agriculture and the production of fruits and horses and sheep must be improved. As far as these industrial reforms go, the Amanullah, or even the Kemal, zeal or enthusiasm will be perfectly justified but their social or religious policy must be ignored. The compromise of Nadir Shah would be the best. In no case should Afghanistan make Russia its enemy. The friendliest relations with "the nearest and most useful neighbour of Afghanistan" must be kept up. But the provocative policy of Amanullah Khan against the British cannot be recommended to the present-day Afghanistan when she lacks money and latest weapons. However at *every possible point and in every practical manner the full, complete and unfettered freedom of Afghanistan should be asserted and demonstrated,* debt or no debt— loan with or without interest. Above all an alliance with other Muslim States, both defensive and offensive, should be immediately arrived at. Afghanistan is weak. Iran is weak. Turkey is weak. Syria, Iraq and Arabia, Palestine, Egypt, Tripoli, Tunis, Albania and Morocco are under the thumb of foreigners. But scenes on the stage of the World change suddenly. It will be well to keep up the spirits and sing with good old Hafiz—

هان مشو نومید چون واقف نئی زاسرار غیب —
باشد اندر پرده باز یهاے پنهان غم مخور—

Who could have thought that the thrilling cry of *Allaho-Akbar* will resound once more after centuries and centuries of silence from the great mosque at Cordova !

The outlook in Europe is cloudy. New factors are arising. New orientations are likely. Afghanistan, though weak, has a good strategic position. Its people are brave and if their Islamic spirit is kept up they will continue to prefer death to foreign slavery. That spirit must be kept up and all the Western materials should be supplied to the people to defend that spirit from being physically crushed. This means that Afghanistan should possesss all the modern weapons of War and particularly air-craft and even poison-gas to save its armies from annihilation from asphyxiating gases and liquid fire, etc. No European nation can be trusted. They are all alike. None of them will hesitate to treat a weak nation as Italy has treated Abyssinia. And not one of them will raise her little finger for the sake of any weak nation

without any selfish object. But a day will come again when the brutes will fight against themselves and will destroy each other. They are all ruthless. They are all self-seeking, cunning and cruel. The Right Honourable Mr. Fisher writes: "In the cruelty and the carnage of the War no belligerent country was exempt." This was the case in the last War. The New War will be a hundred times more ferocious. Every European nation is preparing to make the next war as cruel as possible, as devastating as possible, as destructive as possible, as terrorising as possible. Inventors and scientists in every European country, and in no Eastern country except Japan, are engaged in this nefarious work. Everywhere factories are engaged in turning out bombs to destroy everything living in a few minutes. If war is to come, it had better come soon—before the death-dealing weapons are all ready. When the war does come the whole of this material civilization will collapse. The East will get its opportunity again provided it is ready for the occasion and does not mismanage it. The East was not ready, in spite of our warnings, for the last War. If War is delayed in coming, the East will get greater time for preparation. Little Afghanistan will play an important part in the East as Turkey will play in the West. They should both be ready for it. There is no time to lose. If Afghanistan is not strong enough at that moment it will go to the wall. *But it must not go to the wall.* On the other hand, jointly with Turkey and Iran, Afghanistan should be ready when all of them will be called upon, as was said in *Islam and Socialism*, "by the Supervising Providence, which deftly resets the pieces on the chess-board of the World soon after one game is over and calls out fresh players to recommence the game." It was time that new players were called out by the "Supervising Providence." Let Afghanistan make herself fit to be called out among the new players on the chess-board of the World. She must know that she is not ready yet. She must get ready. The first step for Afghanistan should be a Pan-Islamic one and she should hasten to establish an alliance or *entente* with her Muslim Neighbour—Iran. She should pay the greatest possible attention to increase her resources by the help of American or German experts for the industrial prosperity of her people, and she should mechanize her army as well as perfect the new and most useful arm—the Air Force. To save money her Civilians should revert to their simple, unostentatious, maybe unfashionable, life and supply money for the necessities of defence of their country at the time of crisis which may come any moment. The feverish re-armament of all European Nations may keep the peace for a few years but not always. They will fight, and fight fiercely within a dozen years or so. Germany is getting desperate, France is losing her nerves, Italy is

becoming more and more ambitious. England cannot remain in a state of suspense for long. Russia,—well, Russia's world ambitions are almost gone with the result that she is feeling weak within herself and is seeking security with the help of others who can never be relied upon. In Europe any sign of weakness means death. In short, the situation in the West is very doubtful indeed and because the World has grown much smaller the situation in the East is sure to react to that in the West. Afghanistan may by itself not be a very important country but she is a neighbour of a large country which is sure to be involved in a European conflict if it is general. Iran, her other neighbour, may also be involved. For these reasons Afghanistan must remain very alert, very watchful, and quite ready for all emergencies.

(3) Arabia.

The Bolsheviks did not confine their sympathy to Iran and Afghanistan alone. They expressed it even with Arabia—the birth-place of Islam. This was most strange. Bolsheviks are avowedly irreligious. To Marx, religion was opium. This shows that Marx was completely ignorant of Islam and its history. No religion, no philosophy, no institution engenders such a vitality, so much energy and courage as does Islam. Let every man read the history of the rise of Islam—the history of the Prophet Muhammad and his close followers—the history of the Saracens and Moors and also of the Turks and he will come to believe that the world knows no greater stimulant for physical energy and activity as well as for brain-waves than Islam—than Pan-Islamism. Pan-Islamism acts like an electric current of the highest power when truly believed in. The *foremost active Principle of* it which Christians have tried their best to misrepresent, but of which they have always been frightened, is *Jihad*—one of the five pillars of Islam. Can a religion which has *Jihad* as one of its pillars act as opium ? On the contrary Islam stimulated an energy which the Christian writers themselves have nicknamed "*fanaticism.*" Islam is certainly *not* opium. It may be likened to a strong, stimulating, and energizing drug, but certainly not to opium. It is in fact a novel elixir for life and energy.

It is a well-known and fully admitted fact that new converts try to imbibe the spirit of the new religion most. Read the history of all the newly converted Muslim Nations, Arabs, or Osmanlis, or Moghals, or Afghans, and it will become evident what an energizing religion Islam has been. The effect of Islam is quite contrary to that of opium. It is dynamic—dynamic for brain power, dynamic for physical strength and dynamic for the spirit. We have dealt with this question in *Pan-Islamism* and give it here to remove the notion of the followers of Marxian theories

that every religion is an opium. They must make one exception indeed—Islam. In *Pan-Islamism* we have said that there was no religion in the world to which any people owed so much even of the worldly prosperity and progress as Muslims did to Islam. What was it that brought out the Arabs from the darkness they were in since ages past to play a most dazzlingly prominent part in the history of the world ? What was it that made a people without any cohesion into a compact and united Nation ? What was it that made those people, who were hardly distinguished from ordinary brute creation, the civilizers of world, who held "the torch of learning" for centuries, and showed their activity in almost every branch of human knowledge, who were recognised as "the enlightened teachers of barbarous Europe" in philosophy, medicine, natural history, geography, grammar, the golden art of poetry, chemistry, astronomy, mathematics and other branches of science ? What was it that made these "shepherd peoples roaming unnoticed in the desert since the creation of the world," the conquerors and administrators of such a large part of the world, and extraordinary military genuises and marvellous statesmen —Khalids and Omars ? All this was done by Islam and Islam alone. All the miraculous early victories of the Muslims also must be attributed to Islam—to Pan-Islamism. When two combatants were seen in the field at times not only of the same nation, same race, and same country, but also sons of the same parents, but with the difference that one was a Non-Muslim and the other Muslim, the self-confidence, the undaunted courage and the enthusiasm, the vitality and the wonderful zeal, which the grand cause he wanted to serve created in the Muslim, were clearly distinguishable in the Muslim as against the Non-Muslim who had not the Islamic current in him. When we observe critically how the Non-Muslim Pagan Arabs, though greater in number and with greater advantages of supply and position and arms were vanquished by the smaller numbers of their own brothers who had changed in no other respect than that they had managed to get the spell of Islam over them, we come to understand the secret of the astonishing progress of Arabian conquests which have puzzled many learned historians. The principles of Islam and the cause of Truth both together produced extraordinary heroism and a remarkable energy and self-confidence. One Muslim soldier, Derar bin Azur, always opposed an armoured enemy, even a fellow Arab, unarmoured and only with a simple spear in his hand, mounted on an unsaddled horse. Gibbon has written from authentic sources that on one occasion at least (*i.e.*, in the memorable battle of Ajendan) Derar, in this particular naked style of his, faced and repulsed thirty great warriors of the side of the enemy.

Every historian of the Muslim Conquests knows that the Muslim army was almost always in the minority, sometimes even to the ratio of only one to seven of the enemy soldiers, yet in the overwhelming majority of cases it was the smaller Muslim army that was victorious. What was it that gave them victory ? Noldeke says :—"Rhetorical expression about the decaying condition of both Empires (Byzantine and Persian) and the youthful energies of the Muslims are unsatisfying to the inquirer who keeps the concrete facts before him." Of the "concrete facts" Noldeke himself mentions these :—"On the one side, both Byzantium and Persia had at their command genuine soldiers regularly armed and disciplined. The traditions of Roman warfare were not yet entirely lost and the Persians still possessed their dreaded cuirassiers, before whom in better times even the armies of Rome had often fled. The Emperor Heracleus was certainly the greatest man who had held the Empire since Constantine and Julian. He was an astute diplomatist and a very competent general and as a soldier bold, even to rashness." "On the other side were," Noldeke tell us, "the wretchedly armed Arabs, fighting not in regularly organised military divisions but by families and clans and under leaders who had never before faced disciplined troops." How was it then that the Arabs shattered the armies of both the Emperors ? To Noldeke, as to all European historians, who do not understand the inherent power of Islam "the phenomenon continues mysterious as before." But to Muslims the question is very simple to answer. They know that the key to these successes was Islam itself. It was not the sword that spread Islam. *It was Islam that drilled bodily, invigorated physically, inspirited mentally, elevated morally and vitalized spiritually its followers and gave victory even to that sword which, though its possessors were a fighting people from ages, had never shown its sharpness to the outer world before the advent of Islam.* In short, it was to Islam that the Muslims owed their conquests and it was to Islam that they owed their intellectual progress. Islam is *not* beholden to the sword ; maybe, the sword is beholden to Islam—the sword was used at its best by the hands of Muslims alone. The more the Muslims believed in Islam and acted upon its Principles the more they advanced in their territorial conquests and mental brilliance. But opium dulls and benumbs brains as it dulls physical organs and nerves. Therefore whatever else Islam may be compared to it *cannot be compared to opium.* All the followers of Marx must admit, if they are honest, that Marx was certainly out of the mark when he did not exclude Islam in his general remark that "religion was like opium to the people." The more so when Lenin and other followers of Karl Marx did not treat the Muslim Nation as if it was opiated, although unfortunately the

Muslim Nation was now a degenerated nation and did not possess a one-hundred-thousandth part of its natural vigour of the past. It had degenerated because it had left off following truly and conscientiously what Islam had taught her. As long as Muslims really believed in and truly followed Islam they were all-conquering.

Great credit must however go to Lenin and his friends that they were neither dissuaded by their personal prejudices against all religions nor by the fallen condition of Muslims from showing sympathy to them.

It can be said that the Bolsheviks showed sympathy to Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Amanullah Khan because they also persecuted religion and religious peoples. But in the case of Ibn Saud, nobody in his senses can allege that he lacks religious enthusiasm. It can be said that it was their anti-British policy which prompted the Bolsheviks to help Iran, Turkey and Afghanistan but this also could not be the cause of their sympathy with Arabia. Both Husain and Ibn Saud (the Bolsheviks knew as well as everybody else) were the pets and protégés of the British and moved like dolls in their hands —one was subsidised from India, the other from England ! It was Arab perfidy which broke the back of Turkey. Arabs were bribed heavily. They succumbed to the temptation. An English Daily bewailed in those days that while nobody could see a gold sovereign in England an Arab Bedouin would throw away a pound sterling even for his cigarettes. Besides being bribed they were made fools of politically. Secret treaties were signed to create under Husain, the Sheriff of Mecca, the whole of the Arabic-speaking peoples of the Turkish Empire, into a kingdom. But secret treaties were also signed, such is the brazen perfidy of European Nations, to divide Arab territories between France and England. Syria, including Palestine, was to go to France, while certain other Arabic portions to England in exchange of Constantinople which was to go to Russia. Three treaties were signed at about the same time regarding the same territories, differing from one another. Before Husain and his sons was put the temptation of a big Pan-Arab Empire, and naturally they fell a prey to that temptation. In the middle of 1916 Husain issued a proclamation calling upon all the Arabic-speaking people to revolt against the Turks. The Writer of these pages was then in London when the above proclamation was issued and he fearlessly wrote in the British Press that while the Irish rebel Casement was hanged once for his treason, Husain should be hanged twice because he had rebelled against his sovereign and against his Khalifa.

It must not be thought that the Author approved or approves of one nation ruling over the other and therefore he denounced the proclamation of Husain. The Author was indeed against the Arab proclamation and the Arab treason as it involved an attack upon the solidarity of Islam—the only bulwark against the European conceited, aggressive, and exploiting, capitalistic Imperialism. He came almost to blows in an argument with Husain's son Faisal, who became the King of Syria first and then of Iraq, when he visited London and denounced the Turks but praised Allenby for his victory in Palestine. But the question of nationality does not arise in Islam and the grouping of States must be amicable and brotherly. For this very reason the Author suggested in the Press as well as in two of his publications of the time—one "Turkey" and the other "the Standard Bearers of Islam," a Federated State or the United States of Islam in which each unit was to be completely autonomous but joined together with the international link of Pan-Islamism. The Author denounced the Arab rebellion because it was disastrous for Islam and also because from long, long experience of the natives of Europe, the Author was convinced that all the promises of an Arab Empire after the War were perfidious, as they proved to be at the end of the War. Nobody felt that more bitterly, than the dupe himself—the Shariff Husain, not only when he was the King of Arabia but the more so when he was exiled to Cyprus by those very Powers who had deluded him with the dreams of an extensive Arab Empire. He repented but alas! when it was much too late.

It was as a sign of repentance and disillusionment that he turned to the Bolsheviks and sent Prince Lutfullah to Moscow.

It was in October, 1916, that the Shariff Husain proclaimed himself the King of Hedjaz, and his son Faisal openly took the command of the Arab forces. Djemal Pasha had to turn back because of this danger to his rear, from his great military adventure of attacking the Suez Canal. It was this very Faisal's force which helped Allenby to conquer Palestine and Syria.

To his eternal shame, Faisal himself was present at the Banquet given to Allenby in London when the British Prime Minister uttered those boastful words which pierced the heart of every Muslim. He said, "The name of General Allenby will be ever renowned as that of the brilliant commander who fought and won the last and most triumphant of Crusades." Mr. Lloyd George went on, "It was his good fortune by his skill to bring to a glorious end an enterprise which absorbed the chivalry of Europe for centuries. We forget now that the military strength of Europe was concentrated for generations upon this purpose in vain. A British army under the command of

General Allenby achieved it and achieved it finally." So proud was the British Prime Minister that he did not mention the fact that Allenby's army was helped by Faisal's and other Muslim forces and by the predominantly Muslim Egyptian labour corps which was made so blind as not to see that it was helping in a new "Crusade." The reply of the Author of these lines to the boastful words of the British Prime Minister at once published in England was:—"Muslims did not know that Europe (Christendom) was concentrating its military strength in a Holy War--a Crusade. They are told this now by the Prime Minister of England when the military victory has already been achieved and the military strength of Islam has been almost annihilated. But if Mr. Lloyd George had known anything of the undying spirit of Islam, he would not even now have thrown down the gauntlet to Islam, nor could he have called this "Crusade" the last Crusade. The last but one Crusade would have been a more prophetic title, as Islam will yet have its own back and will not take seven centuries to do so."

Our prophecy has not yet been fulfilled, but the British themselves have changed that "Crusade" to get possession into Christian hands the Holy Sepulchre of Christ into a very wordly object, *i.e.*, to give a "National Home" to the people who crucified Jesus. The struggle of Muslims however is still going on, and news comes, from that once peaceful land, of ceaseless unrest and recurring riots and troubles involving bloodshed. In fact now a war is on between 800,000 Arabs and an Empire where the sun does not set. The Jews are being protected by the Christian bayonets and bombing aeroplanes of the British Government which refuses to surrender self-Government to the Muslim majority. So military powers and the mailed fist still keep the prophecy unfulfilled but it will not be very long that Christ's own saying will come true:—"Those who take to sword, shall perish by the sword." Britain will yet rue the day when it antagonised Islam. Probably she is feeling a little sorry now why she allowed the Italian raid on Tripoli and the taking away of the Dodecanese and other islands from Turkey. She may even be feeling sorry why she broke up the only Muslim Empire in Europe and divided it into small parts to be at the mercy and disposal of Europe. She has sent her King to visit the Turks probably as a confession of her sorrow. Soon she may be sorry for having called the war against the Turks a "Crusade,"—a Holy War. She courted Arabs to destroy the Turks. Now she is engaged in bombing and machine-gunning Palestine Arabs to help the Jews with selfish objects. But she will soon be sorry for this also. The Muslim world has begun to feel the pain because of the atrocities perpetrated upon

the Palestine Arabs when they refuse to sell their home-lands and their liberty to the Jews to satisfy the Imperialistic ambitions and the financial needs of the British. This anti-Arab policy is arousing the anger of all the surrounding Arab countries. Like the Arabs of Hedjaz, now the Arabs of Palestine are also being disillusioned of the "friendship" of Britain towards them.

"Palestine and Transjordan" writes in its issue of 15th September, 1936, while commenting on the British Statement of Policy in Palestine, under the heading "Hypocrisy" thus:—

"His Majesty's Government asserts that it "regards this responsibility as a trust." What responsible guardian, when his ward cries out against victimization, refuses it his pro-paternal ear and administers a smack on the head ? "It has been the constant aim of British policy to secure and maintain relations of friendship and confidence with Muslim peoples," we are told. If Palestine is a case in point, we must remember that Britain did *indeed* secure our friendship in *the hour of need*, and that hour having passed, who cares ? Her need of Jewish money has displaced us *in* the bosom of her friendship ; but history repeats itself, and the Muslim issues and forces in the next world-struggle are likely to be differently disposed. The concluding "confident hopes" couched in the dehumanized courtesies of diplomatic speech mean less than nothing they seem to. 'Doubts and fears on both sides' is how H. M. H. sees it. We have no doubts and very few fears, for the Arabs will never cease to fight against the insidious encroachments of Western diplomacy with its legacy of broken promises, abused trust, "interested" motives, and hypocritical self-justification. Where is the virtue of British justice ?"

In the question of Palestine the Author has taken active interest since 1906. He published an article in the *Jewish Chronicle*, London, suggesting an *entente cordial* between the Jews and Muslims and told the Zionists that in no other way but by the good-will of the Muslim Nation can the Jews satisfy their religious Zionist ambitions. But during the War when the National Home, *i.e.*, a Political State, was suggested, the Author was the first to organise a meeting in London to protest against it. The meeting was held on 9th June, 1917, and the Author, as the Honorary Secretary of the Central Islamic Society, published its proceedings and resolutions in Pamphlet form. Ever since that time the Author, both as a Pan-Islamist and an internationalist, has been taking lively interest in the subject. In 1930 during the canvassing, with his friend the late Saklatwala, for the Communist candidate who alone of the other three candidates of each British Party, in a bye-election in London, had the courage and honesty to support the

suffering and tyrannised Arabs of Palestine, the Author found out that there were not only the financial and strategic and Imperialist reasons why England wanted to dominate over Palestine, (and this could best be done by the old policy of "Divide and Rule"), but also for reasons of British Party Politics, Britain was favouring the Jews. There are constituencies in England where the Jews have a say and can throw their weight on one side or other with effect. This was one of the reasons why, when the Labour Party was in office but not in power, she was frightened to act in favour of the "White Paper" she had published. It was not only the personal pressure of Dr. Weizmann on Mr. Ramsay MacDonald that made him give in. It was also the fear of Jewish Voters that caused that shelving of Sir John Hope-Simpson's report showing by statistics that there was no room as far as land went for limitless Jewish annual dumpings.

In the early years of this century the Author not only preached *entente cordial* between the Jews and Muslims but also practised it. Personal relations of the Author were the kindliest possible with the Jewish people and as then he was the Honorary Secretary of the Pan-Islamic Society he invited Jewish Authors like I. Zangwill and others to every public function of the Society.

The fact is that for many generations past did Muslim Arabs and Jews work together to elevate civilization, even up to the days of Sultan Abdul Hamid the great Muslim Empire was the *safest* refuge for all the distressed and exiled Jews. In Palestine itself brotherly feelings existed between the Arabs and the Jews until fanatical Zionism and the "Balfour Declaration" brought about the rupture. But even now there are men who offer good advice like Prof. Einstein who spoke thus to a group of Zionists in New York:—"The establishment of satisfactory relations between the Jews and the Arabs is not England's affair but We, *i.e.* to say the Arabs and ourselves, have got to agree on the main outlines of an advantageous partnership which shall satisfy the needs of both nations. A just solution of this problem, and one worthy of both nations, is an end no less important and no less worthy of our efforts than the promotion of the work of construction itself."

The Author himself went out from India two years ago, although in very indifferent health, on his self-imposed mission to find out some solution of the Palestine and Syrian troubles. But as far as the Palestine question went he found to his great pain that every Jew with only a few exceptions was a bigoted religious Zionist as well as a political Zionist, a *Jabotinsky* not an *Einstein*—determined to establish not a home for the homeless Jews but a Jewish State—if not an Empire, with its head-quarters in Jerusalem,

and that after having demolished the Mosque of Omar, and having ejected the Arabs from their thirteen-centuries old homes and hearths to rebuild the Temple of Solomon first under the shelter of the bombing aeroplanes of the British but afterwards after ejecting the British also and metaphorically recrucifying the Christ. What wonder that not only among the Palestinian Arabs and all over the Arabic-speaking population but in India also the reaction is taking place.

The Quran had warned the Prophet that "certainly the strongest among men in enmity to those who Believe wilt thou find the Jews and those who commit *shirk*" (v. 82). Considering the centuries old history of friendly relations between the Jews and Muslims one would have doubted the need of the above warning but how true it is that the Master of the Universe alone knows the future. The Jews are now attacking one of the very central parts of Islam. What wonder that the Pan-Islamic tide is rising all over the Islamic world even though Pan-Islamism is still smarting under the hard blow dealt to it by Mr. Ataturk—a blow harder than those dealt to it by non-Muslims. They say that such blows were also foreseen by the miraculous Prophet and in one of his sayings he warned Muslims to beware of the Turks. Without some prophetic inspiration man could not see even what lies at the back of his head much less the remote future.

Every possible effort was made to help the Turks whenever they were in trouble, by Muslims particularly of India because the Turks were Muslims and because their Ruler was the Khalifa of Muslims. But all of a sudden a Turkish Despot took into his head not only to exile the Ottoman Khalifa but to forcibly abolish the Khilafat in Turkey and also to declare the Turkish State a "Lay Republic." Now what happens, as in the case of Palestine, is this that although the Pan-Islamic instinct of Muslims abroad prompts them to undergo all sacrifices to save Palestine for the Arabs the prospect of Arabs also coming to some decision of their own with the Jews harmful to the interests of Islam in the end comes before them and many of them get disheartened. The Arabs however have never been fools and no Arab would give up the most valuable asset for his Nation and country. Besides, the Leaders of the Lay Republic do not really represent the Turkish Nation which is still attached to Islam as it demonstrates every year in the month of *Ramadhan* and has more particularly demonstrated this year on the occasion of the celebrations of the Birthday of the Saviour of Humanity, before whom should bow every Reformer, every Statesman, every Military Genius, and every Socialist if he has any sense of understanding in him.

For having betrayed the Turks, Nemesis has already been punishing the Arabs. Let the British also beware of the same Nemesis. Anybody who has eyes to see can see that it has just begun to extend its hands. What has happened in the Mediterranean and what is now happening in the regions of Gibraltar is the sign-post—the danger mark.

Mussolini has established himself in the Red Sea—not far from Aden.

The most marvellous feat of Mussolini is considered to be that he, without firing a single shot, has defeated the greatest naval Imperial Power of the world—Britain, and has "dispelled the illusion" that Britain was supreme in that Sea or in the Near East.

Mr. Albert Viton writes that a member of the Supreme Arab Strike Committee of Palestine told him before he was imprisoned in the "Sarafand Concentration Camp" that "India will be liberated right here."

Such dreams have been made to get a place in the minds of the Eastern people by Mussolini. He is a man of designs and he is continuing to design something very surprising for the world. Alas! It is too imperialistic to please a Muslim. If an anti-imperialistic Leader had designed that everybody would have welcomed it.

The Italian Naval bases in the island of Pantellaria and in the Dodecanese islands, the military base of Tobruk and the occupation of an Island near Berin which belonged to Yemen and the Fascist movements in Spain cannot be very pleasing to the British Statesmen as the nearest route to India and Australia from the British Isles can now be menaced. Mussolini is not a firebrand like Hitler but he is a more dangerous enemy. In a way, it is he who has sent King Edward VIII to Istanbul but how far the Turks will be induced to trust the British after their bitterest experiences of the past, which has cost them their Empire, cannot be foreseen as the present Turkish Leaders have a queer mentality and lack foresight. Nor can it be said that Arabs will allow themselves to be duped again.

Because of her diplomacy and wealth as well as national vigilance and solidarity, Britain cannot be punished so soon as were the Arabs. Colossal sums have begun to be spent on re-armaments and on air force. This in itself shows that the British Nation has not forgotten to do her duty to her Country and that the evil days have not yet quite arrived for it. Surely they will come but not very suddenly.

Nemesis sometimes gives a long rope though not always a very, very long one. Beware, Beware !

Shavad zalim zi zulme khud kharab ahista ahista,
Ravad az dushnai kassab ab ahista ahista.

It was not long after the Great War, though not a minute before the end of it, that King Husain was disillusioned. He began then to put very awkward questions as to when the solemn pledges given in written treaties would be redeemed and when would he get the opportunity of ruling a large Arab Empire. The unceremonious expulsion of Husain's son from Damascus, which he had entered during the Great War with his Arab forces as a conqueror, completed the disillusionment. Even that British Officer, now dead, whose deceptive promises and actions played the greater part in withdrawing the allegiance of the Arabs from the Turks and in beguiling the former and getting their help, expressed at least in words, his disgust at the way the Arabs were treated after the War by the British and the French. Bolsheviks published Machiavellian documents of the Allies to which Czarist Russia was a party and this encouraged Husain. When Husain got disillusioned and became sure that he had been duped he turned towards Bolsheviks and opened up communications with Checherin—the Bolshevik Commissar for Foreign Affairs. On 6th August, 1924, an agent of Bolshevik Russia arrived at Jeddah where the representatives of Britain and other States reside. Normal diplomatic relations were established thenceforward between Soviet Russia and the King of the Hedjaz. It meant an indication of sympathy with Islam on the part of Bolsheviks as otherwise there was no political connection between Leningrad and Mecca. But this was a bit too much for the digestion of certain Imperialists. They had kept a piece in reserve for such an occasion. Ibn Saud came forward from Riadh and gave a check to the duped Husain. Instead of lending him a helping hand at this most critical moment of his life, a British ship paid him the courtesy of taking him on board, perhaps free of all charges, and put him safely down at the Island of Cyprus, which England had taken as a bargain from Turkey many years ago, under her supervision, and, after the War, had annexed. Ali, Husain's son, tried to keep himself on his father's throne. Some negotiations were secretly opened with the British. Akaba, which Britain had been coveting even during the régime of Sultan Abdul Hamid Khan, was taken possession of by the British and later joined to the Vassalage of Transjordania. But Ali also had to seek the refuge on a British ship to land on the soil of his brother Faisal, who was given, partly due to the influence of an Indian mission under the leadership of H. H. the Aga Khan, the throne

of Iraq when that Country had proved a bit too hard of a nut for the self-imposed "mandatory" to crack. Ibn Saud captured Jeddah on 22nd December, 1925. He thanked Hakinov, who was the Bolsheviks Soviet Consul there, for Russian neutrality. Bolshevists were not concerned who was the ruler in Hedjaz—they only wanted to keep themselves in touch with the Arabs and with the centre of Islam. This also indicated the Bolshevik sympathy with Islam alone that they remained absolutely indifferent to the person at the head of the government in Hedjaz. To them it did not matter at all whether Husain or Ibn Saud was the Ruler. They knew that they could not interfere politically in the affairs of the Hedjaz with any effect. If they could they might have in that case preferred a disillusioned Husain to Ibn Saud as did the majority of the people in India in the hope that the lesson Husain had been taught would not be forgotten by him any more. In February, 1926, Ibn Saud assumed the title of the Sultan of Hedjaz and Nejd. He asked the Soviet to recognise those titles and when on 16th February Ibn Saud received a letter recognising those titles, he sent a warm reply of thanks. When in July of the same year Ibn Saud invited an all-Muslim Conference in Mecca, while it was boycotted by Kemalist Turkey which is populated by Muslims, the irreligious Bolsheviks allowed "the chief religious Directorate of Islam in Russia," which had its headquarters at Ufa to send a strong delegation to Mecca to take part in that Congress. "Moscow seeks," opines Mr. Louis Fischer, "in this and other ways to remind the Arabs of the existence of a big anti-Imperialist Power." But there is one Power at least which does not take the slightest notice of that anti-Imperialist Power in this region. While Britain did take a notice of Bolshevik Russia in Iran, in Turkey, and in Afghanistan, it completely ignored the existence of Russia in Arabia although Russia possesses a very large Muslim population, which is now proportionately larger than it ever was in Russia, as several parts of Russia which had mainly Christian populations and with but few Muslims have been lost by her. As far as the Bolsheviks are concerned they did what they could to encourage the Arabs. They could not help if Ibn Saud was completely under the thumb of the British and was hopelessly at their mercy. As matters stand he can get no support from anywhere. By his iconoclastic attitude and desecration of places in Mecca and Medina which were held sacred by millions of his co-religionists, Ibn Saud has alienated the feelings and sympathies of the Muslim World. In this connection the greatest crime which the Wahabi King committed in his fanaticism against Islam, Muslims, and Humanity itself, was that he did not show that honour, that love which was due to the greatest man that the millions of revolutions

of this earth had produced, the greatest benefactor of Humanity and the most obedient and devoted servant of the One and Only God whose very personality has become the most visible sign and proof of the existence of God. In fact the Prophet alone can save religion itself from destruction in this age of sceptics and doubters and materialists who look at everything from a utilitarian and practical point of view.

There are Muslims in whose opinion the crime of Ibn Saud would not have been greater if he had demolished the "Abode of God" because to Muslims every place in this universe is the "Abode of God," than his "demolition" of the birthplace of Muhammad—the man through whom alone millions and millions and millions of human beings have learnt to believe and worship the One and Only God in a way that would help humanity not only in its spiritual advancement but also its material advancement, and who has set an example how to produce a sober and virile *international* Nation—a Universal Brotherhood.

We personally like, even admire, the puritanism of Sultan Ibn Saud when he is trying to purify the belief of the present-day Muslim masses and to free them from all superstitious thoughts and all those habits of life which Muslims have learnt from non-Muslim nations and peoples. No King, no Statesman, no Reformer can do better than take the Muslims back to the days of the Prophet himself when every individual Muslim without an exception lived the chaste and simple life of a Saint or an angel, the life of sincere piety, honesty, straightforwardness, and of social good and beneficence. No King or Statesman or Reformer can do better than take the Muslim Nation back to the days of the devoted immediate successors of the Prophet—the glorious days of Omar, when the Muslim Nation acquired victories every week and made progress every day and when it possessed itself of a large State—an extensive Empire, and organised it on true communistic lines. Each individual unit of the community was devoted to nothing but to Social Service, and was tied together with the unbreakable bonds of brotherhood as members of one family and one nation. Who would not approve of the success Sultan Ibn Saud has achieved in freeing his dominions of such crimes as theft and robbery, etc.? Who would not approve of the Socialistic features of the life of Sultan Ibn Saud himself and his State? The more the Sultan purifies the Muslim Society the nearer would Communism come to it. What is wanted is that the spirit of the Islamic laws must not be lost in giving adherence to the letters. And what is wanted is that nothing should be done to detach the masses from the personality of Muhammad. Muhammad alone could stop atheism through his intelligent, reasonable, and beneficial God-idea and it was he alone who had

made religion an institution helpful to Social and Political Reformers besides its being useful for the moral and spiritual elevation of man. Ibn Saud must bow down at the feet of Muhammad to learn how to restore human Society to its early Islamic purity and benevolence and how to solidify the Muslim Nation —united together by one cord—the cord of Allah- the حبل الله

Let Ibn Saud take note of the fact that even those Turkish Leaders who are otherwise indifferent to religion have taken a zealous part in the birthday celebrations of the unique man, Muhammad. In India and other countries with mixed populations, intelligent non-Muslims always join in honouring the memory of the Greatest Benefactor, or as Mr. Bernard Shaw says, "the Saviour of Humanity."

Men without an acute brain or a highly thinking mind may deny the existence of God but even they cannot deny the towering and beneficent personality of Muhammad who made a belief in God more necessary than a belief in any Scientific Truth and who made that belief the most powerful factor in forming the characters of the individuals and in organising the most communist Society or Nation or Brotherhood. By his fanatical vandalism Ibn Saud made a capital blunder even from a political point of view as because of that he lost the opportunity of collecting the whole of the Arab Nation round himself and of making himself the centre of gravity of Islamdom, which would have raised his prestige in the eyes of others -Britain and all. Now Britain holds him in disrespect and rejects all his supplications. Lately he sent his son to England to settle a few impending questions with Britain. Not one of them was settled in favour of the King of Hedjaz and Nejd. What to say of such important matters as Akaba or the Hedjaz Railway, even a few sandy dunes near Koweit and other places have not been conceded to Ibn Saud. On the other hand a contract to explore for oil in Arabia has been imposed upon the King somewhat on the lines of the D'Arcy concession if not of the East India Company prospects. With the best of intentions Russia or any other Power cannot say a word against it, at least for the present. Mussolini's recent move may be pregnant with possibilities not over-favourable to Britain in the future but for the time being in any case Britain is paramount in Arabia and because Arabia is weak that "paramountcy must remain paramount" as an Englishman wrote in the report of a Commission as its president which sat to clear the position of Indian States in respect of Britain and cost Indian Rulers plenty of money for nothing. In spite of all this, Bolshevik Russia is not so foolish as to cut herself away completely from Arabia. She has still her diplomatic relations. She still has her sympathies with the Arabs. Mr. Louis

Fischer says:—"It seems queer that cold, far-off Russia should be interested in Arabia and yet she is—because the capital of Arabia is an outpost from which British Imperialist policy can be observed, because Moscow wishes the Arabs to see a friend and moral supporter in the Soviet Union, and because the Bolsheviks, despite their atheistic policies, cannot wholly ignore the spiritual bond that connects millions of Muslim citizens with the Holy places of Islam: Russia is one of the great Mohammadan countries. She has intimate relations of friendship with Turkey and Afghanistan." The King of Hedjaz will himself do well to keep up this bond of friendship with Bolshevist Russia even though it cannot be of much help to him for the present. If Ibn Saud becomes a little less barbarous and crude in his so-called puritanic policy he may yet take into his own hands the lead of the Muslim World which the Turks have so foolishly given away. Then the friendship of Russia, with millions of Russians to whom Mecca and Medina are Holy cities and to whom every particle of the sands of that desert has its own glitter, towards Arabia may become valuable to both. A Pan-Arab movement when in its full strides will be heavier on Imperialism than the Pan-Ottoman or Pan-Turanian ever was.

Arabia will yet regain its glory. It rests mostly with Sultan Ibn Saud to play an important part in it if he likes. The scheme for the defence and strengthening of the centre of Islam which cannot but eventuate in the re-rise of the Arabs is ready cut and dry. As soon as Ibn Saud makes himself popular to the Islamic World the scheme will be put in operation and will help Ibn Saud himself in cutting away the fetters which bind him hand and foot to European Imperialism.

(4) Turkey.

Every student of History knows that the whole of Europe had been trying for many centuries past to destroy Turkey. The Czars of Russia were lately her greatest enemies. They coveted Constantinople. They did their very best to weaken Turkey. They encouraged rebellions of Turkey's Christian subject races and peoples who were becoming quite independent one by one. And Turkey was undoubtedly growing weaker and weaker. Any nation would have grown weaker in the circumstances in which Turkey had been placed by the machinations and intrigues of the European Powers. As an Indian proverb says, "She was like a tongue between thirty-two teeth." In 1853 Czar Nicholas I said to Sir Hamilton Segmore, the British Ambassador at his Court:—

"The affairs of Turkey are in a very disorganised condition . . . . . We have on our hands a sick man—a very sick man. It

will, I tell you frankly, be a very great misfortune if one of these days he should slip away from us before all necessary arrangements were made." On 31st August, 1876, when Sultan Abdul Hamid Khan II came on the throne of Turkey "he was confronted with most serious questions affecting the integrity of Empire" admits an hostile English Historian. The Machiavellian policy of these European Powers was to instigate the Balkan States to rebellions and wars. If these Balkan States were at all successful the European Powers insisted that the Sublime Porte should give them all those advantages which they might have gained but when they were defeated, Turkey was not allowed to reap any advantage from her victory. The most glaring case of such injustice was when Greece rushed to war with Turkey to get possession of Crete in 1897. The Turkish army, which had then been organised on the German system, completely defeated the Greeks within only a month under the command of the Great General Edhem Pasha and occupied Thessaly and Epirus. Edhem Pasha would have as victoriously entered Athens itself shortly after but the Big European Powers, excepting Germany, intervened. They not only saved Greece by insisting on peace with an indemnity of only four million sterling to Turkey but also ousted the Turkish troops, which had been landed in Crete to suppress the rebellion. England then played the most conspicuous part against Turkey. In 1898 Prince George, a son of King George, of Greece, was appointed Governor of the Island and when in 1908 the Young Turk Revolution took place and Austria annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Cretan Assembly declared the annexation of Crete to Greece and the Powers hastened to recognise it. These were the first prices paid by Turkey for her revolution and for a constitutional government. Whatever may have been the faults of Sultan Abdul Hamid and they were many, the army under his absolute rule had been brought to such a high standard that in one month it smashed up the Greeks. The army fought with a religious fervour under the orders of the Sultan Khalifa and under the command of religious-minded Generals. In 1906 when the Author visited Constantinople for the first time he met General Edhem Pasha at the palace with a sword in his belt and a *rosary* in his hand. A photo of himself which the Great General gave to the Author, and which he is still proud to possess, was signed by him یادگار اخوت "a souvenir of fraternity." When the Author visited Turkey after the Young Turk revolution some time in 1909 he visited General Mahmud Shaukat Pasha but he missed the *rosary* in the General's hand and the words "fraternal souvenir" before the signature of Shaukat Pasha on his portrait which he kindly gave to the Author were not to be found.

Soon after the Young Turk revolution, which Anwar Bey had started at Salonika on 23rd July, 1908, when he was assured of the support of the army on behalf of the Committee of Union and Progress, a National Grand Assembly was elected and it met on 10th December with the opening speech by Sultan Abdul Hamid Khan II. Thus was actually visualised what the Author dreamt in 1906 and which he had expressed in his "Pan-Islamism," in these words: "There is no doubt that if Providence spares His Majesty (Sultan Abdul Hamid Khan) for a few years more, Turkey will have a Constitutional Government guided by the masterful hand of His Majesty. It will be the crowning achievement of Pan-Islamism." In the Turkish Grand National Assembly men of all religions and races, even the enemies of the Empire, were equally admitted to the franchise. A counter-revolution was feared on 13th April, 1909. In only eleven days all fears passed. But Sultan Abdul Hamid Khan was dethroned after a rule of thirty-three years and Sultan Mohammad V came to the throne. The Author later had the honour of a private interview with His Imperial Majesty. As a constitutional monarch he would have done well but alas! the Fates were against Turkey.

When the firm grip at the helm was removed the bark of the extremely heterogeneous Empire began to roll. Its enemies did not lose time in taking advantage of troubled waters. An enemy of the Sultan and of Turkey writes:—"It was not long before the process of dismemberment of the Empire was renewed and wolves were gathered round it to share the spoils. The "Young Turks" were less successful in resisting them than Abdul Hamid, who at least had kept them at bay by his cunning and shifty diplomacy during the many years which had elapsed since the Congress of Berlin." Enemies got their opportunity. Bosnia and Herzegovina were annexed by Austria, Crete by Greece. Ferdinand of Bulgaria proclaimed himself an independent Sovereign. A new deceitful enemy appeared. She was Italy. On 2nd December, 1910, the Italian Foreign Minister proclaimed in the Chamber, "We desire the integrity of the Ottoman Empire and we wish Tripoli always to remain Turkish." On 26th October, 1911, however, Italy notified the Powers, without the least provocation by Turkey, the annexation of that Province. The same happened in India when the British annexed the State of Oudh. Italy sent an army of 50,000 men to attack Tripoli. The Turkish Navy was very weak. The Sultan had failed to attend to it. But he had been wise enough to keep a strong garrison in the Province. The Young Turks had foolishly reduced it. No reinforcements could be sent as England stopped the passage of Turkish troops through Egypt though it was legally a Turkish Province. The Turks even then gave a good account of themselves.

Muslims of India showed their sympathy with Turkey in spite of the British. But catastrophe after catastrophe followed. It reminded the Author of the prophecy which Syed Abul Huda Rafai had read out to him from one of his books when he had visited the Syed in 1906 at Constantinople with his friend Sir Shaikh Abdul Qadir. The prophecy was to the effect that if Syed Abul Huda Rafai goes Sultan Abdul Hamid will go and the Sultan's Empire will end.

While the war with Italy was still on, the Balkan States came to a mutual understanding. On 18th March, 1912, Bulgaria and Serbia signed a treaty of mutual help against Turkey. A month later Greece signed a treaty for the same purpose with Bulgaria. Then Montenegro also joined it. On 15th October, 1912, an ultimatum was sent to Turkey by the Balkan group. So long as the European Powers were certain that the Turkish army would prevail even against the Balkan combination, they proclaimed that whoever may be victorious will not be allowed to disturb the *status quo ante bellum*. But when the Turks met with disaster and Salonika fell, Christian bigotry got the better of a statesman like Asquith who delightedly proclaimed that the "gate of Christianity in Europe" had again fallen into the hands of Christians and would not be given back. The Muslims of India were upset by the defeat of the Turks. They sent a medical mission of their own to Turkey. It is strange that Russia did not take any openly hostile part in these wars against Turkey. Nor did she claim any share in the colossal territorial losses which Turkey suffered. Greece got most as a result of the two years' war. It got in Macedonia 17,000 square miles with a population of about 1,699,000. It also got Crete, Samos and other Aegean islands. Serbia gained 15,000 square miles and 1,656,000 peoples. Bulgaria 9,600 square miles and 125,000 inhabitants. Montenegro obtained 251,000 peoples and 2,000 square miles of territory. Rumania captured 2,600 square miles and 286,000 inhabitants. The total loss of Turkey then came to about 4,239,000 inhabitants and 54,000 square miles.

There must have been some reason for the talented Turkish lady Halide Edib in attributing to Russia all the troubles in which Turkey was involved and which ended in disaster for her although there was reason to believe that the fate with which Turkey met at the hands of Italy, Austria and even the Balkans was not to the liking of Russia. Russia could not relish the idea of the Balkan States standing on their own legs to challenge Turkey. Nor did Russia make the slightest gesture of unfriendliness to Turkey on those occasions although England showed benevolence to Italy and sympathy even with Greece. The seat of the Peace Conference which signed away thousands of square miles of the Turkish territories and millions of the populations under Turkey

to others, was also London. In her learned lectures in India in 1935 Lady Halide Edib said :—"The Balkan wars were a dress rehearsal of the Great War. The preparation and the staging of both are due to the evil genius of Iswolski, the Russian Foreign Minister, perhaps the ablest minister of the late 19th and early 20th century. The present world confusion is due very largely to his machinations. Still one must admit that he was a patriot and gifted with an extraordinarily astute mind. Iswolski was opposed to the policy of expansion to the East, and after the Russian defeat of 1905, when he came into power, he set about manipulating the interests and ambitions of other European nations in order ultimately to secure the Straits and Constantinople for Russia. The most important consideration was somehow to obtain the consent of Great Britain and France. To placate England he came to an understanding with Japan in 1907 and settled all the Russo-Japanese differences specially in regard to the sphere of influence in China. In the same year Russia signed a convention with England with regards to Afghanistan, Tibet and Persia. The former two, they decided, to leave alone: Persia they divided up into two zones of influence. Further, Russia, to win over Great Britain's favour, seemed ready to encircle Germany. But still the British were not inclined at all to approve of Russia occupying the Straits. To get Austria on her side Iswolski met Count Aehrenthal in 1908, and suggested that Russia would accept Austria's annexation of Bosnia and Novi Bazar if she would in turn accept Russia's domination over the Straits. The Austrian statesman agreed to this on condition that Bulgaria and Rumania also had rights. With Italy, Iswolski bargained over Tripoli. Both Powers grabbed their promised slices before there was a general consent. But as England and France remained opposed to Russian control of the Straits, Iswolski thought of an indirect plan. Russia would have Turkey smashed and driven out by the intermediation of the Balkan Powers. Then Russia would get France and England involved in a greater European conflict in which Austria and Germany would be ousted from the Balkans. These two, the Germans and Turks, once out of the game, Russia could easily settle in the Straits and in Constantinople. In 1910 Iswolski resigned from the Russian Cabinet and became Ambassador to France from where he manoeuvred very ably the Balkan Confederation. From 1909 on Pan-Slavist propaganda in the Balkans stiffened. Intellectuals in Russia suddenly developed archæological and other interests in Macedonia and there they propagated the idea of a greater Serbia at the expense of Austria-Hungary. In the same year Russia signed a secret treaty with Bulgaria, the fifth clause of which read :—"The realisation of the high ideals of the Slav people in the

Balkans, which are so near to Russian heart, is only possible after a fortunate struggle with Germany and Austria-Hungary. In 1912 (March) Iswolski managed to persuade Bulgaria and Serbia to sign a secret treaty against Turkey. He communicated this to M. Poincaré asking him not to divulge it. Bulgaria obtained a loan of 180 million Francs, which she spent entirely on armaments. Russia seemed to want nothing beyond the right to arbitrate after the Turko-Bulgarian struggle was over."

It is very well to put the blame on the machinations of Iswolski but the question remains what were those people who had got rid of the Sultan Abdul Hamid Khan doing? The following is the reply to that question:—"While all this (machination of Iswolski) was going on behind the scenes the fears of the new régime in Turkey were being calmed by all means. In 1910 both the Bulgarian and Serbian Monarchs visited Turkey and assured the Porte of their pacific intentions. The Italians invited 150 prominent Turks to Italy and assured them that Italy had no territorial ambition and that if Turkey herself offered Tripoli she would refuse. Because of this assurance Turkey transferred her defensive forces from Tripoli to Yemen, where there was a rising. Only when the Italians occupied Tripoli did the Young Turks discover that it was the signal for a general attack." There could not be a greater condemnation of the "Young Turks" than to say that they allowed themselves to be deceived by Bulgaria, Serbia and Italy. And all this a little too palpably showed that if in the whole length and breadth of Turkey there was one far-sighted statesman he was no other than the much maligned Sultan Abdul Hamid Khan. All others were mere boobies.

When the Author went to Turkey in 1906 he found out that a large Turkish army was manoeuvring in Macedonia that year. And the reason for this he was told was that as certain Balkan States on the Turkish frontier had been found to collect their armies somewhere near the Turkish frontier and when asked the reason for this had said that it was nothing but the annual exercise of the troops, the astute Sultan had also ordered a larger army to move about on the same side with the result that the Balkan States saw sense and stopped that collection of their troops which they had done under the camouflage of manoeuvring. Never during his rule of thirty-three years did Sultan Abdul Hamid allow himself to be tricked by the European or Balkan States as his dethroners and detractors did with the result that the Great Empire was wrecked within five years of the dethronement of the much abused Sultan. After dethroning Sultan Abdul Hamid Khan, the Young Turks began to quarrel among themselves. Parliament was dissolved. After new elections the notorious pro-English Kamil Pasha came to power. Though old and

experienced he had too much faith in England and was confident that England would not allow a Balkan War. So in August, 1912, he demobilised 67,000 veterans stationed on the frontier although even a child could have seen that the Balkan States were getting ready to attack Turkey. They did attack. Little Montenegro was the first to declare war. Others followed. Turkey had only 100,000 soldiers on the frontier. They were all raw recruits as the veterans had been stupidly demobilised. Naturally collapse resulted, and Turkey lost within a few years of the removal of Sultan Abdul Hamid 54,000 square miles of territory and over four millions of subjects.

As soon as the Sultan was dethroned a new experiment in the Government of Turkey began to be tried. It was then called Ottomanism. The Author happened to visit Turkey again in those days. He laughed at the Ministers when they told him of this Ottomanisation. He told them that in India, and everywhere in countries with different nationalities, "divide and rule" was the motto of the ruling classes. In Turkey the policy of Ottomanisation resulted in the entry of non-Muslim soldiers into the army who sided with the Balkan Christians when opportunity arrived. Ottomanisation was the idea of Anwar Pasha. So was Pan-Turanianism which was tried later. Ottomanism cost Turkey her European Possessions excepting the *little belt* in Thrace. Pan-Turanianism cost her hundreds of thousands of valuable soldiers at a time when every soldier counted a good deal. It cost Turkey the loss of millions of population. It really caused her collapse in the World War.

It is a pity that the Author's prophecy in 1906 as to a "constitutional Government" in Turkey under Sultan Abdul Hamid Khan was only partially fulfilled. The Sultan's supervision was too quickly removed and the change was *not* "a triumph for Pan-Islamism." Instead, wild objects were pursued which wrecked the Empire.

The most generous, and to a certain extent correct, excuse advanced for the failure of the Young Turks in saving the Empire was by the Author's friend, Mr. Aubrey Herbert, M.P. He said:—"Forces ranked against the Young Turks were too formidable to admit the possibility of a rejuvenated Turkey, even if the leaders of the movement had all risen to the sustained height of the ideals which they proclaimed. Europe wanted a client, not a competitor. Officialdom was conservative and antagonistic, for the Young Turks were not conservative but experimentalists." But even this excuse cannot absolve the Young Turks from the blame of want of foresight and their failure to understand the mentality of Europe. It was the Young Turks who were responsible for the disorganisation or lack of that

all-conquering spirit in the army which had given the lightning victory to Turkey against Greece in 1896, before the Young Turks' régime. Who had prevented by his clever moves the Balkan States from uniting against Turkey? Who had kept up the solidarity of Musalmans in the huge Turkish Empire, though of different races, countries and colours and speaking different languages? How can the Young Turks be absolved from the blame of not taking every precaution for the safety and security of the Empire which should have been their *foremost* consideration before effecting any drastic change in the Government? Why was it that the European Powers at once felt that the change had effected a great weakness and they immediately began to take advantage of it? If the change was for more popular Government of the country it should have resulted in the strength of the Government instead of its terrible weakening. Then why was the Government weakened at all? The critics of Sultan Abdul Hamid fail to answer these questions. It is true that the Sultan had centralised the Government in his hands. In 1906 Sir Nicholas O'Conor, the British Ambassador to the Sublime Porte, told the Author at a luncheon he gave him that "the Sultan held the whole Empire in the hollow of his hands." But do not Mussolinis and Hitlers do the same? Does not Stalin and Mustafa Kemal—the "Ata-Turk" do the same? Did not Lenin himself do the same? And do all these Dictators treat their opponents any more mildly than did the late Sultan? What about the "blood baths" ?—the latest of which was enjoyed by Hitler on 30th June, 1934, but which was not distasteful even to a single one of the Dictators. Europeans mostly, but also certain Turks themselves, talk of lack of liberty in the days of Sultan Abdul Hamid Khan, and of his system of espionage. The Author had himself an experience of that in Turkey on his first visit. While in Constantinople, a friend told him one day that he had read that very morning an article by him on the question of the Khilafat in the London *Times*. The Author wanted to go over it himself so resorted to several places where the *Times* was available of that date. Yes, the *Times* was there all right. But that portion which contained the article had disappeared. Where did it go? Whoever read it considered it to be his duty to send it on to the Sultan! But almost the same is the case in every country which is ruled by Autocrats. The Author himself had unpleasant experience of that in India—his Home. As to liberty, where on earth can it be found these days? A European Writer says :—"Antiquity has never beheld despotism so penetrating and all-pervasive as in Germany, Italy and Russia." The Right Honourable Mr. Fisher could have well included India in the list. What about countries under the "Republic" of France and what

about the "Republic" of Turkey herself under her Dictator? These Dictators do not tolerate the least possible opposition to their often ruthless actions. They, with the exception perhaps of Mussolini who effected a reconciliation with the Pope after years of acute differences between the Italian Government and the Vatican, do not allow even the freedom of conscience, or civil liberties (in Turkey people have been hanged for wearing a fez!) to their citizens. In Turkey which is unfortunately a "lay republic" although the overwhelming majority, almost the whole rural population, is Muslim, the irony is that the Muslims are the only community who are under the tutelage of their "secularised" State regarding their religious life while the Christian and the Jewish Churches are entirely free. What a wonderful conception of "republic" is this that the country is administered by one man with a few of his friends against the conscience of the whole population—at least against the majority of the population? Nobody can deny facts and the fact is that the dethronement of Sultan Abdul Hamid may have given satisfaction to the Europeans; it may have given satisfaction even to some of the Turks themselves, but it resulted in a serious disruption of the Empire soon after. The Young Turks who had any love for the Empire felt extremely sad after the Tripoli and Balkan Wars. Madame Halide Edib said, "France and England felt that Turkey was broken and beaten for good. Her only asset, that of being a military Power of some importance, was no longer of any value. She ceased even to be regarded as a pawn in the international game. On the minds of the Turks the effects of the defeat were naturally greater still." But so enamoured of the Young Turks is Madame Halide that she tries to put the blame of the collapse of Turkey under them on the shoulders of the "Old School." If she could, by any possible means, she would have put it on the shoulders of poor Sultan Abdul Hamid. She says, "The direct cause of the disasters had been the senile vanity of Kamil Pasha and his blind belief in the honesty and humanity of the West, which led him to demobilise a veteran army, and the general bungling and inefficiency of men of the old School (this after three years of the Young Turks' control of the whole Empire). Their chances both as administrators and soldiers were now gone for ever. But the ignominy of defeat was not all that the Turks had to bear. The spectacle of Muslim refugees, men, women and children, fleeing from the fire and sword of the enemy, the slaying of prisoners of war, their mutilation and starvation, atrocities and massacres perpetrated on the civil population—the first of their kind in twentieth-century warfare—inflicted wounds far deeper than the defeat itself. For no voice was raised in the West against these horrors until when the Balkan Powers did to

each other what they had done to the Turks. Then Carnegie sent an International Commission to study the situation." We do not know why Madame Halide Edib did not add to her remarks that the Commission found the atrocities perpetrated on poor Muslims so shocking that its report was shelved. Nor did the learned lady say that these millions of Muslims, men and women, must have cursed the Young Turks for having dethroned the Sultan Khalifa, who had prevented these butcheries for thirty years, because his rule was hard upon a few of them. During her excellently delivered orations there were a few remarks of Madame Halide Edib which reminded the Author of the character that he gave to the Turks after having studied them on his first visit to Turkey. He told his companion that the Turks were the "John Bull" of the East. They were as phlegmatic, as unimaginative, as tenacious, as exclusive and as self-conscious as the British. They also believed all what they possessed was the very best in the world—even their tiny little so-called public garden. We will quote on this occasion only one of Madame Edib's remarks which reminded the Author's saying that the Turks were like the British. After talking of the disaster to Turkey in the Balkans, she said :—

"Unfortunately the Balkan disaster did not, as one would have imagined, bring the Muslims of the Empire close together. To the Muslim brothers of the outside we owe a great debt of gratitude. India helped us and all showed Turkey sympathy in every possible way. But within the Empire the separatist tendencies of the Muslims became more organised and determined." Only a Turkish Lady could think that the Young Turk régime or the disasters brought upon Turkey by its policy of Ottomanisation and unpardonable neglect of the defence of the Empire would bring the Muslims of the Empire close together when the connecting link had been weakened, because she belonged to an unimaginative race. On another occasion, like other European or British theorists, she expresses her view that Anwar Pasha had organised the Pan-Islamic movement, although as we have shown above Anwar Pasha had tried to organise Ottomanism and Pan-Turanianism not Pan-Islamism at all. In the same connection the learned Madame makes a remarkable confession in these words :—"Personally I could never make out its (Pan-Islamism's) political platform. It was possessed with a vague desire to unite the Muslims under the Caliph, but how the numerous geographical and other barriers were to be surmounted was never clearly visualised. It could have succeeded only as a spiritual, educative and moral force but unfortunately that phase of it remained negligible to the last. Germany toyed with it and the Allied Powers eyed it with suspicion. The Nationalists were against its political aspect, but as a

political force it was really always non-existent." The Turks who say that Pan-Islamism "as a political force was really always non-existent" do not seem to know the history of Turkey itself, nor what the Indians did to help her whenever she was in trouble since the days, at least, of the Crimean War. And only a person completely ignorant of the affairs of this world can deny that Pan-Islamism was a living factor when Italy raided Tripoli, or during the last Balkan War, or during the Great War when Turkey was allied against the Empire of which India formed a part. That Pan-Islamism, as a world-power, was weak, very, very weak, is unfortunately a fact but that was due to such Muslims as did not believe in Pan-Islamism in spite of their education because they did not possess political intelligence, or foresight enough to realize its importance.

If educated Muslims, particularly of such places where the government and even the military means were in the hands of Muslims, had realized in time the importance of Pan-Islamism to have organised or helped those who wanted to organise the masses on Pan-Islamic lines, then the weight of Pan-Islamism at the crisis would have been unshakable for the enemies of Turkey herself.

It was not that Muslims, at least of India, did not do all they could to help Turkey only because of their Pan-Islamism, when she was down. It is, however, true that Pan-Islamism did not prove very highly effective, the reason being that the Muslim Nation was not properly organised.

We fail to see how "geographical or other barriers" could have stopped, in these days of improvement in the means of transport, Muslims from establishing brotherly relations between Muslims of different countries, or why should it have been impossible to have a Pan-Islamic flotilla or a merchant marine to carry on trade between Muslims of different countries or to make arrangements for carrying Muslim pilgrims on Muslim-owned and even *Muslim-built* luxurious Steamers ?

Or what could have prevented the Muslim Khalifa from sending his representative to Muslim countries not only for *baiat* but also for collecting a portion of the *Zakat* to advance the cause of Islam, to defend the Khalifa or the Holy Places of Islam as *international* institutions or to have a University at Istanbul or Medina not only for teaching the Holy Quran but also *Hikmat*—science, the best gift of God to man as the Quran itself calls science?

Numerous such schemes were floating in the mind of the Author himself, but he unfortunately belonged to a country whose inhabitants had allowed it to have been conquered by aliens and he did not get any encouragement from the hands of those who were in a position to give due help not for the sake of Islam alone but even for the sake of their own country—their Nation.

The only Pan-Islamic enterprise in recent years that Turkey undertook was under Sultan Abdul Hamid Khan. It was the Hedjaz Railway but even from that she failed to draw full advantage.

So brainless the leading Turks have been that they did not value the best prize they possessed and have thrown it away of their own accord, and thus have played into the hands of their own enemies and enemies of world peace and happiness. It is a shame that even the best talented and the most intelligent among them fail "to make out the political platform" of Pan-Islamism and even the "Ata Turk" unnecessarily adopts a policy of pinpricks for his own people.

We have already dealt with the question of *Pan-Islamism* separately elsewhere particularly with its "spiritual, educative and moral force," and we claim to have studied the question in all its aspects for a longer period than any other living man. Suffice it to say here that anybody, who admits that he or she cannot make out what Pan-Islamism is, has no right to expect that Muslims of other races and colours, etc., would feel for the Turks as their brothers or would not cherish "separatist tendencies" particularly when they see that the chief connecting cord had almost been broken to bits, and Ottomanism and Pan-Turanianism had taken the place of Pan-Islamism. The soldiers of Albania, Macedonia or Arabia did fight before for the *Turkish* Sultan in torn shoes, tattered garments, and with very simple food with all the attachment to his person and with the death-defying courage and enthusiasm against the enemies of their religion, their culture, their civilization, their social system, and their sacred Head (Khalifa), because the Ottoman Sultan was their Khalifa, and loved them, and bound them together in spite of all racial and other differences, into one cord. But the Young Turks had humiliated the Khalifa. They had almost broken the uniting cord. They had adopted Ottomanism. The Author saw with his own eyes an Armenian selling, near the Sublime Porte, picture postcards with the Sultan-Khalifa Abdul Hamid's photos, having naked women painted in his long curled beard. In many other ways the position of the Khalifa which had been considered sacrosanct before was humiliated. The Author then and there pointed out to Ahmad Raza Bey (who wielded great influence with the Young Turks) that it was a dangerous political mistake to weaken the Iron Chain which linked different Muslim citizens of the Turkish Empire as no other chain possibly could. The Author put before the Young Turk Leaders the example of the British. In their very early history they compelled their King to grant them a *magna charta* of rights. Then they even beheaded a King to get the rights of the people

established. The British people are proud to possess "the mother" of all the representative and democratic Parliaments. Yet they, even in this age of republicanism and Bolshevism, when empires and kingly dynasties have gone up in smoke, worship their King. The British are not a mad people. They know what they are doing. They have an object. It is no other than to keep a link to connect those people of different races, colours and countries which form the British Empire, and which is so extensive that the sun never sets in it. Not only does the democratic British nation still cling to its monarchical system, it also continues to attach great political importance to its religion although who does not know that the political value of Christianity is as nil when compared to Islam.

Every year in the Lord Mayor's show-procession, a car carries a huge Bible with remarks in bold letters to this effect:— "This is the secret of England's glory."

Not only this. In India a large sum is annually budgeted for the Christian Ecclesiastical expenditure in the civil and army departments, and now by the new Act even Indian Legislatures and Parliaments have been deprived of any power to reduce that budget even by a farthing.

Not only this. K. R. Wales, Chief Secretary of the Sudan United Mission, said:—"The British Government realised the difficulties which would arise if the twenty or thirty million pagan Sudanese became Muslim.. It had appealed to the Sudan United Mission to extend its work, and had opened doors to the Mission, which unfortunately it could not enter because of the lack of support from the Christian Churches at home. Mohammadanism had been definitely increasing, and there was need for haste if the Sudanese were to be saved from the Muslims."

Everybody knows of the political ambitions of Sig. Mussolini. Probably Kemal Pasha also realizes them. But we wonder if he knows that this great political man has reconciled, after long years, the Italian State with the Pope while Kemal has abolished the Turkish Khilafat.

Mussolini, as a wise man, is prepared to adopt every means which will **solidify** the nation. But the present head of Turkey is trying his best to *isolate* Turkey as a "lay republic".

It would have been very funny if the matter were not really too serious that the same man is so much afraid of his Nationalism failing to solidify his Nation that he is keen on removing all subjects of Turkey who are not Muslims from at least the danger zones in Turkey and is even ready to receive Muslims (whatever may their Nationality be) to Turkey from the Balkans. This means that he feels that he cannot depend much upon the non-Muslim part of the Turkish Nation. Yet he calls the Turkish Muslim

State a secular State. Undeniably this Secular State or Lay Republic is populated, so far at least, with very devout Muslims who have even been sacrificing their lives for Islam. When such is the case of this "Lay Republic", if it is not changed, it will not only be isolated from the outside world but most of its own citizens will feel dissatisfied with it—at least those religious-minded of them who are proud to feel that it is their State and that its Government and its Parliaments represent them.

How can the Muslim population take a pride in a "Lay" State?

The Young Turks also had a reforming genius but they never adopted such measures as to isolate Turkey or to make the peoples of Turkey take no pride in their country. On the contrary they adopted the policy of Ottomanism that non-Muslim citizens and Muslim citizens both may unite themselves in one nation, although that link proved to be weak at the time of the crisis, but the object was solidification not disintegration.

We never meant nor mean now to denounce altogether the Young Turk régime On the contrary we put in their stongest defence in "The Standard Bearers of Islam." We have great regard for the Young Turks. There is no doubt that the Young Turks tried to introduce several educational and economic reforms of great value in Turkey. Their motives were good and for the betterment of their Nation. The best thing they did was the abolition of Capitulations in September, 1911. Capitulations had become the symbol of subordination as nothing else was. They were the greatest handicap to the sovereign rights of Turkey. Besides, they caused great financial and economic loss to the Turkish Government. During the War also, the Young Turk Government conducted many useful Reforms. Nobody can deny the reforming spirit of the Young Turks. If the European Powers had given them time they would undoubtedly have reformed Turkey and raised it up to the level of any European country. But this reforming genius cannot absolve them as it cannot absolve Amanullah Khan, for neglecting those steps which would have prevented the disruption of the State itself. Hitler, Mussolini, Trotsky, and Lenin all had a greater reforming genius in their own way but not one of them allowed that reforming genius to run over the regard for the *security* of the State. When pressed by Germans, the Great Reformer, Lenin, committed to Communism and the anti-Imperialism as no other person was, supported his colleague Trotsky when the latter proposed to ask the Allies for aid against the Germans, with these words:—"Please add my vote in favour of the receipt of support and arms from the Anglo-French Imperialist bandits." Bolsheviks were supposed to be doctrinaire, but their first and foremost consideration was to save the State. They were ready for all kinds of

compromises for that purpose. Mirsky says: "One of the first measures proposed by Lenin to the second Conference had for its aim to bring over the peasants to the side of the Soviet Government. This was the land decree passed by the Conference at its second sitting on 8th November (26th October, *i.e.*, the very next day of the insurrection of 1917). "In 1921," says another biographer of Lenin (Bhargava), "Lenin revised the Programme by giving up the old policy in the economic field and adopting the New Economic Policy which is known as N.E.P." In the eleventh Party Congress held in March, 1922, Lenin defended his inconsistency with these words:—"By one side a Capitalist is busy, he acts as a robber, he grabs profits, but he knows his job, and you—you are trying new methods, and you make no profits. Communist principles, excellent ideas, are writ large on you; you are holy men fit to go alive to Paradise. But do you know your business?" Then Lenin recommended to the people that they should get rid of their communist conceit and went on "we must understand this simple thing, that in a new and unusually difficult task we must learn to begin anew again and again. If one start led you into a blind alley, begin again, re-do the work ten times, but attain your end, do not be self-important, do not pride yourself on being a Communist." Lenin further said, "All the revolutionary parties, that have hitherto fallen, have fallen because they became proud and unable to see where their strength lay, and were afraid to speak of their weakness. We shall not fall, however, as we are not afraid to speak of our weakness and will have to overcome our weakness." Both Amanullah Khan and the Young Turks learnt of their weakness and mistakes when it was too late. Just as disaster overtook Afghanistan because Amanullah Khan did not realize his weakness in time, so disaster came to Turkey in the Balkans through the negligence of the Young Turks and their failure to realize their weakness. And even worse disasters than the Balkan ones followed for the same reason.

In November, 1914, Turkey joined the World War. Russia was first in its declaration of War. England followed immediately. Those conceited people in the world who think that they can control all the circumstances and who pretend that they do not believe in Fate, should ponder over the incidents of the Great War. They may think over the circumstances which led to the grouping of Powers during the War and because of which Turkey joined on the side of Germany.

People in Turkey were mostly pro-British. When the "Young Turks" revolution took place, friendly demonstrations were made before the British Embassy in Constantinople (Istanbul). Sultan Abdul Hamid had initiated a new policy of

being specially friendly to Germany, but the public opinion was inclined to the old "friend"—Britain. Therefore when the Great War came on, most of the Turkish Statesmen tried to be accepted by the *entente* Powers as their partner. Everybody knows that Anwar Pasha was pro-German. He signed a defensive alliance with Germany on 31st July, 1914. But only a week after that *he himself went to the Russian Embassy and gave his word to attack Austria and fight with every pro-German Balkan State provided Turkey was given a chance to wipe off her Balkan defeat and to make some changes in the map of the Balkans favourable to her.* On 24th December, 1914, Mr. L. Mallet, the British Ambassador to the Sublime Porte, telegraphed to Sir Edward Grey, the British Secretary for Foreign Affairs:—"His Highness (the Turkish Prime Minister) seemed more occupied with the Balkan situation at the moment than with anything else. He said that the Turkish Government would be unable to refrain from an attempt to get back what they had lost in the Balkan Wars if Balkan complication ensued. No arguments of mine would induce him to change his attitude in this respect. He said, "he would be powerless to prevent it."

But Britain in no case would allow the discomfiture of Greece even though Greece at that moment was more pro-German than pro-English ; and neither Zaharoff nor Venezelos could be ignored by Mr. Lloyd George. It also happened that England had taken steps only a little over a month before, which had very seriously affected her popularity, not only with the Turkish Statesmen, but also with the Turkish masses. Since the Balkan defeat the Turks had been smarting. They raised a subscription from the Turkish poor masses and ordered two men-of-war of the very modern type from England. The British Government confiscated both the ships even before the declaration of war. Turkish Naval Officers and crew had arrived in England to take those ships away to Turkey but they were commandeered by Britain. The money was also confiscated. This naturally upset Turkey. Mr. Mallet telegraphed to the English Secretary for Foreign Affairs on 18th August, 1914:—"His Highness said that the seizure of Turkish ships building in England by His Majesty's Government had caused the whole crisis, as almost every Turkish subject had subscribed towards the purchase, terrible impression had been made throughout Turkey, where British attitude had been attributed to the intention to assist Greece in aggressive designs against Turkey. Turkish population would have understood if Great Britain had paid for the ships or if she had promised to return them when the war was over, but as it was it looked like robbery. Germans had not been slow to exploit the situation of which they had taken every advantage." Besides this, both France and England expected a good deal from

the Imperialism of Russia. They would not do anything which Russia did not approve. Russia could not approve of an alliance with Turkey because her chief war aims were the Straits and Constantinople. Thus the party in Turkey which was pro-British became weaker. The sympathy which England had shown to Italy and the Balkans was itself sufficient to make the task of pro-Germans easier. The policy adopted by England after the outbreak of the Great War which was anti-Turkish and pro-Greece strengthened still further the hands of the pro-Germans.

Germans also gave two of their men-of-war to the Turks which bravely entered the Dardanelles although pursued by the British Mediterranean fleet. So the Turks were quite justified in choosing Germany as their ally. On the occasion of a visit to Mr. Montagu, who was the Secretary of State for India, the Author indignantly said that it did not lie in the mouth of Britain to blame the Turks for having joined the Central Powers in the War.

If Anwar Pasha had not frittered away the brave Muslim Turkish army in his Pan-Turanian hobbies and adventures, which caused a loss of thousands upon thousands of brave Turkish soldiers in the frozen mountains of Caucasia, the history of the Great War would have been quite different to what it is and the situation of Turkey would not have been what it came to be when the War ended.

The Turkish offensive against the Russians in the Caucasus ended in a disastrous retreat. Early in January, 1915, Russian armies were victorious at Sarikamish and Aradhan, while another Russian column drove back a Turkish force which had invaded Western Persia. From Tabriz the Turkish army had to retire from the Vilayat of Van and also from the Suez Canal.

One other fact which had a great effect upon the part played by the Turkish army in the Great War was the alienation of the feelings of the Arabs through the intrigues of England on the one hand and the harsh and ruthless treatment meted out to them by Djamal Pasha in Syria on the other. When the War was still on, the Author, who had been devoted to the Turks since his childhood and always defended them, was given the shocking news by his Arab friends that Djamal Pasha was ill-treating the Arabs and had left several Arab leaders' bodies hanging in the streets of Damascus after having shot them.

It is true that in every country rebels were treated with exemplary punishment but in our age exemplary punishments, with a racial tinge, generally create a spirit of greater revolt. Generally it does not succeed in subduing the national spirit. In the case of the Arabs it was foolish to expect that the revolt would be cowed down by brutality when there were powerful intrigues of the enemies of the Turks to arouse racial antagonism.

And so it did. By the excesses of Djamal Pasha, who was the Turkish General in the Arabic-speaking country, it was impressed upon the mind of the non-Turkish Muslims, that the propaganda which was being made by France and Britain, that the Young Turks were anti-Islam and that they were pure and simple Pan-Turanians and that they intended to return even to the worship of the "White Wolf", was after all not quite false.

Those Turks who want to justify the stupid anti-Islamic moves of the present-day Turkish rulers use the argument that Pan-Islamism was not the living force at that moment. Pan-Islamism is always a living force among Musalmans. Anybody, who knew how the eighty million Musalmans of India were fired with the zeal of Pan-Islamism in those days, cannot deny that Pan-Islamism was a living force even at that moment, although the Turks themselves had done everything to kill it. Excepting the early Ottomans, no Turkish ruler or people understood Pan-Islamism at all, if we do not take into consideration for the moment Sultan Abdul Hamid's limited Pan-Islamism, which being novel in the case of the Turks, earned the affection of the Muslims and the enmity of the Europeans. Sultan Abdul Hamid was considerate to his non-Turkish people also, and it was for this reason that after his dethronement and humiliation, Albanians, Arabs and Kurds, etc., did not show such a close attachment to the Turks, as some people had expected.

During the Great War it was impressed upon the Muslim peoples that no question of religion was involved in it. There were certain phases of the War which confirmed this viewpoint. One of these was referred to by the Paris Peace Conference in its reply to the memorandum of the Turkish Delegation of 17th June, 1919. It deprecated the raising of the religious issue "by a struggle in which Protestant Germany, Roman Catholic Austria, Orthodox Bulgaria, and Muslim Turkey banded themselves together to plunder their neighbours." With such telling propaganda on the one hand and certain exemplary actions on the part of the Turkish generals and ministers on the other, it could not be surprising that the *Fatva* of *Jihad* "fell flat" (it did not actually fall flat as an eye-witness Indian Muslim who himself joined the Jihad because of that *Fatva* told the Author) and "Muslim brothers still continued to fight against the Turks". As has been said before that anybody who is the least conversant with the history of the post-War incidents and knows the state of agitation and revolution in India when the *Entente* Powers tried to destroy Turkey by their Peace terms can never say that Pan-Islamism was not a living force. Indian women gave away their well-loved ornaments to help the Turks. Young men wrecked their careers to agitate for the *Khilafat*. Students were turned

out of their schools and colleges when they attended the meetings and movements to help the cause of the Turks. Thousands of respectable people gladly courted prison and demonstrated their sympathy with the Turks, demanding easy terms for them when they were defeated. Thousands of Indian Muslims were so infuriated that they refused to live under a Government which was inimical to Turkey and so left their homes and hearths and suffered innumerable hardships in the neighbouring countries. Even such loyalists as H. H. the Aga Khan, the Right Honourable Syed Amir Ali and Government Servants such as Sir Abbas Ali Beg and Mr. Aftab Ahmed Khan, publicly expressed their sympathies with Turkey and sent memorial after memorial (half a dozen were printed in a separate pamphlet) to get milder terms for Turkey when she was on her knees. What was all this agitation, sacrifice, loss, rebellion against their own Government, voluntary exile and courting of imprisonment and sometimes even death, due to ? What had the Muslims of India got to do with the "descendants of barbarous and blood-thirsty Chengiz or "Halaku" (the killer) if it was not the spirit of Pan-Islamism which created a brotherly affection for the "unspeakable Turks ?" There was nothing common between the Turks and Indians--neither race nor language, except Islam. Undoubtedly there were Muslim soldiers in the Indian mercenary army of Britain but that was not due to lack of Pan-Islamism. It was due to over-powering circumstances. The Author personally knows of Turks themselves who acted as spies against their own countrymen and reviled them in those days of War. Did not the Turkish Sultan himself send an army against the Turkish leaders fighting for the liberty of Turkey ? And was not Sultan Vahiduddeen, who accepted the slavish conditions, and those persons who signed the horrible Treaty of Sevres themselves Turks ? What could those thousands of Germans do who were in America when America declared war upon Germany and when America's help turned Germany's glorious victory into a most disgraceful defeat which imposed upon her the hardest possible and most humiliating terms of peace ? Does the fact that they did not, rather could not, revolt show that Germanism in them was dead or was it only *force majeure* which kept them quiet observers of the defeat of the fatherland ? Some of the Germans had even to fight against their brother Germans.

In those glorious days of Ottoman history when Turkish Sovereigns and Turkish armies gained a victory almost every year the Turkish people and their Rulers were thoroughly imbued indeed with the spirit of Pan-Islamism. Salim the Grim had once even made up his mind to convert all his Christian and Jewish subjects to Islam either by preaching or by force. And it was

the true spirit of Pan-Islamism alone (as no other power on earth could restrain him from carrying out his object) which stopped him from using force for conversion. The learned *alims* themselves pointed out to him that Islam forbade compulsion in religion. لااكراه في الدين

But in later years if there were any spirit of Pan-Islamism left in the Turkish Rulers, they would not have been degenerated as they were. Quite a large number of them had had to be dethroned by the Fatvas of the Muslim Ulema themselves as unfit to hold the headship of the Muslim Nation. Degeneration and Pan-Islamism do not go together. If the Turks had any Pan-Islamism in them in later years they would not have allowed the Muslim Empires of Spain and India to be destroyed before their very eyes. How often have Christian Powers saved small Christian States from the Turks themselves. Turks never showed that kind of sympathy with Muslim States. In fact in India the Muslim Empire was destroyed by the indirect assistance which England received from the Turkish Sultan and Khalifa who even sent a letter to India in favour *not* of the Muslim King but in that of the British. No other race probably lacked Pan-Islamism more than the Turks. The last time that the Turks showed any trace of Pan-Islamism was in the wording of the appeal sent to President Wilson of America in March, 1919, by certain Turkish dignitaries. They said *inter alia*:—"Besides this, the Powers wish without demanding their consent, to liberate certain Mussalman peoples of the Ottoman Empire—peoples that have never expressed a desire in that direction, for our Empire is a Mussalman State, in which the Arab and Kurds enjoy the same rights as the Turks. Islam recognises no differences of nationality. Are we then to be freed from our own rule ? That is a pretext to destroy us and to reduce us to slavery . . . . This mania for dismemberment and the mode of procedure are far, Mr. President, from corresponding to your initial intentions . . . . . But there must not be two sorts of justice. If you desire really to apply the principles of justice, why exclude the Turkish Nation and the Mussalmans ? Why wrench from them their patrimony ? The Ottoman Empire constitutes an indivisible whole, in which among the Turks, Arabs and Kurds, there are neither oppressors nor oppressed."

The fact is that Sultan Abdul Hamid had given certain special rights to the Arabs which even the Turks did not possess and by such methods he had kept his non-Turkish people more attached to the Ottoman Empire.

For the last thirty-five or forty years and more the Author himself has been trying to arouse the feelings of Pan-Islamism in Muslims and he met with very little response from the Turks.

After the Italian day-light robbery in Tripoli, the Author induced a few other Indian Muslims to form an Association, to safeguard the Muslim Centre—*Kaaba*, and to help the Turks who were its custodians in protecting it from the *Italians*, etc. We should remember that every European Power is an Italy in embryo and would not hesitate to do with Arabia as Italy did with Tripoli in pre-War days or it has done with Abyssinia to-day. *A Khuddamal Kaaba*, the *Servants of Kaaba Association* was formed. It was meant to give the Turks a very substantial help annually besides a moral help by arousing the spirit of Pân-Islamism all over the world in favour of the Khalifa who happened to be the Turkish Sovereign. One of the rules of the Association was to collect one rupee (1*s.* 4*d.*) from every Mussalman annually, *i.e.*, about Rs. 80,000,000. One-third of the collected sum was to be spent in India on Mosques and Schools, etc., but two-thirds of the whole sum was to be sent out to the Khalifa to defend the Kaaba by providing submarines and aeroplanes, etc., and to serve the Islamic Centre and the Muslim Nation by having universities and technical schools there, open to all Muslims of every part of the world who may like to go there. The Association would have relieved the Turks of a great burden and would have raised their power and prestige but so unimaginative were they that they expressed their disapproval of it instead of encouraging it. Some of them were so suspicious as to think it to be a part of the Pan-Arab movement. Alas! Fate was against them. Just when the Author had made arrangements to go to Turkey with his friend Allama Shawaish, and an Indian theologian, to remove the misunderstandings, the Turks were fated to meet with the disaster before Pan-Islamism was organised. They were fated to ally themselves with the losing side. And they lost. But nobody can deny the fact that they gave a glorious account of themselves as Muslims. At Gallipoli and Kut and Caucasia they added new chapters to their already glorious history.

The Turkish Nation, *since the time that it allowed Islam to mould its character*, became a nation worthy of the highest respect of all nations. Probably it was Napoleon who said that if he had Turkish soldiers under him he could conquer the world. Somebody also said that the Turkish army lacked only good officers.

If all that is said about Anwar Pasha and other Young Turk Leaders who conducted the Great War is even half true it is not surprising at all that Turkey met with the disaster. A historian whom we personally knew and who is maliciously against the Young Turks has described the disaster and its cause thus:—"The adventurers who used his (Sultan Mohammad V's) name and dragged Turkey into the war were as unscrupulous and tyrannical, though they pretended to democratic principles,

as any of those who in former times had bought their Office from the Seraglio. They filled their pockets whilst their people were starving and Anwar Pasha, above all, who was in charge of the actual conduct of the War, set the example of ruthless speculation in food supplies at the cost of his unfortunate soldiers, who were driven by their want to desert in tens of thousands. Too obstinate and vain-glorious to accept the more experienced advice of the German Officers whom he had called into Turkey, he squandered the limited fighting strength of his armies on scattered fronts and sometimes on remote and bootless adventures in pursuit of wild political dreams which had not even the merit of originality for the Pan-Turanian megalomania of the Young Turks was merely the contagious infection of Pan-German megalomania. An extra turn of the screw was given to all the traditional forms of oppression at the risk of sapping the inert loyalty of the Muhammadan masses themselves. The hanging at Damascus or Beirut assured the response to be given soon afterwards, throughout the Arab Provinces to the trumpet-call of the Sharif of Mecca, and the welcome ultimately accorded to the British armies as their liberators from an intolerable yoke." The same historian further says:- "Those who had staked their fortune on the war fled from Constantinople in October, 1918, leaving to others the humiliation of suing for peace, when nine-tenths of the large armies which they had conscripted to disaster had melted away, and one-fourth of the whole population had perished from the effects of wanton misgovernment quite as much as from inevitable losses on the battle-field." The above is undoubtedly a too over-drawn and malicious picture but the Author *personally heard from Muslim eye-witnesses* certain facts corroborating one of the two incidents related above. It cannot be denied that Turkey suffered great losses in the War not only territorially but also in men. According to Turkish calculations 427,000 were killed, 400,000 wounded and 123,000 prisoners or missing. All the Arab Provinces and populations were lost to her. This was due to the treachery of the Arabs and the mercenary armies from India. It has been well said that the disease of the East began from its toe—India. The slaves of India as mercenaries of a Western Power have put the chains of slavery on many an Eastern people. By the end of 1918 Turkey was prostrate.

In his book *Turkey* Mr. Arnold Toynbee says, "Like wolves about a camp-fire the Powers were prowling at the threshold with hungry eyes. For Turkey is rich by nature and Imperialism is greedy."

Sultan Muhammad V died on 3rd July, 1918. His brother Vahiduddeen came to the throne as Mohammad VI. Anwar Pasha, Talaat Pasha, Djamal Pasha and almost all Young

Turk Leaders quitted Turkey soon after. Bulgaria threw up the sponge in September, 1918. On 29th October, 1918, Turkish envoys boarded the British Admiral's flagship at Mudros and sought peace. On 30th the Armistice was signed. The terms imposed by the Armistice included the surrender of the whole Turkish army. If disorders broke out the Allies were given a right to occupy in the six Armenian Vilayets in Asia Minor any points which they thought necessary. The Armistice laid no condition as to the Allies occupation of Constantinople, nor of the surrender of arms or munition, nor any interference in the internal administration or form of Government of Turkey. But respect for treaties or of their plighted words is not the strong point with the European Nations. Only ten days after the Armistice a powerful British fleet with a few French ships entered the Dardanelles and anchored in the Golden Horn with its guns trained towards the Sultan's Palace. The British had met with disaster when they had tried to enter the Straits during the War. Suvla Bay was the grave of their reputation. But the British are always strong with the weak. Now, when Turkey had fallen, they sent their fleet through the Dardanelles and landed the army in Constantinople although they did not enter the Capital of any of their other enemies. They occupied Istanbul, Cilicia and Chanak.

If Russia had not been Bolshevised she was certain to have been given the sole occupation of Istanbul and that permanently. But Bolsheviks were not Imperialists, although the provisional Government of Russia which was formed immediately after the dethronement of the Czar was as keen on occupying Istanbul as were the Czars and Czarinas—Catherine of Russia had been most keen in occupying Constantinople.

On the very next day that Turkey entered the World War, *i.e.*, on 13th November, 1914, the Russian Ambassador, Count Berkendorff, was told by King George V, "Constantinople must be yours." On the basis of these remarks a few months later, Czar Nicholas II said, at a Royal reception, to the French Ambassador, M. Paliologue, "I have, Monsieur Ambassador, made up my decision. The city of Constantinople with Southern Thrace must be incorporated in my Empire." These were verbal talks. Later on by four secret treaties the Turkish Empire was distributed among all the four big Powers of the Entente Group who were not supposed to be fighting for any territorial aggrandizement. The first was an agreement between England, France and Russia in March, 1916. By this the Straits were given to Russia but Istanbul was to be a free port and the sacred places of Islam in Arabia were to be given to the Sharif of Mecca. In April, 1915,

a pact was signed in which Adalia was offered to Italy as a bait for her joining the Entente Group. Then came the Sykes-Picot agreement signed between Russia, France, England and Italy in May, 1916. This was kept secret from the Arabs as it contradicted in several respects the promises made by England to Sharif Husain. So that when the Bolsheviks published it from the Russian archives later on Husain was disillusioned and refused to sign the Treaty of Sevres. How well has Mr. Toynbee described that third treaty in *Turkey* when he says, "This private and secret treaty indicates, as do the others, the way in which, anticipating the successful outcome of the War, the Allied representatives carved up an Empire and planned new States as if the countries and people of the world were Jigsaw puzzles, to be toyed with, shaked up and refitted as a statesman's pastime." The fourth treaty was signed in April, 1917, and Italy was promised Western Asia and Smyrna. But then Bolsheviks dethroned the Czar. A new provisional Government came in. As far as the Russian ambitions went it was no different from the Czar's Government. If possible it was even more Imperialist. Miliukov, the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs, indignantly denied that the new Russian Republic would surrender in the least those privileges and concessions which secret agreements with Russia's Allies had granted to Russia in respect of either the Straits or Istanbul (Constantinople).

M. E. A. Adam writes in *Constantinople and the Straits*, "Miliukov considered both Constantinople and the Straits were the life interests of Russia."

The very first good which the Bolsheviks thus did to Turkey and to Muslims who had been for generations attached to Istanbul as the seat of their Khalifa was that they at once forsook all the Imperial ambitions of old Russia in respect of Constantinople. Only a month after the Communist *coup d'état, i.e.,* on 7th December, 1917, a proclamation under the signature of Lenin and Checherin was issued that "Constantinople must remain in the hands of Muslims"—they used the word "Muslims" not the "Turks". There were these irreligious, rather anti-religious, persons ready to respect the religious sentiments of Muslims ! What wonder that Muslims hailed Bolshevism ! What a contrast the Bolshevik regards for the religious feelings of Mussalmans made with that of the British Statesmen at the Paris Peace Conference can be judged by the following report sent by an English correspondent of an English daily on 19th May, 1919, which ran:—"With a greater practical experience of Mohammedans than is possessed by any other of the Great Powers Great Britain is willing to see a final end put to the temporal as well as religious claims of the Ottoman dynasty." He further made it clear that "the British

Statesmen did not agree with the French contention that this complete disruption of the dominions of the late Khalifa (to the British journalists Khilafat was finished even then) is a political blunder." - And this was the case after the British Statesmen had issued proclamation after proclamation (in India one was issued on 7th November, 1914) assuring "His Majesty's most loyal Muslim subjects that no question of a religious character is involved." The Author has reason to believe that Mr. Lloyd George was at first determined to deprive the Turks of Contantinople. All other British Ministers, including Curzon, but excepting Montagu, agreed to it. But we think that it was the Bolshevik announcement that showed so great a respect for the Muslim sentiments which took his courage away, the more so because agitation in India was reaching to fever point in its intensity and fury. Chirol has written, "In India itself the Pro-Turkish agitation had assumed increasingly menacing proportions." There was nothing surprising in this. The Allies led by the British had been committing outrages in Constantinople and the fact which hurt the Muslims and also all respectable and self-respecting Hindus to the quick was that the Indian mercenaries had been shipped to Istanbul and were slave-like taking part in these excesses. The houses of the Nationalist Turks were raided. A large number of respectable Turkish statesmen and noblemen including the Prime Minister Prince Said Halim and the world-renowned Turkish Admiral Rauf Bey (a friend of the Author for whom he cherishes very great brotherly affection and who is a really great Naval genius), whose name had become a bye-word all over the Muslim world since he had performed miracles of movements with his small boat Hamidiah during the Balkan war, were exiled to Malta. The Turkish Parliament was dissolved. Martial Law was proclaimed. Even Christian bands were armed to stop the Nationalists from going over to Asia Minor. A special Court was constituted which passed death sentences on Mustafa Kemal and others. Since the very first day Sultan Mohammed VI, for whom nobody had much respect, came under the influence of the foreigners. Cabinet after Cabinet changed. First Izat Pasha was the Prime Minister to arrange the Armistice. Then on 10th November, 1918, the old Statesman of Turkey, Tewfik Pasha (who was the Minister for Foreign Affairs in 1906 and was specially kind to the Author) came in. He had been for some time the Ottoman Ambassador in London. In March, 1919, he gave his place to Damad Farid Pasha (also personally known to the Author). The Sultan being Pro-British, his Ministers were the same. If any peace with Turkey had been signed then Turkey would have been finished as an Independent State. Even the Treaty of Sevres could most

probably have been imposed. Turkey then was absolutely helpless. But the Young Turk leaders, Anwar Pasha (the Author never met him), Talaat Pasha (the Author met him and Djavid Bey at Rome with his friend Dr. Nihad Rishad who had worked with the Author for the Turkish cause in France and had also presented the Angora case in London with great ability), Djemal Pasha—all of them who had fled from Turkey, were active—Anwar Pasha, the most of all. He was the first to try and approach the Bolsheviks. He once tried to fly to Russia but met with a mishap. As all Muslims are interested in his career in its final stage it will not be inopportune to describe it as shortly as possible here. The most authentic account has been given by Mr. Fischer as far as it is connected with the Bolsheviks. We take most of the facts from his very informative book.

The Bolsheviks had adopted a very sympathetic and helpful attitude towards the Turkish revolution in Asia Minor. But because there was rivalry between two Turkish leaders, Anwar Pasha and Kemal Pasha, both of whom approached the Bolsheviks for help, the latter found at times their position a little awkward. Anwar Pasha was a world figure when Kemal Pasha was nobody. During the War, Anwar Pasha was the actual Ruler of Turkey. He was advised by two other Young Turks—Talaat Pasha and Djamal Pasha. Anwar Pasha had won the affection and admiration of the whole East. Even Kemal Pasha's Tripoli exploits or Gallipoli heroism were not known at all anywhere except perhaps to the Turkish officers. While upto this day, Kemal Pasha seems to be suffering from the *inferiority complex* in relation to Europe having been overawed completely by its civilization, Anwar Pasha and his colleagues—Talaat Pasha and Djamal Pasha —possessed demonstratively a *superiority complex* and, even when defeated, had high ambitions.

The Author is an optimist. He is a confirmed Pan-Islamist. If he were daunted by adverse circumstances he could not be a Pan-Islamist. He claims to have a poetic imagination too. But even he was taken aback when, in a conversation at Rome some time in early 1922 or so, Talaat Pasha, while discussing with the Author the future prospects of Turkey, said words to this effect:— "*Now that Czarist Russia is finished the East is before us—the Turks.*" These brave words were uttered when the condition of Turkey was the darkest—when even the Asia Minor revolution had not established itself. The Sultan at Istanbul then was a slave of the foreigners and did their biddings. It was the undying optimism and superiority complex of the triumvirate, as it has been called— Anwar, Talaat and Djamal (alas! all killed later), which made them dream of other Empires even when the Turkish Empire itself was in the melting pot. Talaat Pasha could not give

practical effects to his ambitions but Djamal Pasha and Anwar Pasha did. Djamal Pasha with Halil Pasha and Sami Bey arrived in Moscow even before Anwar Pasha did. Djamal Pasha was not anti-Kemalist. But he too was anti-British. The Bolsheviks were at that time hard pressed by the British. They welcomed Djamal Pasha. They thought of the idea of using Djamal Pasha's talents against the British. The best course that suggested to them was to send him to Kabul. Afghanistan was just then struggling for Independence. At Kabul the new Amir Amanullah Khan was glad to receive Djamal Pasha. It was Djamal Pasha who organised the Afghan army. The constitution of Afghanistan was also framed largely by him. His friend Anwar Pasha met with greater difficulties in chalking out a way for himself. "Anwar had wilder flights," says Mr. Fischer, "than Djamal. His imagination swept all of Asia." And this was the case after his fall and flight from Turkey. Writes Mr. Fischer :— "While Kemal was rising in power, Anwar was falling into disgrace. His armies had met miserable defeat in Caucasia. His policies, it was claimed, had caused the collapse of his country. In 1919 he was condemned to death." Sentences of death were cheap in those days when even the Shaikhul Islam was not independent. The Sultan himself was a puppet. Like Mustafa Kemal Pasha, later when he was sentenced to death, Anwar Pasha also escaped from Turkey and saved himself from death.

He tried to reach Odessa on a sailing vessel. But his Star of Fortune had set. Fates were against him. There are some fools (their number is on the decrease) who say there is no *Taqdir*, no design, no fate as if man is the full master of his destiny, as if he can control the whole universe ; as if he can prevent all adverse circumstances and accidents.

Anwar Pasha, in spite of all his efforts, was repulsed by the strong hand of Fate. A storm arose in the Black Sea. The high mast of his Boat broke. But Anwar Pasha was determined to reach the Bolsheviks. His imagination must have made them out to be a rising Power. He found means to get to Germany. From there he flew on his own aeroplane for Moscow. Misfortune was still dogging him. The aeroplane crashed. Fortunately he was not himself killed. But he was captured. He was sent to prison first in Kovno, then in Riga. He, being a Muslim, believed in *Taqdir* and therefore even most dire circumstances did not dishearten him, nor did even repeated failures discourage him or stop him from trying again and again with his trust in God. A Muslim never loses hope because he believes in *Taqdir*. He persists even when others give up all efforts for any hopeless job. He never despairs. Anwar Pasha at last managed in 1920 to reach Moscow. Now he denounced Germanism. A declaration was

read on his behalf at the Congress of the Eastern Peoples at Baku that he hated and cursed German Imperialism and British Industrialism. The first declaration was an opportunism. The latter part could not but be sincere. Anwar Pasha was always anti-British. It was England that had made it impossible to defend Tripoli, that had encouraged the Balkan States against Turkey, that had now taken away the Arab population from Turkey. England was mostly responsible, with Russia, for the defeat of the Turkish arms by the help of Indian armies and the Arab betrayal. It was England that had wrecked the Ottoman Empire. And it was England he thought who was trying to drive "the unspeakable Turk" out of Europe. With those notions how could Anwar Pasha or any Muslim Turk help hating England. Anwar was a Turk ; he was a Muslim.

The Bolsheviks tried to effect a reconciliation between Kemal Pasha and Anwar Pasha. Alas, it was found impossible. There is a Persian Saying :—

دو پادشاہ در اقلیمی نہ گنجند

Two kings cannot rule the same kingdom.

"Bolsheviks then thought," says Mr. Fischer, "that they could use Enver as they had used Djamal. Enver, speculating on the old Russian hatred for Great Britain and on the possibilities of the new hostility between Red Moscow and Imperial London, came to the Soviet Capital in the expectation of receiving sympathy and support. An excellent partnership might have sprung up if Enver's dreams had fitted into the Bolshevik frame. But the only field for Enver's activities was Afghanistan—far too narrow for a man of his nature." "Enver's mind's eyes," adds the author of *The Soviets in World Affairs*, "swept Empires. He dreamt of re-establishing the kingdom of Tamerlane. He saw himself the Ruler of a realm embracing Chinese Turkestan, Russian Turkestan, Kazakstan, and Afghanistan. Then, like Alexander the Great, he would march through the Khyber Pass into India and strike a mortal blow at the British Empire. He would be the Napoleon of Asia." Man proposes and God disposes. Fates did not favour Anwar Pasha. The Bolsheviks too were frightened of him. They preferred a weaker man,—less ambitious,—less imaginative, who was to be satisfied if Turkey was saved as a tenth-rate Power—as one of the Balkan States—her vassals of old. "But while Enver chafed under months of idleness in Moscow", says Mr. Fischer, "the Russians were cementing their relations with Kemal . In the beginning Anwar Pasha tried to act as an intermediary in the Russo-Turkish pourparlers and to put himself in the position of the real representative of Turkey. "Mustafa Kemal," he would say, "is weak. He is known neither at home

nor abroad. I, on the other hand, have a reputation throughout Turkey and Europe. Every child in the Muslim world knows the name of Enver Pasha." These very facts, these very ambitious dreams, frightened the Bolsheviks. Anwar Pasha dreamt of a Pan-Turanian Empire with Turkey as its centre. It *included* Russian territories also. How could the Bolsheviks like that? He was the guest of the Government in Russia all the same. When on 16th March, 1921, the Soviet-Anatolian Treaty was signed Anwar Pasha "felt that his chances of supplanting Kemal with Bolshevik assistance were gone." So he thought of leaving Russia for Caucasia. It was in 1921 that he was given a Saloon Car in which "to travel South". However he had to give a promise not to interfere with Kemal Pasha. But when he arrived in Batum he met many Turkish officers who had come to meet him. "He was," says Mr. Fischer, "still influential in the Turkish army, in Church quarters—for Kemal *was an announced opponent of Pan-Islamism and of the Sultan* Caliph—and with the upper classes. A full-fledged Enverist Congress now took place in Batum, which, the Russians learned, planned a *coup d'état* against the Kemal régime." But the *coup d'état* did not materialise. Man proposes and God disposes. When Anwar Pasha tried to get into Turkey he was detained by force by the Bolshevik authorities. He then said he would meet Djamal Pasha who was retiring from Kabul and was in Transcaspia. Anvar Pasha also gave out that he wanted "to hunt in Bokhara." On arriving at Bokhara he at first met Soviet representatives. He disappeared suddenly afterwards. The next time he came into prominence was when he assumed the leadership of the Basmarchi. Like the Young Turk Party there was a Young Bokharan Party long before the Great War. In 1910 a rebellion had taken place against the local Amir who represented the Russian Czar in Central Asia. After the abdication of Nicholas II when Kerensky came into power as the head of the Provisional Government, a delegation of Bokharans presented him a petition for the abolishment of the Emirate. But Miliukov was not any less Imperialist than the Czars. He had his say in the Provisional Government. He objected. Mr. Fischer describes the after-events thus:—"Throughout the early phase of the Communist revolution, Moscow had no contact with Bokhara. But the expulsion of British internationalist troops and the defeat of the Whites in Siberia and Turkestan encouraged the young Bokharans to continue their struggle against the unpopular Emir and in September, 1920, a three-days revolution flared up which forced him and his harems to flee to Afghanistan. This upheaval left the feudal Khans and the Pro-Enver party dissatisfied. The peasants also did not like the

anti-religious moves of the Bolsheviks." Enver Pasha, on his arrival in Bokhara, soon became the leader of the discontented Group and opened war against the Bolsheviks. He organised the Basmarchi and mobilized an army against the Bolsheviks. What a whiligig of time! Anwar Pasha was undoubtedly a great military genius. He belonged to the German School. He was a master of modern military tactics. "But in the mountains of East Bokhara his strategy almost invariably improved the position of the Red forces sent to destroy him." We repeat, man proposes and God disposes. Anwar Pasha's military genius, his tactics, his strategy, his reputation, his popularity, *all* failed. He was killed just as he was bidding farewell to his friends before leaving for Afghanistan. He was killed accidentally. If Providence had disposed otherwise the accident would not have happened.

Anwar Pasha's ultimate fate had long been a mystery. The whole Muslim world was anxious to know the details. There are people who would still like to believe that the news of his death was false. We ourselves wish that he were alive even with his Pan-Turanian dreams. Alas! it was only too true that he met with his death in Bokhara. Mr. Fischer has given us the story regarding his stay in Russia and "his last adventure" as obtained by him from "General Kakurin, Chechcrin, Karakhan, Zuckerman, the chief of the Middle East section, Pastukhov, the chief of the Near East section of the Commissars of Foreign Affairs." Nobody can doubt the authority of the story when he says:--"On the night of June 14, 1922, he (Anwar Pasha) attacked in the region of Derbent where Alexander and the Romans had marched centuries before. General Kakurin, who commanded the Bolshevik forces, estimates that Enver had no more than 3,000 men and little cannon, whereas the Soviet division was 8,000 strong and enjoyed the advantage of superior artillery and trained cavalry. Enver suffered defeat. Kakurin now pressed Enver's shattered band deep into the mountains, and before long the Turkish leader had turned South towards the Afghan border. Here the Red army operated in small patrols which combed intricate defiles for rebellious Basmarchi. One such patrol of approximately 100 horsemen entered a narrow pass on August 4, 1922, and saw in front of it a large group of Bokharans seated on the ground in a circle. When the Bokharans spied the Red unit they immediately gave battle and repulsed the assailants. But one gunner, assisted by two comrades, carried a single piece of light field artillery to the top of a low hill where he was able to hold the Basmarchi at bay. Meanwhile, another Red army patrol, attracted by the booming mountain echoes of the firing, galloped to the scene and a struggle ensued which resembled the combats of King Richard, the Lion Hearted, and his mediaeval

Knights. The warriors hacked one another to pieces with scimitars and sabres, and wrestled for their lives on the rocky ground. Finally, the remnant of the Basmarchi retreated, leaving their dead on the field of battle. When the Red soldiers examined the corpses they found that all the Basmarchi Khans were dressed in long richly coloured Bokharan robes and typical Central Asian headgear. But one had worn high military boots, breeches, and a tightly buttoned blue jacket. On his fingers was a valuable signet-ring. They examined his papers. There were three letters from Berlin written in a woman's hand, a notebook, and scraps of paper in which orders had been scribbled in Turkish. The dead man was Enver Pasha. Alas! This dead man was indeed Enver Pasha. He was *accidentally* killed by a bullet of the Bolshevists. His things were taken to Tashkent and deposited in the Military Museum after being photographed. Mr. Fischer avers, "the assertion that his head was cut off and carried through the streets of Samarkand is untrue as are numerous other unauthoritative versions of the last episode of his romantic career." It is good that Mr. Fischer has contradicted the unauthentic versions. Muslims will be relieved to a certain extent to learn that. The finishing paragraph of Mr. Fischer is worth quoting. He writes:—"According to information subsequently obtained the conference in the defile which the Soviet Patrol had discovered was a meeting of the most important Basmarchi Khans and Shaikhs. Enver had decided to give up the struggle and retire to Afghanistan—but not for ever. It was his farewell discussion with the fighting Chiefs to whom he proposed to transfer the Command. It took place near Badakshan, only eighty kilometres from the Afghan frontier." Alas! Anwar Pasha proposed one way but Fate another! What a series of incidents, what a chapter of chances brought about the downfall and death of a historic man! Luck deserted Anwar Pasha as it had deserted some other great men. It deserted Alexander. It deserted Napoleon. It deserted Hindenburg and Ludendorff. It favoured lesser men. Those whom it favoured won. There is a Persian saying:—

جوے طالع ز خروارے هنر به

The Author heard with his own ears, soon after the War, from a British officer when he returned from France, say, "We have won this War by a d— miracle." A miracle undoubtedly it was but it was aided by the lack of statesmanship in Germany and the possession by the winning Powers of almost limitless cannon fodder in the shape of Eastern mercenaries. While luck disfavoured Anwar Pasha it did a good turn inasmuch as it did not desert Mustafa Kemal Pasha. It helped him. The author of *Grey Wolf*, when he describes the fact that the Sultan and the British themselves sent Mustafa Kemal Pasha to Asia Minor,

says:—"Suddenly once more Fate gave Mustafa Kemal a full hand of cards. As Lemon Von Saunders had said of him, he had that essential qualification of a great Commander--Luck and again Luck." He adds:—"He had also the second great qualification of a Great Commander—the power to seize Luck and use it." In India what happened in the years 1919—21 was that luck offered the Leaders a favourable opportunity to get Swaraj but not one of them, particularly the Chief Leader, had the second great qualification of a great Commander—to seize Luck and use it. Through lack of political sense a mess was made of the opportunity, rather opportunities, in India. However, Kemal Pasha seized his luck in Turkey. The Bolsheviks also helped Kemal Pasha in his good luck as they helped Anwar Pasha in his bad luck. "The Enver episode," says Fischer, " indicated clearly how solicitous the Bolsheviks were for the safety of the Kemal Government. The relations between Moscow and Angora had always been extremely cordial." He says elsewhere, "The rejection of the Urquhart Concession on the ground that Great Britain was pursuing an anti-Turkish policy throws a bright light on the mentality of this period." But it came to the knowledge of the Author from firsthand sources that in those days of trouble for the Turks when the Greek army landed in Smyrna and began to advance towards the Turkish Headquarters in Asia Minor, the Bolsheviks could not give much substantial help even to Mustafa Kemal Pasha. In November, 1920, the Author's friend Bekir Sami Bey, who was then the Minister for Foreign Affairs in Turkey (Ankara *not* Istanbul), himself went to Moscow to solicit Bolshevik aid at that most critical stage. But the Bolsheviks could neither spare any men nor any ammunition. They themselves were in trouble. They could give a little money. Even that was useful as it helped in getting munition from elsewhere. The Author knows himself that a very influential person went to Briand, the then President of the French Republic, to ask him to let the Turks' friends smuggle French arms and munition for Asia Minor. The smuggling was very, very difficult without the connivance of the French authorities. The reply of Briand was very interesting. He did not utter a word with his mouth. He simply adopted the attitude of Buddha. With the fingers of his hands he closed his ears, his mouth and his eyes. The suppliant understood the meaning of the gesture. He thanked the President and came back satisfied.

On 26th April, 1920, Kemal Pasha sent a letter to Moscow offering to participate in the struggle "against foreign Imperialism which threatened both countries." Kemal Pasha suggested an alliance. The Bolsheviks thought they could not take it upon themselves to help Turkey in an actual war with Greece. Checherin

in a note on 2nd June, 1920, suggested "the establishment of regular diplomatic relations." On 29th November, 1920, Kemal Pasha sent another letter to Checherin in which communistic terminology was used. Mr. Fischer informs us that it contained strictures against "international capital" and made references to "the proletarian masses of the world through whose efforts, seconded by the oppressed peo ple of Asia and Africa, the rule of the bourgeoisie would end." Kemal Pasha likewise made mention "of our close union." Together with the letter by Kemal Pasha to the Author himself through Djami Bey in Rome, this shows that Kemal Pasha had a wider outlook then and his ambitions were far from being so narrow at that time as to be satisfied if Turkey was left as a tenth-rate Balkan State. "After the victory over the Greeks, from every Islamic country—from India (the Author also sent a telegram which was duly acknowledged), Africa, Malay States, Russia, Afghanistan, Persia and China, even from Christian Hungary," says his biographer, "came addresses of congratulations, swords of honour, telegrams of praise—a fulsome praise, enough to turn any man's head. All across the world subjected races stirred in hope. Wherever there was massed hostility to the Imperial Nations of the West men looked up expectantly to Mustafa Kemal Pasha, believing that a champion had arisen. They saw in this Muslim General, who had defeated all the might of Europe, the spearhead of their advance towards freedom from the "white man" and the Christian. The Soviets were urging him on. Persians and the Syrians and the Egyptians wanted his help. From all sides came invitations to become the champion of the East against the West." But very strangely the heroic success of Kemal Pasha had contracted his vision to only what he could see just in front of him—not much beyond his nose. His reply was :—"We have but one principle—to see all problems through Turkish interests." This meant in his own words again "to safeguard the life and independence of their Nation within its natural frontiers." The fact is that the whole world was disappointed in Mustafa Kemal Pasha. He only proved himself a soldier of fortune without much greatness who only knew how to impose his autocratic military authority according to his own fancies over a submissive people. Only Europe heaved a sigh of very great relief on his post-Graeco-Turkish war policy. In its heart of heart Europe was delighted at the lack of ambition in Kemal Pasha. All the European Powers felt that they had succeeded in destroying Turkey as a great and ambitious Power with a world outlook, and as a world-figure with a unique historic position. They felt happy to think that they had succeeded in destroying Turkish culture and civilization of which the great Turkish rulers—Salim and Sulaiman—were as proud as was the

great conqueror of Constantinople. They were glad at the *inferiority complex* which had been accepted by the proud and self-satisfied Mustafa Kemal—the Ataturk as he likes to call himself. If he had any greatness in him the world would have called him Abul Muslim, the father of all the Muslims of the world. Here we will take the liberty to give long quotations from Sir Valentine Chirol as they may provoke thoughts within even the unimaginative mind of the now famous Turkish soldier—and Turkish military expert and the Life President of the Great Turkish National Assembly. He may yet realize what he has lost for the Turks. Sir Valentine writes:—"Eighteen months ago at Mudania, it was because of the resurgency of a militant Turkey in a trail of Islamic glory, and in ominous alliance with the destructive forces of Russian Bolshevism, as the spearhead of a widespread Mohammedan, if not general Asian, revolt against Western ascendancy, a portent full of menace, that the world's unstable peace had to be saved by the surrender at Lausanne." Sir Valentine cheerfully goes on to write:—"The outlook to-day is wholly different. Lausanne itself revived some of the old antagonism between Turkey and Russia, which even under Soviet rule, has not by any means relinquished the Czarist Policy of Eastern expansion. That was not altogether surprising. Infinitely more is it that *Turkey should itself have laid aside the sword of Islam.* The Turkish Khilafat has rapidly followed the Turkish Sultanate to its unhonoured grave. (Does Kemal Pasha also agree with Sir Valentine Chirol that the Turkish Sultanate and Khilafat both were unhonoured ?) The last of a long line of Monarchs, who have been Sultans of Turkey for seven hundred years, with the added title of Khalifa for just over four hundred years, has been driven into exile. The new Turkish State is a (so-called) republic, and has proclaimed itself a lay republic, which is the very negation of Islam. *Now that it is shorn by its own doing of the prestige which it had acquired to a much greater extent than ever before as a formidable bulwark of Islam, the attitude of the Powers towards it will be determined no longer, as in recent years, by the weight of Mohammedan sentiment, real or artificial, mobilised in its favour, but by the weight it can itself pull.* The Turk will be master in his own house (what about the ambitions of a Mussolini, the wool in Angora and Constantinople—Istanbul itself ?) for the population of Turkey will, for the first time, be almost purely Turkish. But the total population will be merely 8,000,000—some estimate it at a little over 6,000,000—exhausted for many years to come by the hardship of more than ten years' warfare and undermined by older ravages of congenital disease. Immense tracts of country have been laid waste and Smyrna, its greatest commercial city, has suffered such destruction that it will take, under

favourable conditions, a whole generation to recover. Its principal economic activities have been paralysed by its own doing, through the wholesale rooting out of the Greek and Armenian communities, whose superior intelligence and education had secured an almost complete monopoly of the internal trade and commerce of the whole country in the smaller villages or in the larger towns and played a vital part in the higher processes of cultivation required to produce some of the most valuable of rich exports, *e.g.*, the fig, the raisin, and the olive. Peace with Foreign Powers may be maintained on the basis on which the Treaty of Lausanne has restored it, but it will not result in the fruitful reactions essential for the revival of Turkey's material prosperity, unless the new rulers of Turkey can put away the Nationalist xenophobia as they have apparently resolved to put away the religious xenophobia. They are men of undeniable courage and of no mean ability (what a bribe to induce the Turks to get back the Greeks and Armenians to commerce and trade !) and if the great revolutionary adventure upon which they have embarked and which, be it said to their credit (Chirol has not a word of praise for the Bolshevik revolutionary adventure) they have so far carried out without any serious effusion of blood, really reflects an equally psychological change in the Turkish people, Turkey may have a more respectable future before her than her past history might perhaps encourage one to expect." Chirol forgets that past period of Turkish history when the British Ambassador considered it an honour if His Highness the Grand Vazier granted him an interview as the Sultan himself was too sublime a person to receive the representatives of European Powers. For the future, Sir V. Chirol has the cutting remark to make that "Turkey's importance in the world will scarcely be greater than that of any one of the Balkan States which once formed a part of the Great Ottoman Empire."

We wonder how the "Ata-Turk" must have felt when he read, if he ever read, the closing paragraph of this part of the history of "The Turkish Empire." Chirol wrote:—"Perhaps the brightest hope with which this volume can now be brought to a close is that the hegemony of Islam, to which she (Turkey) has suddenly resigned her claim, will pass back to the Arab race, if it is still capable of restoring to one of the Great World-Religions the intellectual and spiritual elasticity it displayed under the Arab Khilafats of Damascus and Bagdad and Cordova before the Turkish blight settled down upon it, when the Ottoman Sultans took the Khilafat in their strong but barbarous hands and made it an appendage, sometimes merely ornamental and sometimes dangerously effective, of their temporal power." Our personal view is that unless Kemal Pasha changes his

policy of isolating Turkey from the Muslim World—which and which alone could have real sympathy with her in her material progress, all the brave work of having defended the little that is left of Turkey will be ruined after Mustafa Kemal is gone, if not in his life-time. It is even doubtful if the Bolsheviks will not themselves covet Istanbul and come to some agreement with England herself to take it out of Turkish possession. But the latest peril not only to Smyrna but to Istanbul itself is Italy's Imperialism. In the near future the Imperialism of the new "Emperor of Abyssinia" and that of India may come to a clash or there might again be secret agreements between the European Powers and a future King of England may say to the Italian Ambassador as did George V say to the Russian Ambassador, "Constantinople must be yours."

As we have pointed out "the *lay* Republic of Turkey" is unnatural. It is not a republic in any case when the majority of its citizens are *not* "lay" but Islamic. This "lay Republic" has no moral basis. The endeavours of Ottomanising Turkey failed; Pan-Turanianism failed, and now this "lay" nationalisation of Turkey will also fail. A population as large as that of London or New York can have no world significance even if it progresses to its highest limit or stature. It would have been left in oblivion if the geographical position it occupies had not been of world-importance. A Balkanized Turkey, deprived of all world influences, cannot be of much use to any other Power—not even to Bolshevik Russia with her ambitions of a world, anti-Imperialist revolution. It is fortunate for Kemal Pasha that the European Powers are exhausted. It is fortunate that they are burning with jealousy against each other. Therefore Turkey has not been involved in any new war for the last ten or fifteen years. Otherwise it would have been demonstrated whether the Turks fight more sacrificingly and more heroically in adverse circumstances for their religion, their culture, their civilization, with grand ambitions of world conquest and with a superiority complex or for narrow nationalism and for paved roads, railways and factories, even if they be supplied with beer and brandy, good uniforms and equipment and sumptuous canteens. May this time of trial never come. But if it does, as it is likely to come sooner or later, more likely sooner than later, the Turkish mentality is such that the Kemalian rigid Nationalism is not likely to succeed any better than did the Ottomanism of Anwar Pasha. And who knows what the attitude of Turkey's neighbours will be when the time of trial comes? Shall Turkey have any friends at all or not?

In the last crisis there was no dearth of genuine sympathizers with Turkey. There was substantial help also given to Turkey

from beyond Turkey. In 1920 even the Bolsheviks could not give much help to Turkey though Karakhan has told Mr. Fischer that in 1921 they helped Kemal Pasha with "much cannon, money, arms and military advice." Muslims all over the world, excepting the Arabs, who had been bribed and tempted by Foreigners, and the Turkish régime at Constantinople, had the fullest sympathy with Turkey in her troubles when the Greeks occupied Thrace and landed at Smyrna. Muslims in India together with their Hindu fellow countrymen pressed the Indian Government so strongly to urge the evacuation by the Greeks of the territories of the Khalifa that the Viceroy had to send a Muslim deputation to the anti-Turkish British Prime Minister to represent the views of India on the question of Thrace, etc. The deputation consisted of His Highness Prince Sir Aga Khan, the late Mr. Chotani and the late Mr. Hasan Imam. On its arrival in England the late Dr. Ansari and the Author were also included on the recommendations of the Aga Khan. Before the arrival of the deputation in London, delegates both from Istanbul and Angora had also arrived. One was headed by Tewfik Pasha and the other by Bakir Sami Bey. The Indian deputation came at once into touch with both the Turkish delegations specially with the Angora one as the Indian Muslims were more insistent than even the Angora delegation on keeping the Turkish Empire intact—even its Arab portion to be made autonomous under the Sultan-Khalifa.

While the Indian deputation was discussing the Turko-Greek question with Mr. Lloyd George—the British Prime Minister, an incident happened which revealed the mentality of Indian Muslims even of the position and status of His Highness the Right Honourable Sir Aga Khan, G.C.S.I., K.C.S.I., G.C.V.O., etc., etc. In the course of the discussion Mr. Lloyd George very cunningly and very pertinently, as if to silence the verbal arguments of the deputation, asked:—"Now that the Greeks are in military possession of Thrace who will turn them out from there?" Immediately none other than His Highness stood up and with a raised finger, and an undaunted gesture replied:—"Well, Mr. Prime Minister, old though I am I will go sword in hand and turn them out. We will charter ships, we will do everything. Leave them to us." Mr. Lloyd George was crestfallen. All those present were thunder struck. What did the reply convey? That even His Highness the Aga Khan was ready to fight and sacrifice his life for the Turks. He was ready to spend all his fortune to charter ships to convey troops to Thrace to turn the Greek army out of Thrace. Could any Turk, Kemal Pasha himself, say or be ready to do anything more for Turkey? Surely, the Aga Khan had not the slightest connection with the

Turks except the all-powerful link of Islam. In fact the Aga Khan had many reasons to be anti-Turk. The Aga Khan has himself the purest of the pure Arab blood. He is a descendant of the Prophet himself. Then, he belongs to the School which does not recognise the Khilafat of the Osmanlis. He himself, on the other hand, is the temporal and spiritual Head of his own Community. Besides this, he is not only loyal to the British but has stood in special friendly—more than friendly—relationship with the Royal Family of Windsor for the last three generations. And who does not know that the British Prime Minister and therefore the British Government of the time was pro-Greek and the Turks were the enemies of the British during the War. Yet in spite of all this, His Highness the Aga Khan stood there challenging the British Prime Minister and declaring his readiness to sacrifice his property, his very life, his all for the Turks. Why? Only because they represented Islam.

The question can well be put to those persons who think that Pan-Islamism was not a living thing that who spoke those words and showed that readiness to sacrifice his all for Turkey although he had nothing to do with that country except that it was a Muslim country, of which even the bravest, the most patriotic and the greatest nationalist Turk should be proud? Was it the Right Honourable His Highness Sir Sultan Mohammad Shah, G.C.V.O., G.C.S.I., K.C.S.I., so on and so on, possessor of a number of Salutes of guns, and three-generation friend of the British Royal family, most loyal to the British Empire, who spoke such defiant and bold words on such a serious and solemn occasion?

No, no, no.

It was the son of the Prophet who spoke those words; *it was Pan-Islamism personified* that uttered those thrilling words which expressed the desire and readiness of a man who had all the luxuries possible at his command to give up that life, old though he said he was, to spend all his fortune, to risk his very life, dear to millions of men as no other human life was, and to go "sword in hand" to turn the barbarians from the *Muslim* soil of Thrace?

Only those who are dead themselves could call Pan-Islamism not a living thing after such incidents—a living thing which could speak and fight and sacrifice all. Could those words, expressing that kind of readiness to sacrifice all, ever come out of the mouth of any man of any other religion, creed or institution in those circumstances? Can the Turks of the "lay" republic expect such readiness from any person beyond Turkish boundaries anywhere in the world? Can friendship be any more sincere and true?

It must be remembered that the friendship of His Highness for Turkey was symptomatic of the mind of 80 millions of Muslims of India and it shows beyond doubt that Turkey was not friendless

at all *before* the present Kemalist régime. This friendship increased rather than decreased from day to day as the need of Turkey for true friends increased in those days. The dictatorial attitude of the Allies led by the British at Constantinople, the brutal Treaty of Sevres and the barbarities of the Greek armies increased the sympathies of the Muslim world as well as of the Russian Bolsheviks with Turkey.

On 10th March, 1919, the great Imperialist Curzon, announced in the House of Lords that the Allies, acting in unison, could not any longer acquiesce in a state of affairs in which they were flouted at Constantinople. Six days later General Milne landed more troops in Constantinople, took possession of the Admiralty and War Office and of all the means of communication. The Salch Cabinet was dismissed and Damad Ferid Pasha was once more asked to form the Cabinet. There had been violent outbreaks in Mesopotamia, India, Syria, Egypt, showing that "how *widespread*," says Sir Valentine Chirol, "was Mohammedan unrest." The Allies now thought that they had delayed the peace with Turkey too long. They settled at San Remo the terms to be imposed upon Turkey which on 10th June, 1919, they handed to Tewfik Pasha who had headed the Peace Mission from Istanbul to Paris. On 15th August, 1919, we gave the purport of these terms in our own language in the *Sword Against Islam* thus:—"We (the Allies) will confine your race (the Turkish) to three barren and mountainous districts in Anatolia. We will surround you with your centuries old brutal enemies. We will help those enemies to become very strong and we will do our best to make you weak. We will give all the important sea coasts to those enemies, and will deprive you of all the convenient outlets. We will cut you off altogether from men of your own Faith who have close bonds of affection and of pride." The authors of the *Turkish Empire* have given the terms of the Treaty in greater detail. They say, "Save that the Sultan was to remain *magni-nominis umbra* at Constantinople the term could hardly have been more stern. They reduced the Ottoman Empire with an area in 1914 of 613,000 miles and a population estimated at 20,000,000 to a second rate Asiatic State of 157,000 square miles and a population of some eight millions. What remained to the Ottomans of Thrace after the Balkan wars was to go to Greece whose frontiers were drawn at the lines of Tchataldja, leaving only Constantinople itself to Turkey (and this also after very great agitation in India when the Muslims and Hindus had made a common cause to save Turkey) with a few square miles of the hinterland and the area round Lake Derkos, required for the water-supply of the Capital. In Asia, the new Turkish State was to be restricted to Asia Minor, and there only to those acknowledged homelands in which the Turkish

population is fairly homogeneous or in a very large majority. An independent Armenia, of which the boundaries were reserved for arbitration by the President of the United States, was to be carved out of the vilayats of Trebizond, Erzerum, Bitlis, and Van, and to the South an autonomous Kurdish State with eventual rights to complete independence was to be created in the predominantly Kurdish areas East of the Euphrates, South of the new Armenian State and North of the Southern frontier of Turkey. In the Smyrna region an important territory with a sea frontage of over 180 miles, and in some places stretching almost as far into the interior, was to be definitely transferred, together with the chief harbour of Asia Minor, to Greek administration, though for the present still under the Turkish flag with the further provision that not less than five years hence it might be finally incorporated into the Hellenic Kingdom, on a petition to that effect to the League of Nations from the representative Assembly there constituted and after endorsement of the petition by a plebiscite."

In fact, a new Armenian State in the East from Samsun to the Caspian Sea, including portions even of Persian and Russian territories, an extended Greek Empire which would include Eastern and Western Thrace and Smyrna and a Kurdish State were to surround the little State that was left to Turkey, to imprison the Turkish race in a "black hole" as we called it in 1919.

This was not all. A long strip of territory was reserved extending along both shores of the Dardanelles, the Marmora and the Bosphorus for special administration under an International Commission with its own flag, budget, and separate organisation in order to secure perpetual freedom of navigation on those Waters both in peace and war.

Even this was not all. Turkey was to be reduced to the abject condition of an Indian State under the paramountcy of England. At the present time in all the Indian States of any consequence "white elephants" have been imposed and almost everywhere finances and revenue have been taken away from the hands of Indians and given into those of the natives of Europe—England.

In Turkey also an International Commission, on which poor Turkey would be graciously allowed only one representative and that too only in a consultative capacity, was to be created under the atrocious Treaty of Sevres with the right to take such measures as it liked for the Turkish finances. It was invested with such far-reaching powers as to constitute, in practice, a financial and economic tutelage. In certain respects Turkey was to become even worse than an Indian State. Like an Oudh Talukdar she would have had to destroy and dismantle all her fortifications.

She could not have any fleet or air force. Her army was to be reduced to 50,000 men and a bodyguard of 800 for the Khalifa Sultan.

Even this was not all. Turkey had to surrender all her Arab provinces, some in the name of Mandate to Christian Powers, others directly to the Arabs. She had to recognise specifically the independence of the Kingdom of the Hedjaz, the British protectorate over Egypt and the Sudan, the British annexation of Cyprus, the French protectorate over Tunis and Morocco, Italian rights in Tripoli and the transfer of all her islands in the Aegean and Mediterranean seas to Italy and to Greece respectively,. as well as to acquiesce in advance, in all agreements between the Allies for the final disposal of the territories ceded by her.

"To accept the Treaty", says Sir Valentine Chirol, "was to accept the doom of the Empire."

Yet in 1920 a few Turkish Ministers under Sultan Vahiduddeen had so fallen down as to accept it even though their valiant brothers in Anatolia, as elsewhere, were urging them not to do so. The heroes in Anatolia were organising themselves in spite of the "Khilafat Army" sent by the Sultan who had become a slave to foreigners to save himself and his throne and who had forfeited all claim to the Khilafat because of that slavishness.

A Delegation from Constantinople arrived in Paris and had the temerity to sign such an atrocious and cruel Treaty on 10th August, 1920. Fortunately it was never ratified. It was a sentence of tortuous death for the Turkish Race. But man proposes and God disposes. The Turkish Race did not die and in a few years this horrible treaty was torn to pieces and a new treaty was signed which saved Turkey from death.

We foresaw it on 15th August, 1919. In concluding our book *The Standard Bearers of Islam* we said:—"The reply sent by the Council of Ten threatens the Ottoman Empire with a worse fate than that meted out by Rome to Carthage. History records many occasions like this, when haughty men, enthroned on the pedestal of power and might, and goaded by passions and prejudices have dismissed from their all high presence the fallen and the defeated, unheeding the unfailing hand of Justice that befriends the distressed, and the indignant voice of Nemesis that warns the proud with a certain fall. In its fury and disregard of the plighted words of its own leaders the Council of Ten condemns the Ottoman race to be tortured to death. It forgets that virile nations do not die. Depressed and subjected, even bruised and mauled they might be at one moment, but they rise again and again to get back their own from the children or children's children of the wrong-doer. The nation which at the

time of victory is not magnanimous and merciful, herself sees those days soon when her turn comes to seek kindness and favours at the hands of others. The heroes of Gallipoli and Kut may die, but their race shall not. Islam shall continue to be proud of them as its banner they have kept aloft for centuries and centuries. Should they not be left in a position to fly that banner now as high as they have done before for many generations against innumerable enemies—they would receive no blame. The Arabs in Hedjaz, the Moors in Spain, the Moghuls in India, lost that banner through their fault—through disunion among themselves, love of luxury, neglect of duty, indifference to military requirements, degeneration and effemination. But the Turks are still a noble nation of heroes. Muslims with any sense of duty to their brothers, any respect for the fundamental and unique demands of their Faith, shall continue to cherish an unending love for them. These regards will be increased by the misfortunes of the Turks which the religious bigotry and racial prejudice of Militarism deigns to inflict.

The Council of Ten at Paris has condemned them to death, but the ever-growing, imperishable Great Brotherhood of (Six-Hundred and Fifty Million Souls) of the World has not, Islam has not, God has not. They shall not die.

Inn Allaha ala kulle shain qadeer.

Who can blame Mustafa Kemal if he got disgusted with such a Sultan as was Vahidudeen who went to the length of sending a "Khilafat Army" to suppress those very Turks who were sacrificing their all to save Turkey and the Khalifa from slavery? Who can have any respect for a Shaikul Islam who, instead of denouncing the disgraceful Sultan, gave a *fatwa* against the Muslim Heroes who were defending with their blood the dominions and the independence and the honour of the Khalifa and of Islam itself? The traitor to Islam was then Vahiduddeen *not* Mustafa Kemal. How many less unworthy Khalifas were dethroned—even executed, by the *fatwas* of the Shaikhul Islam! Vahiduddeen proved himself the unworthiest of all of them. Yet a Shaikhul Islam was found to support him. This was an insult to Islam. Those godless Bolsheviks who, with whatever notions, helped Muslims and Islam to save the honour and status of Muslims and Islam, were far better Muslims than those who had sold at a price that honour for the selfish ends—*samanan qalilan* as the Quran had said. In the Muslims' eyes the anti-religious Lenin who wrote to a Muslim King, "Fate sends to the Afghan people the great historic task of uniting about itself all enslaved Muhammadan peoples and leading them on the road to freedom and independence", was better than Vahiduddeen

or the slavish Shaikh-ul-Islam of his time who had condemned the defenders of the only Islamic Empire in Europe at the sacrifice of their all.

Is there a Muslim who would not have helped those valiant Leaders ? The most praiseworthy of those at that moment was Kazim Kara Bakir. Then others and Kemal Pasha arrived and all of them did their very best to save the lives and properties of Muslims from cruel foreign aggression and greed. Those who survived the fighting were *Ghazis*. Those who were killed were *Shahids* indeed. If they rebelled against the Sultan for a good cause—for saving the honour of Islam, they deserved all praise. They followed the footsteps of the Great Martyr—Imam Hosain, on the Plains of Karbala. The beloved grandson of the Prophet himself gave the lesson that a corrupt and unscrupulous Khalifa or King or despot should not only be defied but fought against at tremendous sacrifices. The tragedy of the greatest and noblest martyr the world has produced—the deathless Hosain—who most heroically sacrificed not only his own saintly life but also that of about eighty of his dearest relatives and friends including small children rather than submit to a despot, although he was offered a luxurious life for himself and his family if he would do *baiat* to Yazid, was a lesson taught not only to the Arabs, not only to the Muslims, but to all the nations—all the world. The tragedy of Karbala is an example for all—a heritage for the whole of mankind. The grandson of the Prophet was not greedy of power or pelf. He was ready to retire to a poor man's life but under no circumstances was he to owe allegiance to an unscrupulous man even though he was sitting on the Khilafat throne.

If anybody thinks that a Muslim Khalifa is sacrosanct and must be respected whatever his conduct may be must be thinking of any other constitution but that of Islam. An Abyssinian slave, if he defends the honour of Islam, may certainly be respected and obeyed, but not one even with the bluest blood in him if he disgraces Islam. The Prophet himself has repeatedly declared under God's own orders, "I am only a human being like yourselves." He himself has declared that if he were to go wrong he would be destroyed at once. The early Khalifas themselves told the Muslim public openly when they first made *baiat* (Social Contract) that they would always welcome just criticism. They asked the Muslim peoples to correct them at once if they committed any mistakes and adopted the wrong way.

What greater wrongs could a Muslim Khalifa or Ruler commit than those committed by Sultan Vahiduddeen and his Ministers who had accepted the disgraceful Treaty of Sevres ? The Treaty of Sevres was not the only article of torture in the armoury of the enemies of Islam—nor was the Khilafat Army

the only instrument used to try to destroy the Defenders of Islam—the heroic Mujahids. Greek savages were sent to Asia Minor to commit devastation and butcheries. Even Sir Valentine Chirol has repeatedly said in *The Turkish Empire* that "the Greek Army was introduced into Asia Minor mainly by British instigation and only with the reluctant assent of the Allies." Another British Historian, Arnold Toynbee, has described the entry of Greeks into Smyrna in these words:—"On 15th May, 1919, a destructive force was let loose in Western Anatolia, as sudden and apparently incomprehensible in its action as the eruption of a volcano. One morning six months after the close of the European War civilians and disarmed soldiers were massacred in the streets of Smyrna, whole quarters and villages were plundered, then the rich villages in the hinterland were devastated by further arson and bloodshed. A military front came in existence, which cut off the ports of Smyrna and Constantinople from the interior and ruined the trade. As the war continued capital investments like houses, bridges and tunnels were steadily destroyed. Human beings were conscripted, or otherwise driven away, if they escaped murder. In fact a wholesale ruin and extermination of the inhabitants began over an area which extended with alarming speed." And who were these inhabitants who were slaughtered in hundreds and thousands? Most of them were better Muslims than Vahiduddeen or his Shaikh-ul-Islam. Some of them were helpless Muslim women and children who were slaughtered because they were Muslims and said "our God is one Allah." Some of them were real *mujahids*, fighting for their hearth and home from which they had been turned out by the brutal enemies of Islam. Under Islam no one has greater honour than a *mujahid*. Who could then deny a greater honour to Kemal Pasha and others than to Vahiduddeen or his wretched and cowardly ministers? If a plebiscite had been taken in those days not of Muslims of Turkey alone but of the world it would have been found that Mustafa Kemal and *not* Vahiduddeen was performing the duty assigned by the constitution of Islam to the Khalifa—the duty of protecting the Muslim hearths and homes and lives—the duty of defending Islam itself. Among the foreigners whom were the Muslims expected to favour or love more—those who were helping their Muslim brothers in defending Muslim lands and saving the lives of thousands of Musalmans and the properties of millions of the Believers in the One and Only God, or to those who had themselves sent that devastating scourge to destroy Muslim lives and villages and under the protection of whose fleets the Greek Armies were landed in Asia Minor? Sir Valentine Chirol writes:—"Meanwhile another Greek Column had been landed at Mudania on the Marmora, *under the cover of the British fleet*, whose guns rendered

the port untenable for the Nationalists (Turks)." This enabled the Greeks to capture Brusa "the cradle of the Osmanli dynasty."

On 13th July, 1919, an Englishman, Mr. Western Bain, wrote in a London paper, "I hold no brief for the Turk, though I probably know him better than Miss Moore does. Like men of other races he has good qualities as well as bad ones. But if his misdeeds are held up to public reprobation, should not the same measures be meted out to those of others. Why, for instance, has a veil been so discreetly drawn over the four days' looting and massacre that succeeded the landing of the Greek troops in Smyrna of 14th May. A corner, but only a corner, was lifted in the House of Commons on 26th June. Before anything was settled as to the ultimate destiny of the velayet we who had been in control since the armistice, voluntarily withdrew and invited the Greeks to take our place. No one acquainted with the country could have had any doubt as to what would happen. The Greeks had many scores, old or new, to wipe off against their hereditary enemies and one cannot wholly blame them for taking occasion by the hand, but the tragic ignominy of the situation was that they *did so right under the eyes of the Iron Duke and several other allied Super Dreadnoughts.* The result, as may be gleaned from tiny paragraphs that appear in odd corners of the Daily Press, is that a new war has been started in Asia Minor and that the Turks, unless the Allies intervene, seem likely to drown the Greeks in the sea." Even the partial Chirol had had to admit "His (Venezelos's) influence has been, however, greatly weakened by the evidence of wholesale atrocities committed by the Greek Armies during their final débâcle in Asia Minor." It must be said in defence of the British Public that real facts were not put before it otherwise it might have expressed its disapproval of the actions of its pro-Greek Ministers ; nor did it possess sufficient intelligence to grasp the facts itself or even to put two and two together. The Press was mostly Lloyd Georgian at that time and therefore pro-Greek except a few which had not a very large circulation. The well-wishers of the Turks were, therefore, helpless for the time being. The Author himself was in London in those days and fully in touch with what was happening in Turkey. He left no stone unturned to bring home to the British the responsibility for the savagery of the Greek barbarians. He approached British members of Parliament, published pamphlets and articles and also such terrible news as the following from Rechid Safvet, Secretaire General De Le Legue Ottoman, Hotel Angleterre, Geneve :—

(*Translation*)

"The Ottoman League informs you that all the Turkish villages around Aidin have been completely destroyed, and

burnt. Ten thousand Mussalmans of the districts of Smyrna, Pergania, Menemen, and Maniss of which the chief is the illustrious family of Kara Osman, have been killed by Greek troops. Greek invasion puts to fire and sword inhabitants of the province of Smyrna, which is essentially Turkish and until now the most prosperous in Anatolia. We appeal to the justice, magnanimity, and higher interests of Britain to put an end to the state of anarchy resulting from the unjustifiable Hellenic occupation."

In those very days the Author was informed on reliable authority that thousands of Muslims had had to take refuge in the thick forests where they lived upon forest-fruits and herbs as their homes were destroyed and their crops commandeered by the Greeks. It is said that the Bolsheviks are irreligious ; they are untrustworthy. But blessed they be for having helped Mustafa Kemal Pasha in destroying the pestilential Greek Army, which was supposed to be Christian. It would have all been drowned in the sea if the Allied ships had not helped it to cross over.

How does anybody expect the Muslims of the world generally, and those poor persecuted Muslims of Asia Minor in particular, not to be thankful to the Bolsheviks who helped Turkey against the Greek savages and who destroyed Czardom which in the Great War itself had perpetrated unspeakable atrocities ?

We have mentioned accounts of Greek atrocities from the pen of Englishmen themselves who were the friends and helpers of Greece. In 1919 we published the following account of the Russian atrocities from the memoirs of Lt.-Col. Tweredo Khlebof relating, on the authority of the Commander-in-Chief, Odichelidze, the massacres committed by the Armenians, when the Russians took Erzerum. It ran thus:—"The massacre was organised by the doctors and tradesmen, that is to say, not by the lower classes or brigands. Not knowing exactly the names of these Armenians, I will abstain from mentioning any. More than eight hundred Turks, deprived of any means of defence, were assassinated. Great ditches were dug, into which the poor Turks were thrown after having been slaughtered like cattle. The Armenians counted them, and were heard to say: "There are only seventy, the ditch will hold ten more. Kill."—And ten more were killed to fill up the hole, which was then covered over with earth ! ! One tradesman put eight unhappy creatures in a house and amused himself by killing them one by one as they came out. After the Erzindjan massacre the Armenians, armed with the best weapons, retired towards Erzerum. A Russian artillery officer who, in order to protect his line against the attacks of the Kurds, had been obliged to retire with a few cannons, was obliged to make some Armenians take up position at the front. The latter, not approving at all of this decision, set fire one night to the house in which the Russian

officers were lodging. The Russians, who were most of them asleep, had great difficulty in escaping. Many of them lost all their belongings.

"The Armenian bands retiring from Erzindjan to Erzerum destroyed all the villages and the Mussalman inhabitants on their passage. We had engaged native Kurdish drivers for the transport of provision-carts and artillery munitions. They were peaceful people and unarmed. As they approached Erzerum, the Armenians, taking advantage of the Kurds, began to kill them. The officers who, on hearing the cries of the unhappy fellows, came to their help, were threatened with the same fate, and forced to abstain from all interference while the massacre went on." Leiutenant-Colonel Griaznoff, who returned from Ilidja on 26th February, three weeks after the massacres, said he saw on the road leading to the villages a great number of mutilated bodies which each passing Armenian spat on and cursed.

"In the courtyard of the mosque, ten to fifteen sagenes wide, corpses had been piled up to a height of two archives. Among them were the bodies of old men, children, and women of all ages. The women bore on them signs of violation, and in the sexual organs of many of them cartridges had been introduced."

. . . .

The greatest help which was given by the Bolsheviks to Turkey was at the time of its greatest need—when Turkey had entered into the last stage of its struggle for freedom. At first however there was a little quarrel. The Mensheviks of Georgia were ready to offer Batum, which was ceded by Turkey to the Czars in 1878, to Mustafa Kemal Pasha if he helped them against the Bolsheviks. On 11th March, 1921, the Turkish army under the heroic command of Kazim Kara Bekir, the first and foremost Saviour of Turkey, entered Batum and the Bolsheviks did not like it. The Red troops under Kjubisheff closed in on the city, but wiser counsels prevailed and on 16th March, 1921, "The Russian-Turkish Treaty" was signed for "solidarity between the two peoples in the struggle with Imperialism," which ceded Kars and Aradhan to Turkey but gave Batum to Bolshevik Russia. Mustafa Kemal Pasha had been trying for long for a Treaty with the Bolsheviks but it was only now accomplished. It regulated the Caucasian frontier between Russia and Turkey, mentioned Constantinople as a part of Turkey, stipulated for the convocation of a Conference on the fate of the Straits and "declared the identity of interest between the nationalist liberating movement of the peoples of the East and the struggle of the Workers of Russia for a new social system."—(*International Politics of Modern Times* by Kluchnikov and Sabanin). This was the time when the Greek army was advancing towards Sakaria and the Grand National

Assembly had to leave its headquarters at Angora. When in September, 1921, Kemal Pasha gained a victory Chicherin at once telegraphed congratulations to him. The task before the Turks was gigantic. From Sakaria to the Sea, the Greeks were occupying Turkish territory. They had got arms and munitions from the British. There were even British officers in the Greek army. When the Author got enquiries made regarding them in the House of Commons it was alleged that they were only *liaison* officers. But it came out that Tanks and aeroplanes had been supplied to the Greeks by British firms. Kemal Pasha applied to the Bolsheviks. Michael Frunze, the Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet forces in the Ukraine, was sent to Asia Minor and arrived at Angora on 13th December, 1921. He was welcomed heartily. He came to negotiate an agreement between Turkey and the Soviet Republic of Ukraine. But his short visit of a few days was used to arrange for heavy shipment of Russian munitions and for the mapping out of a detailed plan of campaign against the Greeks in which, if need be, Red officers would participate. Arlov, the new Bolshevik envoy, came to Turkey soon after the departure of Frunze. He became very popular. He went with Kemal Pasha to the front and encouraged the soldiers and distributed comfort bags. More welcome to the soldiers, however, were the gifts of part of the Allied military equipment captured by the Bolshevist armies from Denikin, Yudenich, Kolchak, Miller and other "Whites." Mr. Fischer adds "this intimate relationship between Russia and Turkey appreciably raised Bolshevik prestige with Islam and was, therefore, doubly irritating to Great Britain."

The Allies of Great Britain themselves began to leave Greece to her fate. For the sake of Greece they were not ready to jeopardise their own prospects even to please England. Italy evacuated Adalia. The French came to terms with Kemal Pasha. Franklin Bouillons' Mission had established intimate relations between the French and Ankara. The British alone persisted in their hostility against Turkey. Until at last by a remarkable military feat which even a Napoleon would have envied Kemal Pasha re-conquered Smyrna in September, 1922, and would have annihilated the whole Greek army if that had not been allowed to cross over the sea. Mr. Fischer further on says, "The Mudania Convention was hailed with enthusiastic demonstration by Mohammedanism—Indians in Calcutta as well as by the Turkish population in Constantinople, and it was hailed everywhere, not without reason, as a blow dealt specially at England." The reconquest of Smyrna on 8th September, 1922, by Kemal Pasha was celebrated everywhere with joy by Mussalmans. Houses were illuminated including that of the Author and joyful meetings were held all over India. It was a great day—as great in India as in

Turkey. Kemal Pasha was the hero of the hour at every place. On every lip was his name. With the conquest of Smyrna (Izmir) on one side, the victorious Turks marched towards Istanbul on the other, and reached Chanak which the British had declared to be within the neutral Zone. Naturally Kemal Pasha refused to recognise such a high-handed declaration. A direct quarrel between England and Turkey was feared. It was actually averted by the foresight of Lord Harrington, but H. H. the Aga Khan should also be given the credit of using his influence and statesmanship in impressing upon the British public the disastrous results of a war with Turkey at that moment when the whole of the British Empire in the East was shaking and the British people laboured under heavy taxation. The British Popular Press now gave its support to the Aga Khan. War with England was averted. It was a great service indeed rendered by the Aga Khan to Turkey, but no less a service to Britain. The Aga Khan himself has never made public the important and effective part he played at that crisis and the Author gives it the publication even now, *without* consulting him, as a historic fact. On 16th September, 1922, Mr. Lloyd George sent an S.O.S. to the British Dominions supplicating for help in a war againt Turkey. It fell flat. The Aga Khan got his opportunity. His English friends, in influential positions, particularly those who were the proprietors of popular Papers, helped him because the new war would have increased still further the taxation in Britain. Mr. Lloyd George fell not long after. It was a great diplomatic victory. On 23rd September, 1922, a note addressed direct "to the Government of the Grand National Assembly" at Angora was sent which was framed in very different language and exhibited a very different spirit from that of his Downing Street "declaration of policy" of 16th September. An armistice was at last signed at Mudania on 11th October, 1922. It ended the Graeco-Turkish War. The Grand National Assembly became the sole ruler of the Turkish State. Just as in 1897 Edhem Pasha had brought Greece down to the feet of Turkey, and England, France and Russia had saved her, so Mustafa Kemal Pasha had now got Greece at his mercy and could have taken back from her all that she had gobbled up after the Balkan War defeats of Turkey, but England again intervened at Chanak and stopped the victorious Turkish army from advancing any further for the moment. Sir Valentine Chirol lamentsin thus in "The Turkish Recovery" :—

"Then indeed in the presence of a Turkish triumph far more decisive than had probably been foreseen by our Allies and certainly quite unforeseen by the British Prime Minister, who had only recently given fresh and cordial expression to his confidence in the staying powers of the Greek army, a final effort was made to

restore the long lost unity, though it could now serve no other purpose than to save appearances. Even so Great Britain was left to take alone the Military and Naval measures which the British Government professed to deem imperative in order to avert an immediate rush of victorious Turkish armies across to Constantinople, and into Thrace. Greece was piteously abandoned to her fate and the Mudania Convention registered the surrender of the chief Allied war aims (Were they to destroy Turkey ?) and the resurrection of a militant Turkey." On 17th November, 1922, Vahiduddeen took refuge on a British Man-of-War. He was taken over to Malta. Chirol says, "This was a last service we could not deny to the unfortunate ruler who was paying the penalty for having placed his trust in our promises of support and steadfastly endeavoured to fulfil his engagements towards the Allies." No comment is necessary on this telling acknowledgment of the deceitful promises of the European Powers and of the slavishness of the Sultan. The Grand National Assembly selected Prince Abdul Majid Effendi as the Khalifa but all sovereign rights were put "inalienably, undividedly, and irrevocably in the moral person of the Grand National Assembly, the sole and only emanation of the people." (We wonder if the Lay Republic, declared afterwards, was really the sole "emanation" of the Muslim people of Turkey ?) The Powers decided to call a Conference at Lausanne to settle the terms of Peace in place of the already rejected Treaty of Sevres. The Lausanne Conference opened in November, 1922, and lasted till July, 1923. It was a battle not only between Asmat Pasha and Curzon but also between Chechcrin and Curzon. It was a good duel. To beat England at a Conference table is no joke. England, as usual, had to deal with other's patrimony, other's rights, not her own. But the *Manchester Guardian* had to write: "In M. Chechcrin, Lord Curzon for the first time, met a person whose rapier was sharper and quicker than his own." George Chechcrin had the better of George Curzon inasmuch as he could talk in every European language. He was as well acquainted as was Curzon with the geographical or historical points of the case. It was the question of the Dardanelles that was the main issue. Mr. Fischer has very eloquently described the whole situation:—

"The very presence of Chechcrin provoked the first British delegate at Lausanne. Curzon could assume no cultural superiority *vis-a-vis* the Commissar . . . . Chechcrin to Curzon stood for communist doctrine and history of Russia—a combination which acted like a 'red rag on a bull.' But the chief reason why Lord Curzon did not like M. Chechcrin was because he felt that Bolshevik Russia hindered an agreement with Turkey." Asmat

Pasha was weak. Nor was he very clever. He might have been a good general but he was not so good a diplomat. He, like other Turkish Leaders, lacked diplomatic shrewdness and finesse. He also lacked imagination. "If Checherin distressed Curzon," says Mr. Fischer, "Curzon indubitably irritated the Turks. The British Foreign Secretary wished to sign the death warrant of Turkey in Europe." "For nearly five centuries," he had written, "the presence of the Turks in Europe has been the source of destruction, intrigue, and corruption in European politics." "Curzon, therefore, proposed," says Earl Ronaldshay, "*the ejection of the Turks from Europe* and the establishment of a much-reduced but compact and homogeneous Turkish State in Asia Minor."

But in respect of the Sultan-Khalifa even Lord Curzon did not propose to go as far as Kemal Pasha has gone. He was afraid of the "Sultan's retirement which may easily burst into savage fury" and when on 6th January, 1920, the British Cabinet rejected the plan of expelling the Turks from Constantinople, Lord Curzon, like an Englishman, consented to give effect to the British Cabinet's Policy at Lausanne. Mr. Lloyd George in fact was more hostile to Turkey. Lord Curzon wrote to his wife that "the Prime Minister is as convinced a Venezelist and Phil-Hellene as ever." The Turkish delegation at the Lausanne Conference was supported by Soviet Russia, Soviet Georgia and Soviet Ukraine, Great Britain led the opposition which consisted of France, Italy Roumania, Greece and even Japan which would have been wiser to support an Asiatic State as it would have been of some help to her when the European Powers will hem in and treat her as they treated Turkey just as she grew weaker. Mr. Child was a neutral observer on behalf of the United States. He supported Turkey on the question of Mosul for the selfish ends as the American Admiral Chester held concession rights there, but supported the Allies on the question of the Dardanelles as well as on other matters which involved the interests of Bolshevik Russia.

"It devolved on the Russians at Lausanne," says Mr. Fischer, "*to be more Turkish than the Turks* and Checherin actually defended Turkish sovereignty over the Straits with greater zeal than Ismet Pasha." The European diplomats tried to play at their old game and create differences between the Bolsheviks and the Turks but they failed to do so. The Turkish demand of protecting Istanbul was summarily rejected, although Lord Curzon did assure Ismet Pasha that "if he wished to guarantee his country's territorial integrity he had only to join the League of Nations"—whereupon Checherin referred to Vilna. "The impotence of the League," the Commissar commented, "has become proverbial." The French, Italian and British plenipotentiaries argued, cajoled, threatened. But at 7-45 p.m. Ismet Pasha and Raza Nur

rose and took their leave. Checherin had seen Ismet Pasha practically every day during this period. In Checherin's view, a break would only strengthen Turkey's position. He felt that in case of war, France would not fight by the side of England. In the end when rupture brought "greater benefits", Ismet agreed that Chechcrin's counsel had been wise—and helpful. He never forgot it.

In April, 1923, however, there was a resumption of the negotiations with Turkey. The Allies had more or less their own way, because of Turkey's own weakness, though a few modifications were made in the previous proposals in her favour. Chechcrin has written that the gigantic forces of England were not thrown against Turkey after the February rupture of the Lausanne Conference "because of Soviet Russia." Poincaré also wired an encouraging message to Kemal Pasha. "Moreover", says Mr. Fischer, "a war against Turkey in 1923 might have thrown India and the whole Muslim world into convulsion. Soviet Russia's *rôle* might have proven important. The fear of what Moscow could do in such an eventuality probably sobered Lord Curzon who, judging from his mood on the night of 4th February, when Ismet Pasha frigidly defied him, would have been only too ready to order the Mediterranean Fleet to Smyrna. Bolshevik prestige with Islam was then very high. For if Great Britain, before the War, won sympathy among Mohammedans by emphasizing the evils of Czarist oppression, she put a similar weapon into defter hands after the Communist revolution. A war against Turkey therefore might have shaken the British Empire." It was undoubtedly the Indian agitation and the Bolshevik friendliness which strengthened the hands of Ismet Pasha.

It must have become clear now to every reader of this book why Muslims welcomed Bolshevism at its rise. In its early days when the father of Bolshevism—Lenin—was at the helm it helped and sympathised with the whole of the Muslim world much more than the French or the Italian or even the British, who always profess a great friendship for Muslims, and are said to be the "greatest Muslim Power," ever did. Wherever any Muslim people were in trouble—in Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan and even in Arabia—whoever reached Lenin or his colleagues with any grievance he was ready to help not only by words of mouth but by deeds also. Muslims would be a very ungrateful Nation indeed if they did not respond to the Bolshevik sentiments of kindness and sympathy which they showed at one time or other to every Muslim State in distress. Nobody can deny that the Bolsheviks had before them their own ends. But the fact remains that they did give help to Muslim States and Muslim peoples, and up to this day have not drawn any selfish advantage for themselves from it. Bolsheviks

have taken no Muslim lands as a price of their help to Turkey in her troubles. For truth they have not taken any price or any portion of Muslim country not even from Iran, although it was they and they alone who helped Iran in getting herself out of the very mouth of the British Lion. A Pan-Islamist cannot but raise his cap to them. *They even tried to encourage Muslim solidarity.* They tried to reconcile Anwar Pasha and Kemal Pasha. They advised Amanullah Khan not to cause a disruption among his own people, and not to hurt their feelings. They advised Kemal Pasha also not to weaken the world position of Turkey. Lenin was a remarkably able and talented politician. He could see what the Turks with their limited vision and lack of imagination and foresight could not see. That is why Bolsheviks "were more Turkish than the Turks" and the Indians the same. Poor, brave, noble Turks! they are heroes in war, but they have not much brains. Even the best of them lack that and it was for this reason that not much of Turkey was saved in spite of their colossal sacrifices, their unequalled heroism and the remarkable military feats of their Marshals—Kazim Kara Bekir, Asmat Pasha, Kemal Pasha and others. The European Powers have almost got all that they wanted for the time being. The fact remains that it was England that won in the end, specially on the question of the Dardanelles. What Chicherin foresaw at the Lausanne Conference is now evident to the dull-headed Turks also and they have reopened the question of the Straits on the very lines which were insisted upon by the Soviet representative at Lausanne and because England has been frightened by Mussolini they have succeeded this time. Nor did Greece lose an inch of her territory in spite of the sacrifices she inflicted upon Turkey and although she was utterly defeated by the Turks in Asia Minor. Turkey never got any reparation or compensation. The Turks' military victory at Sakaria was grand but the net result of the Lausanne Conference has not been such as to justify much pride in it. Why? Because the Turks have no brains. Nor has Turkey got any position now internationally of much consequence. Why? Because the Turks have been so brainless as to give up of their own the unique international importance which Turkey possessed even in her degenerated recent past. As she has only a handful of Muslims left under her she has been given liberty to persecute or ill-treat them as much as she likes. Her persecution of her own people and an antagonism to their religious beliefs and social habits and culture is welcomed by the European Powers because it serves the object which they had had in view for the last three hundred years or more. Turkey has been allowed to join the League of Nations, as other Balkan States have been, But there also she has no position. If she had kept the

leadership of the Muslim World in her hands and continued to take pride in her own civilisation and culture, which had a world-wide scope and a marvellous historic background then she would have had her own status even though she was reduced in territory. She could have insisted on *a permanent seat* in the Council of the League of Nations as she would have represented a different culture inherited by millions of Muslims for generations past. She could have commanded at least seven votes—of Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, Albania and that of Egypt and Syria, which cannot be kept long away, and possibly also of Arabia and Palestine. With 90 million Muslims, 250 million other fellow citizens of theirs in India, would have been friendly to her against the intolerable and conceited Imperialism of Europe. With her progressive bent of mind and activities every Mussalman would have kept her as an example before himself. She would have really led the East. European Powers would have been compelled to respect her far more than what they were compelled to do by Sultan Abdul Hamid Khan for the degenerated Turkey of his days. And because Turkey would have then had a world position the Bolsheviks would have attached themselves to her *more* closely than they do now. Probably the Bolsheviks would not have given up so docilely their chief aim of World Revolution.

It is true that European Nations did not like Turkey as the leader of some 600,000,000 people spread all over the world and they used to intrigue to destroy that position of the Turks. But greatness has undoubtedly some drawbacks, even some penalties—it arouses jealousies ; it increases responsibilities. Turks did arouse jealousies. They aroused enmities. They generated fear. They often caused Imperial States, particularly Britain and Czarist Russia, grave anxieties. Their movements, their conditions of life were watched by millions of peoples all over the world. Sir John Morley, the one time Secretary of State for India, had admitted that what was said or done in Calcutta by Muslims was echoed in Constantinople and *vice versa*. Years before Morley the great historian Gibbon wrote :—

"Though the faces of Muslims of Delhi and Fez are turned five times a day towards the temple of Mecca yet their eyes are constantly fixed on the city of Constantinople."

Who can deny that in the Great War itself the little that has been left to Turkey of her old Empire was due *not altogether* to the victory of the Turks over Greece. There were friends of Turkey numbering by millions who did, if nothing else, at least keep off other big European Powers from joining with Greece in an open, organised attack on Ankara when the Turks were very, very hard pressed by the Greeks. A little push on that occasion by Britain would have finished Turkey. Even Russia was not then in a

position to help Turkey—who knows this fact better than Kemal Pasha himself? All writers of the history of the Great War and Turkey have acknowledged the fact that in 1921—23 "a war against Turkey might have shaken the British Empire." By whom? By Mussalmans—by Pan-Islamism. Pan-Islamism, though weak and unorganised, was far from remaining only an ineffective bogey. It was a living force. It stopped the Power with the greatest possible resources, which had played the chief part in smashing up Turkey even when German men and money and munition and other scientific resources were at the command of Turkey, from attacking Turkey when she was almost crushed by a puny State, which was Turkey's own vassal not very long ago. None but obstinate, self-deluded fools would say that Pan-Islamism was not helpful to Turkey in saving what has been saved of her.

Of course nobody in his senses can minimise the sacrifices, the heroism and the patriotism of the Turks themselves. Nor can anybody deny that if the Nationalist Turks had yielded as did the Constantinople Turks not much could be saved. But if Indian Muslims had not kept England in check by their own sacrifices the Turks would have been completely overwhelmed and their sacrifices, heroism and patriotism would have hardly got an opportunity to come into play. Now that Turkey has discarded the Khilafat and alienated Muslim attachment by her irreligious or "lay" policy does she expect that worldwide sympathy and support which she had before? No. The truth is that it was a capital political blunder to abolish the Turkish Khilafat. None but the unimaginative Turks who lack political sense and are no good diplomats would have done it. The time will come when the Turks will curse the day in March, 1924, when the Khilafat was abolished. Then the soul of Kemal Pasha himself will feel uneasy about it.

The fact is that the Turks had no power or authority to *abolish the office of the Khilafat.* What they could do was to banish the Ottoman Khalifa and that they did. By their foolishness they themselves gave away that which had made them the cynosure of the Muslims of the world. They were preferred even over the Arabs—over the descendants of the Prophet himself. This was the glory of Islam. Nationality or heredity did not carry much weight. The Afghans and the Persians, the Turks and Arabs all were alike. But the Turks had the Khilafat with them. So they had the superior authority. Who will now be the ultimate loser? Thousands and thousands and thousands of Kemals will come and go but Islam will live for ever. Even the Office of the Khilafat which is a part of the constitution of Islam will not remain long unrejuvenated.

Would the Ata Turk relearn the history of his own race—the Turkish and Moghul.

Did not a cruel invader of his own race, before the Moghuls or Turks embraced Islam, destroy the Khilafat of Baghdad ? Did not again Timur, a non-Muslim, capture Bayazid, a Muslim, and put him in a cage. But did not these and scores of other events like these or even more severe than these, as the expulsion of the glorious Arabs from Spain or the destruction of the magnificent Great Moghul's Empire in India, fail to destroy Islam ? Islam has gone on and *is going* on extending its sway far and near on *all* the Continents—even in Australia.

History may even repeat itself. The "lay" Ruler of Turkey himself or his successor may become an instrument in extending even the territorial possessions of Islam as the descendants of the terrible destroyer of the Baghdad's Khilafat did. Everybody who has eyes to see can see that those Turks (and their number is very small, although they have at present got the power in their hands) who voted against the Khalifa did it in a huff and because of a spite.

Mr. Hampden Jackson in his *The Post-War World* (1918—1934) has put the matter well in these words:—"Under the necessity of ridding themselves at once of old shackles the Turks had torn off much of their living flesh, doing violence to their own traditional culture." Let us hope that this tearing away of "their living flesh" will not cause blood-poisoning. Mr. Jackson is hopeful. He says :—"But these changes" (made by Kemal Pasha), "are not much more than skin-deep. The Caliphate, the subjection of women, Arabic letters, and the covered head were only incidental to Islam. The life of Islam depends not on them but on the faith and on the vitality of the Islamic people. The faith is still alive." (Yes, but the generation is being deliberately divorced from religion. M.H.K.) . . . . "The vital test of an organism is its capacity to adapt itself to its environment. The Islamic people have proved their vitality by adopting the political and economic weapons of the West." Mr. Jackson forgets, as have forgotten the Turkish Reformers, that both "political and economic weapons of the West" have been now *discredited* by the sound thinkers of the West itself. Not only Bolshevists but also Fascists and Nazi-ists are in revolt against them. But he is not far wrong when he suggests, "They (Muslims) have ensured their survival by taking on the protective colouring of the Western world. In a world of "Nation States" Islam has taken to Nationalism." But this shows the *inferiority complex* of the Turkish Reformers all the same.

Mr. Jackson continues:—"We have said that the position of the Islamic world of to-day is like the position of Christendom

at the Renaissance . . . . . Yet Christendom built up a new civilization after the Renaissance and conquered half the world" . . . . . .

"It is perhaps worth while to emphasise that the absorption by Islamic peoples of an infidel culture—which is in its essence only the development of the Arabic science (Will the Ata Turk please note ? M.H.K.) and Greek philosophy absorbed by Europe—is a sign not of decadence but of adolescence."

In what we have said about the new Turkish reforms we must not be misunderstood. Our criticism of the policy of Kemal Pasha is only when he has exceeded the limits of statesmanship and as far as he has done harm to the interests of Islam and Turkey both, politically.

Considering all the circumstances of the moment one would feel inclined to excuse Kemal Pasha to have taken certain steps to ensure the safety of the new Turkish State which he rightly thought was in danger at the hands of its old enemies. In those days the Ankara Leaders were wisely and justly suspicious of England. A wretched Indian spy had to be hanged in Turkey. It so happened that two Indian Muslims sent a letter to Kemal Pasha advising him, as Turkey's well-wishers and also because they were well informed of the feelings of 90 million Muslims of India towards the Khilafat, to reconsider his decision to do away with the Khilafat. We have come to know that although personally Khalifa Abdul Majid Khan was above intrigues yet there were reasons for the Ankara Turkish Leaders to suspect that secret steps were in contemplation to restore the Sultanate. The letter of H. H. the Aga Khan and Mr. Justice Amir Ali (both personal friends of the Author and whose honest motives for the occasion were well known to him) was supposed to be the work of the British Ministers to create a rupture in the Turkish Nation. Who can say that this was not possible or even probable ? Therefore the Turks thought they should scotch the mischief, when they were powerful enough to do so and at the time when the victory over the Greeks had raised the prestige of Kemal Pasha to its highest point. If the Khilafat of the Ottomans was to be given up it was undoubtedly the best time for it, from Kemal Pasha's point of view. We do not say that Kemal Pasha was *not* justified in adopting measures to *nip in the bud* the machinations of European Powers to create schism in the Nation under the cover of Khilafat, *He was perfectly justified in having no faith in England.* He was rightly afraid and suspicious of England. England had already done Turkey the gravest harm and if Russia had not been Bolshevised the two together would have finished her. Both the Aga Khan and Mr. Amir Ali were undeniably loyal British subjects. They

would have admitted this themselves. Their *bona fides* could be questioned. Yet the matter of the Khilafat was too serious to be dealt with precipitately on the spur of the moment. It was wrong not to take the advice even of Turkey's tried friends and well-wishers. It was wrong to be moved by personal prejudices and spite on such a question. Statesmanship demanded cautious steps. By these panicky moves Kemal Pasha confirmed people in the view that the Turks lacked statesmanship. The Khilafat indeed was not only a source of religious honour and prestige for the Turks; even politically it conferred on the Turkish Nation a very high international position and status. As a military general also Kemal Pasha cannot do credit to himself if he cannot appreciate the military value of the Constitution of Islam. And the policy he adopted after peace was established, has done him and his colleagues no credit at all.

It seemed that the panicky fear of England on the one hand and the prejudices that were created in Kemal Pasha by the actions of the Shaikh-ul-Islam and the Khalifa at the end of the Great War on the other hand made him lose his balance of mind. The sense of proportion was gone. The worst of all was that a man of Kemal Pasha's military genius adopted an inferiority complex. He allowed himself to be overawed by Europe. Everything European—not only indulgence in wine and women—but also the hide-bound nationalism and an immoral and irreligious outlook of life were considered to be worthy of imitation. He felt ashamed of the Turks being an Eastern Nation. He felt ashamed of their Eastern culture, their Eastern civilization, their Eastern language, their Eastern traditions, and their Eastern religion. He forgot the glorious pages of his own history. He forgot that the Turks were proud of being an Eastern Nation and that they looked down with contempt upon Europe. He forgot that the Turks in their Eastern dress reached Vienna and knocked at the gates of Rome. He only thought for the moment of the darkest page of the Ottoman history—the page that was written by Vahid-uddeen. It was ridiculous to hide his face in an Asiatic corner and to pose as a Westerner. He himself adopted a small town in Asia as the headquarters of his totally isolated little Turkish State yet he pretended that Turkey under him had become a Western State to be treated as a European Power. He thought that if he put on the skin of a wolf, Europe would believe him to be really a wolf. Was it not idiotic?

Alas! the Turks have no imagination nor have they much political sense. They think that if they can dance like Europeans, if they get drunk like Europeans, and if they dress like Europeans, Miss Europa will fall in love with them and hug them to her bosom. But the fact is that she only laughs at them up her sleeves as

self-deluded simpletons. And they have alienated the sympathies of their brothers in Asia by their stupid and blind imitation of Europe.

It was only a lame excuse that modern reforms could not be initiated unless Turkey was made a "*lay*" State. Most of the recent reforms are the old Young Turk or older Nizamist reforms. It was as early as in the reign of Sulaiman the Magnificent (sixteenth century) that the "*Canun*" (criminal and commercial law) was incorporated in the *Shariat*. In the nineteenth century, after the French Revolution, the Tanzimat reformers adopted the French Penal Code and the French Commercial Code. During 1869—1877, the Ottoman Civil Code was codified which became the Common Law of the Ottoman Empire irrespective of creed and race. While the Muslim family law continued to remain under the jurisdiction of the Shaikh-ul-Islam, non-religious Nizamat State Courts have been established since 1856. In the courts of Causation, Christian Judges sat side by side with the Muslim judges. In other respects also a new movement began in 1909. The famous French Regisseur Antione was engaged to establish a new theatre. Even the change of the alphabet was carried out in the adjoining Muslim country before it was effected in Turkey.

The difference is that previous Reforms were carried out in a better spirit. They were not initiated in a provoking or deliberately defying manner. Now they have been carried out with a haughty autocracism which no self-respecting people can cherish. Now defiantly a "lay republic" has been declared which outrages the sentiments of all the citizens excepting a very few persons.

One of the best proofs of the fact that the Young Turk methods were better than Kemalist methods is that the former made the enemies of Turkey uneasy as they brightened up its future prospects and were thought to increase its popularity and influence in the Muslim world. Now the enemies are very happy at the folly that Turkey has itself given up its international position and its world-wide influence—even leadership. Then the European Powers thought that a reformed Turkey would become a great world Power with a religious hold over millions of brave and virile people whom they would have to reckon with. Now they know that these methods of Reform and their anti-religious colouring will isolate Turkey and make her friendless and weak. Even if she succeeds in teaching all her people to dress and dance like a tenth class European or Eurasian nation, they will be more reassured of her insignificance and impotency. It will estrange the East more from her.

It is only the East which can really defend her and help her when in trouble. If she loses the sympathy of the East she will be isolated soon.

But we are optimistic: a Pan-Islamist cannot but be optimistic. Islam is another name for optimism—optimism in this world and in the next. We expect that Kemal Pasha will take upon himself to assert the superiority of his own culture, traditions, even of his own dress and food and certainly of his glorious religion and the Universal Brotherhood. This cowardly cringing before the West will go. The present blind imitation will go.

The Writer of these lines who has spent about twenty years of his life in Europe used before to put on the English dress while in Europe but now he puts on his oriental costume as a mark of superior civilization.

By long experience he has learnt that Eastern civilization is superior to that of the West even in minor matters—in dress, in food, etc., etc.

What right have they, for instance, to set a fashion in dress to civilised people whose womenfolk go almost naked like savages and that in public social functions ?

Surely an *achkan* (a kind of long coat) is a more decent, civilised and gentlemanly dress than a shabby, almost indecent, short coat.

Some of the Turkish so-called "reforms" show a childish mentality. It seems as if a few upstarts have been favoured by fortune with power and authority which they did not expect—nor did they deserve by their merits. They impose every fashion with an iron hand which has overawed them.

One of these "Reforms" is the changing of names. Rushdi Bey has been now changed into "Rushto Aras," Ismat Pasha into "Ismet Ivonu," and so forth.

It is propagating "nationalism" with a vengeance. But it is surely a funny kind of nationalism which compels an *Eastern Nation* to submit to the idiosyncrasies and even immoralities of the West —which prefers Western characters for an Eastern language and thus kills in one stroke all the past literary attainments. The Turkish Nation always used to write its language in its sisterly Arabic characters. Those letters had become *National* to the Turks as they were to Persians or to Indians (Urdu is also written in Arabic characters) or to Arabs themselves.

It is a funny kind of nationalism which makes it criminal to wear the cap which had acquired a *national* significance and a sign of national honour and to compel the Turkish Nation to put on the hat which it used to look down upon with contempt. It is a funny

kind of nationalism to compel a people to take pride not in their own culture, or civilization, or dress or religion but in that of other nations.

While attending a meeting of the League of Nations' Council as a visitor it was pointed out to the Author how rapidly the Turkish Foreign Minister was taking down some notes in the Turkish language *but in old Arabic* (*not Latin*) *characters* obviously because it was not possible to write as fast in Latin characters as in Arabic. If this were known to the "Ata Turk" that his own Foreign Minister preferred to use the old Turkish or *Arabic, Eastern* characters to the occidental, foreign Latin ones, he would certainly be sacked, if not hanged, as a rebel against the "Republic"—The Grand National(?) Assembly. In Turkey denationalisation has come to mean nationalisation! In India we have passed that stage when everything European overawed us. Our Ankara brothers are still in that low stage of mental development when they humbly *acknowledge the superiority of Europe in every possible thing.* To them everything European is worth copying.

Like India, Japan has now been regaining her superiority complex. She has stuck only to the most *useful parts* of European civilization. A Japanese would wear European dress when he is at work—riding, or driving a machine, or going up in an aeroplane, etc., but in his home or in cinemas and theatres he wears his own *national* kimonos and sandals. At home he would offer rice to the spirits of his forefathers on fixed days as did his remotest ancestors but in his office he will be a well-suited and booted clerk-driver if not a clerk himself. The Japanese language and alphabet are very complicated but the Japanese do not abandon them. They do not want to cut themselves away from their past although what is their past as compared to that of Islam—as compared to the Islamic past of the Turks themselves?

We do not deny that at certain times the copying of Europeans may be desirable—even wise and necessary. To protect oneself from the poison gas one should not hesitate for a second to wear a mask however hideous one may look in it. But no one would take to it as a part of everyday dress as it is so ugly and uncomfortable. If Amanullah Khan and Kemal Pasha had used their autocratic powers in introducing European dress in the army, navy and flying corps nobody would have blamed them but to have compelled even civilians and theologians, who have their own dress in Europe itself, to put on that dress which was neither convenient nor beautiful nor civilised was senseless. It meant barbarous interferences in and encroachments upon personal liberty. The spirit underlying such orders is autocratic and therefore extremely condemnable. It is a useless and objectionable onslaught on one's free will,

No man in the East can claim to be more at home in Europe, to be more conversant with its civilisation and culture and to have come more in touch at the spot with the best brains and the *elite* of society than His Highness the Aga Khan who has travelled all over Europe (and also in many parts of the East), who is a scholar at least in three European languages—French, German and English, and a poet and author himself in the last. No European can claim to be more cultured than he as he has fully assimilated all that is best in the Eastern culture as well as the Western. He is one hundred times better qualified to appraise the values of the Eastern culture and of the Western than most of the Turkish Leaders. But this man—a responsible, thoroughly educated, well-experienced, well-travelled, well-polished man—a gentleman, a nobleman respected by one and all, stood up before the Assembly of more than fifty learned representatives, mostly European, on an official occasion when Afghanistan entered the League of Nations, and in spite of his own official and responsible position (H.H. was the Leader of the Indian Delegation to the League) declared :—"India is proud of her Eastern culture, Eastern traditions, Eastern language, Eastern civilisation and with Afghanistan, eighty million Muslims of India are proud *as I am proud* to belong to the glorious Brotherhood of Islam."

Europeans like Mr. Edwin Felstead themselves say:—The Europeans "wear a terribly unnatural dress . . . . . The women are not like women ought to be, but hideously clad, overslimmed relics of human beings . . . . Rank, canned stale meat is eaten daily by millions . . . . European civilisation is insufficient. Something else is wanted, and wanted very badly to-day. Muslims emphatically disagree with the assertion that politics and economics must be kept apart from religious life. This saying is responsible for the appalling state of the world to-day, and it is clear that this terrible state is the outcome of only one machine—European or Western Civilisation."

It must not be understood that we think that Islam depends on how we dress or what alphabet or language we use in our writings and speeches ; or how we spell our names ; or whether we use the titles of effendi or mister or saheb or signor, or monsieur. Our prophet did *not* invent any new dress for his international Nation or for himself. He used the same old pagan Arab dress. Nor did he bring any new language. The Quran itself is in the old pure Arab language—in the pure Arabic of the Quraish. The way in which the Prophet ate his food was also the same old one and so forth. So the changes which have been made in Turkey recently are not very objectionable in themselves. A Muslim scholar has said that if he were made a Dictator he would accept 95 p.c. of the Kemalist reforms. What is most objectionable is

the way they have been made and *the spirit underlying them.* Their object seems to be to defy and provoke Islam. But those who push their heads against a rock shall burst their own heads—not the rock.

Once the inferiority complex is adopted by the Turkish soldiers all will be lost for Turkey. Every Turkish soldier felt himself superior to all Christians and Europeans and would have challenged any number of them before without the least hesitation.

The worst thing Kemal Ata Turk has done not for Turkey alone but also for himself is that he has lowered his aspirations for Turkey to a very degrading standard. His aim is to make Turkey another Greece or Bulgaria or maybe Switzerland. The Turks are expected by him to be overjoyed that Turkey has been accepted in the *Balkan Entente*!

To have high aspirations is the characteristic of great men—great minds. Kemal Pasha has shown that he has no great mind. Woe to that nation whose Ata (Father) has low and degraded aspirations as Kemal has come to possess.

He who was hailed from *all over the world* as the saviour has come to think of nothing but of the future of 6,000,000 or 8,000,000 people as part of the "*Little Entente.*"

The man who was chiefly responsible for "the resurgence of a militant Turkey in a trail of Islamic glory as the spearhead of widespread Muslim, if not general Asian, *revolt against Western ascendancy,*" feels self-satisfied if he can correctly copy a "Goose Step" in a European dance! The great *Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Pasha*—the modern Mr. *Ata Turk*! the brave victorious General who smashed to pieces a well-equipped enemy now uses his autocratic authority to behead his own people if they wear their *national* dress! And for this disgraceful fall nobody else is responsible but the man himself.

We cannot describe in words how sincerely grieved and how terribly melancholy we feel to have to express such views regarding a man for whom the Author bore the greatest respect and affection. The Author was the very first to address him as *Ghazi* in a reply to his letter sent through his agent in Rome some time in 1921. But we have been given to understand that nobody can utter a word of criticism before Kemal Pasha, so used to fulsome flattery and sycophancy has he become. A little bitter *truth* spoken to him may do him some good and the shock may restore him to a healthy, honest outlook of his life and conduct. No man of position or power has yet heard from the Author anything but unalloyed, solid and pure truth—nothing but truth. The Author had had an occasion to write recently:—Names do not count with me, shibboleths carry no weight and party divisions do not appeal

to me. In respect of personalities, I am a "political atheist" never overawed by anybody.

We, however, always make due allowance for everybody's position and have for this reason been behind nobody in praising Kemal Pasha when he deserved it.

In a letter sent in October, 1924, we said :—

After your national triumph at Lausanne I cabled my hearty congratulations to Your Excellency and you were good enough to cable back your reply. Now I take the opportunity of sending again my felicitations on the miraculous victory you achieved for your Nation and for the whole Muslim world against a very mischievous and barbarous enemy who I know was supported by at least one other most powerful enemy . . . . I also offer my congratulations not only on the military miracles which you and your associates performed which excel in certain respects the Historic achievements of great Generals, but on the still greater task of reorganising your Nation on the most advanced lines in every useful department of human life. You are trying to make the Turks great not only as individuals, not only as soldiers, but as a rapidly progressing Nation. I assure Your Excellency that probably there is not a single person in Asia who is not proud of you and your Nation. I feel that my dream is being realised, and that it will not be Japan that will prove the Saviour of Asia but the great and invincible Turkey which will take the lead not only of Islam but of the whole non-European world and save it from the thraldom of Europe.

To save misunderstandings we will make a personal explanation. We claim to be a *staunch Pan-Islamist* but have no pretensions whatever to be a "mulla" or a "hodja." In our October 1924 letter to the Head of the Turkish Government while protesting against the abolition of the Khilafat we said :—

"I am quite a *layman* and may even be considered by the over-orthodox, not to be an even apparently orthodox Muslim in rituals and ceremonies. In politics I am a Socialist—a Communist—and do not consider it just for any individual or group of individuals to possess any special privileges or prerogatives.

As a Muslim, I think that I or even the meanest beggar in the street for that matter, has as much right to be *Khalifa* as any other good Muslim. I do not believe that even the Khalifa has any right to be despotic or anything else but to be the first and chief servant of the Nation, still I owe it to my own frankness, to my own conscience as well as to the love I have for Turkey, to tell Your Excellency and through you to all my brothers in the Turkish National Assembly that the steps which have been adopted to demolish the Khilafat have been extremely unjust and unwise.

I consider them suicidal for the Turkish Nation. (I meant suicidal for its world position).

So understandable are the ways of Providence that while on one hand the Empire which had the seat of Khilafat in it is finished and only a small State is left of it and that too has fallen in the hands of people who have declared it to be a "lay republic," this very generation has seen the extension of Islam even to such places where it had not reached before. Within a few years' time mosques have been built where there were none before. There is a mosque now in London, Berlin and Paris and even in distant Japan where the religion of Islam is not even now recognised by the State, a well-endowed, imposing mosque has been built which resounds with the call of *Allah-o-Akbar*, *Allah-o-Akbar* and with *haye alal salah*, *haye alal falah*, come to prayer, come to prosperity, **five times a day.**

The news has just come that now the old Cordova Mosque has also been restored to Muslims.

The number of Muslims, in spite of the fact that the great Muslim State where the Khalifa was the head, has now been forcibly turned into a "lay republic," is increasing rapidly and we have no doubt that in India at least the increase will become more rapid and more substantial if the untouchables really desire a religion excellent not only spiritually but also **the very best** means of giving "untouchables" equal status and position and rights with all Muslims—even Kings—even persons of the bluest blood not in India alone but all over the world.

Messrs. Bennett and Browne have brought out a book under the name of *What an Unlettered Arab Uttered in His Trances.* It is an excellent collection of a number of verses of the Quran under 143 distinct headings. It has been fittingly dedicated to "The peoples of the East and to the peoples of the West, the coloured and the white, the untouchables and the touchables."

The one heading in the book is:—

A Message of Hope to the Untouchables.

In the preface of the book the learned authors say:—
"The Book (Quran) to-day has a word for the "untouchables" and a word for the touchables. It has a word for the princes and a word for the peasants. Indeed it reclassifies them all, creates a fresh order of precedence; promulgates a *new order of nobility.*

"Truly," says the Quran, "the noblest of you in the sight of Allah is he who (in the conduct of his daily affairs) fears His reckoning most. Surely Allah is knowing, Aware. (XLIX: 13)."

This then is the Quranic conception of a noble life. Live a life of righteousness, walk in the fear of Allah, and you are a *nobleman*. Rejoice therefore ye lowly of the earth, for here is honour and nobility within your very own grasp. Accidents of birth, place, caste, creed do not count. Lip-professions, appearances, labels, do not really matter. Says the Quran :—"And they say, None shall enter the garden (Paradise) unless they be Jews or Christians. These are their own fancies. Nay ! but whosoever submits himself entirely to Allah, and *doth good* his reward is with his Lord, and there shall no fear come upon him, neither shall they grieve."

Sincere workers who are themselves converts from Hinduism and present personal examples that Islam has trampled under its feet all the caste and race and other distinctions which divided man from his brother man, are moving among the untouchables and there can be no doubt that their examples will be followed soon by thousands, if not, millions.

That neither Buddhism nor Sikhism can solve the problem of *untouchability* has been made evident by Mr. Raghavan who accepted Sikhism but had had to renounce it after actual experience.

He says, "This claim of the Sikh leaders is a glaring and Himalayan lie and a piece of Satanic propaganda to befool the poor and unsophisticated depressed classes of other provinces of India who are ignorant of the real state of affairs in the Punjab and of the actual social and moral conditions of the Sikhs.

"Whatever little good there is in Sikhism is the blessing of Islam. Nay, Sikhism is only a travesty of real Islam. Why accept a shadow in preference to the real substance ? Sikhism was originally a faith nearer to Islamic unity but it has long died a natural death. What we find in actual and factual life is mere a child of Hinduism and combines all the curses and evils of the parent body together with some filthiest and most repulsive customs which are the by-products of Sikhism itself.

"I feel it my national duty to warn all Depressed Classes against the suicidal step of embracing Sikhism which has got over ten lakh untouchables within its fold. I can assure every honest man that the condition of the Depressed Classes will be worse in Sikhism than in Hinduism. They will only fall into a frying pan from fire.

"We must leave Hinduism. But equally we must be careful to avoid contact with all off-shoots and natural children of Hinduism, *e.g.*, Sikhism, Jainism and Buddhism. From even the nationalistic point of view our conversion into Sikhism or Buddhism will be the greatest disservice to the cause of the unification and liberation

of our motherland. Nay this step will sound the death-knell of all hopes for the Nationhood and Statehood of India for centuries to come. The creation of the inter-communal problems of Sikhs versus Muslims, or Buddhists versus Muslims in all provinces of India will further Balkanize our motherland. It will introduce new elements of conflicts and quarrels where there are none. Let us all be careful of this danger and steer our bark clear of these rocks and shoals.

"I fear there is an *Imperialistic* design behind the interested move to revive Buddhism and Sikhism in India. Buddhism will do no good to our country. It has done little for the unification of China. It has been tried and found wanting in India. Why waste time in making experiments ? We have neither the time, nor the resource for such costly trials. Let us all embrace Islam and save India. It is absolutely incorrect to say that by embracing Islam we will be "denationalised." In fact, the 80 million Muslims of India are sociologically the only "Nation" in this sub-continent which is worthy of its name. To call the congeries and conglomeration of thousands of castes, communities, classes, races and tribes of the Hindus a "nation" is a misnomer. Muslims are far more nationalist and patriotic than the caste-ridden Hindus can ever aspire to be.

"Dr. Ambedkar has rightly termed Hinduism as a "contagious disease and not a religion." The best service to the motherland is to save her from this deadly "plague" and not to remain within the ambit of its blighting "culture" and dehumanizing civilization. There is place for ants, cows, monkeys, peepul trees, and stone idols in this civilization but not for the people who are hungry for social equality, human brotherhood and economic freedom.

"Islam and Islam alone, as Dr. Ambedkar has admitted, can give the Depressed Classes all they need. Compared to this substance all other systems are mere shadows. Let us all accept the substance and enter the universal Brotherhood of Islam."

Thus though the "sword" of Islam has become rather dull for the moment, its spiritual power seems to be getting more and more sharpened day by day.

In the East, India and Japan and in Europe the British Isles seem to be the largest fields for proselytization, although we think that Bolshevik Russia should offer the greatest opportunity.

No Pan-Islamist, much less one who is a resident of India, can be indifferent to the fate of that country which was under Muslim rule for centuries, which in one way or the other, has played a great part in the political and social conditions of the world and which now possesses a Muslim population which no other single country in the world possesses. The number of

Muslims which have congregated in one Province of India alone—Bengal—exceeds those which populate any one country anywhere.

Unfortunately these Muslim masses in India are very down-trodden, very weak, very poor, very disorganised—in many respects very un-Islamic. Unfortunately even the few educated that there are among these masses are mostly demoralised and degenerated. Unfortunately even the intelligentsia lacks unity and has little talent for organisation. The Ulema have a more narrow outlook and are more hide-bound than are their *confrere* in Europe. Unfortunately Indian Muslims do not have that love of liberty, that courage of conviction which would have made them worthy of Islam. Unfortunately Muslims of India supply the foreign rulers of India a large number of loyal and brave soldiers who have helped in the subjugation of not only a good many non-Muslims but also Muslim peoples themselves.

Yet Islam like a brilliant diamond shines even in darkness.

These illiterate, poor, weak, depressed masses have after all that very spark in them, though it is just an infinitesimally tiny spark, but the spark it is, which "blazed heaven-high" not only once, but repeatedly in the last thirteen centuries.

Because of that little spark these Muslim masses can prove a splendid material for a world revolution in the hands even of a Lenin much more in the hands of a Pan-Islamic Reformer—*Mujaddid* who would combine in him a military with a spiritual genius—a *Mehdi*—one who would closely follow the footsteps of Muhammad. If India ever regains her glory it will be through a man like that.

It is not a matter of credit to the Muslims of India that there are still in India over 250 millions of non-Muslims, most of whom are steeped in idolatory and superstitions, although Muslims have been in India for centuries and centuries past. Most of these Non-Muslims continue to worship idols, trees, rivers and cows although in a few years only the whole of Arabia was freed from all idol worshippers not by the sword but by the Grand and Noble example set by early Muslims—the example in moral character, honesty, truthfulness, love of the neighbour, help for all distressed and depressed people, and in fact in all social virtues.

If the Muslims of India had done the same, the millions of Non-Muslims would have undoubtedly been attracted by Islam. And what do we 90 million Muslims do now ? We are sorry to say that in certain respects our attitude is such that some of our own independence-loving, courageous, and self-respecting brothers get disgusted of the example we set.

Indeed there have been many such men produced by Islam in India who have attracted hundreds and thousands of Hindus to themselves. As has been related before even in our own time Haji Waris Ali Shah had thousands upon thousands of such *Murrids* who were technically Non-Muslim. Thousands, if not millions, of Non-Muslims go to his tomb even now year after year on a kind of pilgrimage.

Besides such saintly exceptional examples Islam must have expected of thousands of its sons to have captivated Non-Muslims and brought to its fold in millions by setting an example of the love of independence of the nation and country and a high moral character. It is only by showing superior merits in their own person by Muslims that the masses of the Hindus and untouchables can be converted to Islam and the Muslim minority changed into majority even for the political ascendancy of Islam in India.

At one time it was thought that Kemal Pasha had started the policy of persecuting religion and religious Heads at the dictation of the Bolsheviks. But the Bolsheviks were then under Lenin and *Lenin was no fool.* Perhaps he had more brains than the whole Turkish Nation combined. He was a wise man. He was a far-seeing statesman. If he had lived he would most probably have chosen Islam for Russia. It is said that he had some Muslim blood in him. It is also said that in a conversation with a Muslim leader known to the Author, Lenin said that when the Communist State would settle down, passions would subside and in due course all Russia would adopt Islam. Politically also a far-sighted statesman like Lenin would have liked as a helpmate a resurgent, self-conscious, ambitious, proud Turkey which was looked up to as a leader by an innumerable mass of virile people spread all over the world than a tenth-rate Balkan State ashamed of herself and with her head bowed down before everything European—a cringing dog ready to lick every boot made in Europe. Lenin wished to encourage the Pan-Islamic tendencies of Amanullah Khan. Naturally he would have liked to do the same with greater force in the case of Turkey which could make herself a strong spearhead for the East—at least the Muslim East, far more powerful, far more effective than could Afghanistan.

Nor would it be correct to say that Lenin did not like Anwar Pasha because of his Pan-Islamism. What Lenin did not like in Anwar Pasha was not his Pan-Islamism but his supervening Pan-Turanianism. And that also because Anwar Pasha's ambitions covered Russian Turkestan as a part of his Pan-Turanian Empire. How could Lenin or any Russian like that ? Who knows, Anwar Pasha might have aimed at conquering Russia herself later. Anwar was *not* Kemal. Kemal Pasha had a narrow,

national outlook. He had no Pan-Turanian schemes. His interests did not clash with those of the Bolsheviks. He did not dream of conquering the whole East. It was for these reasons that he was preferred.

Mr. E. Cassey, in his article in the "Islamic Review" of February, 1932, under the heading "A Debt of an Outsider to the Fold," has well diagnosed the cause of the disease of the Inferiority Complex among certain Muslims, in these words:—

"It is probable that there are a few at least in all Muslim countries (mostly in the authoritative quarters in Turkey. M.H.K.) who are so much confused and confounded by the glare of modern, sudden, and overwhelming advance in Europe that they do not feel certain of their own ground, and are looking at facts and questions in the way Europe has set them and have no time even to read their own Book and see how it puts the question or answers them."

It is absolutely wrong to say that Bolshevik Russia and a Khilafatist Turkey could not have pulled on well together. Their viewpoints would have come closer together because Bolshevism and Pan-Islamism have mostly a common objective in view and they can very conveniently work together. "Bolshevism is Pan-Islamism minus God," only the Quranic God-idea gives Islam a tremendous superiority.

In October, 1924, when the Writer of these pages sent a letter to Kemal Pasha he explained in detail the Muslim point of view, as regards the abolition of the Ottoman Khilafat. But unfortunately about the same time the Turks were given another cause to get suspicious of the Indians, *i.e.*, of the British. The Khilafat Committee of India, through a lack of political sense and without gauging the situation in Turkey, asked for permission from the President of the new Turkish Republic to allow a deputation to come to Turkey to discuss the Khilafat question. Then Ismet Pasha was fresh from the Lausanne Conference where he had had to make a severe fight, helped by the Bolsheviks, against Lord Curzon representing England. Ismet Pasha had seen what sinister motives had actuated England at the Conference table. So the Nationalist Turks thought that the request for accepting a deputation must be another trick of British statesmen to interfere in the internal affairs of Turkey. Besides this, a public deputation at that moment would have brought home to the Turkish masses themselves the foolishness of the Turkish Leaders in giving away a valuable international asset which no Non-Muslim Empire, even if it was the widest and the largest, ever possessed, and which was a source of honour and strength to the Turkish Nation. For these reasons the Turkish Government refused point blank the request

on the excuse that the Ottoman Khilafat was an internal affair of Turkey in which no external interference could be tolerated. What should have been done was to send *privately* somebody whom the Turks knew and in whom they had full confidence to explain the Indian, rather the Islamic, point of view in a *brotherly* manner impressing upon the Turks the idea that they were injuring their own nation by exiling the Ottoman Khalifa from Turkey and that what the Indian Muslims said was as sincere friends of Turkey not as the subjects of a nation which they knew was the enemy of Turkey. That probably would have induced Kemal Pasha to reconsider the matter at some time later even if not immediately. But Fates will have their own way. The Ottoman Khilafat had to finish. And it did finish as far as Turkey was concerned. We can only repeat :—

Inna Lilallah va inna ilaihe ragiun.

Who could have ever imagined that the Turks themselves will abandon the Ottoman Khilafat ? But such is Fate that the Ottomans have themselves abolished the Khilafat which one of their most famous Sultans had acquired as the brightest jewel in the Turkish Nation's Crown. The Ottomans have themselves given away the headship of 600,000,000 peoples of the World ! This they have done out of fear of the British and to spite, in their simple minds, the Arabs who had revolted against them in the last war. But by this very means they have given in the hands of fortune an instrument which might tell against the Turks and which may revive the glory of the Arabs and make them again the first Nation in the world in due time.

Be it so !

Malikul Mulk Tutial mulk ! min mun tashaa. Vatoizze man tashaa vatuzille man tashaa biyadikal khair.

The Arabs may regain in a few years the position which they had lost for centuries and which if the Turkish leaders had not been foolish enough to give away voluntarily—the Leadership of a very large part of the East and a unique international status,—there was not much chance of the Arabs ever getting back.

Clever as the Bolsheviks are they have, with their friendship for Turkey, already adopted a sympathetic policy towards Arabia also, remote though that Sea of Sand, which is the international centre of Islam, is from Russia and irreligious though the Bolsheviks are.

Wonderful are the ways of Heaven and so marvellously cosmopolitan and tolerant are both the Faith and the Constitution of Islam which does not recognise any racial, colour, language

or other boundaries, that who knows that one fine morning his own reason, his own conscience and the interests of his Nation and country may prompt the Mikado of Japan—the ruler of the land of the Rising Sun—to sincerely call out the magical formula which has revolutionised the world several times before—the grand *Kalama Tayyebba*, the sacred call—*La illaha illa Allah, Muhammad rasul Allah.* At that very moment Japan will become a world-Power with six hundred million friends and sympathisers spread all over the globe. Nothing would then prevent the Mikado from even acquiring the *Khilafat* and thus becoming the Head, the *Amir*, of a great mass of humanity who would owe moral and spiritual allegiance to him and will have the fullest social and even political community of interest with him. If the Mikado succeeds, as the Arabs at one time did, and which the Turks failed to do particularly in the later period of their history, in organising the Pan-Islamism of that mass of humanity, the *empire* of the Mikado over the hearts of the peoples in ever-increasing numbers, even if not also over territories, would extend all over the globe.

Or quite the contrary case is also possible.

The Bolshevists, after an experience of a godless life of fifteen or twenty years when they see that all their noble ambitions of a world-revolution are being, in fact have actually been, destroyed, and when they find that it is only through the Red Army that they can impose, and that too only upon their own people whose slavish mentality has been confirmed rather than diminished, their noble socialistic and communistic principles, they may themselves accept the aegis of Islam without having to give up even one item of their really beneficial principles. They may thus automatically make members of the Communist Party all the millions of Russian Muslims and also many and many and many millions more spread all over the world. Thus by one stroke they may effect a world revolution and succeed in spreading those cherished principles of theirs which Islam had advocated centuries before but which undoubtedly stood in need of rejuvenation and reassertion.

The Author has repeatedly criticised certain actions of the present régime in Turkey. This is so extremely painful to the Author's own heart and those Turks who know the Author must understand this, that he does not hesitate to return to the subject once more at the end of this chapter on Turkey to leave no room for the slightest misunderstanding. It is long and persisting love for Turkey and the Turks that causes this pain. It is the affection and respect for Kemal Pasha that has been hurt by his unexpected suicidal policy.

The very first point to be mentioned is that we do *not* think that *any* advancing and civilised State in these days can be anything but a *neutral* State from a religious point of view. In fact the Islamic State has been a neutral State in all racial or even religious matters in its *best days*. Muslims have given charters of liberty of conscience, not only to Christians and Jews and Zoroastrians nor only to the "Peoples of the Book" but even to the "idolatrous Hindus."

Mr. Ishwari Pershad writes in his "Mediaeval India":—"When the people of Brahmanabad approached Muhammad bin Qasim, the conqueror of Sindh, in India, to grant them the freedom of worship he referred the matter to Hajjaj who sent the following reply:—

"As they have made submission and have agreed to pay taxes to the Khalifa nothing more can be properly required of them. They have been taken under our protection, and we cannot in any way stretch out our hands upon their lives or their property. Permission is given to them to worship their gods. Nobody must be forbidden or prevented from following his own religion."

In every Muslim country all people were allowed to be governed by their Heads—even under their own secular laws. It was this extreme tolerance which later on became a curse for all Muslim States in the form of capitulations.

So if it had been declared that Turkey would adopt a strictly neutral policy in all religious or racial matters nobody would have welcomed this declaration more than the Author. We would have gone to the extent of saying that it would have been a really Islamic declaration if it had been proclaimed that every Turkish citizen, rich or poor, official or non-official, Turk or non-Turk, Muslim or non-Muslim would have equal rights, equal status and equal opportunities.

We believe that the greater freedom of conscience and opportunities of free judgment a person is given the more he or she will appreciate Islam. Islam must be accepted only as Islam, by only its good points, without any compulsion or any bribe. So it is only the declaration of Turkey as a "lay" republic which we object to, not why it had not declared itself afresh a religious State.

It was a Muslim State and there was no need of any change. We do not applaud or approve of Ibn Saud's iconoclastic "religious" Government although it is alleged to be the most Puritanic Islamic State and it lies in Holy Hedjaz.

We think that there was *no justification whatsoever for changing the Muslim Turkish State into a "lay" State simply because a few persons*

in Turkey who have possessed themselves with autocratic military powers are themselves "lay".

These "lay" Rulers have no right to call the whole State "lay" as if, like Louis XIV, they were the State. This self-importance and self-conceit is condemnable. They are *not* the State. The Turkish State is formed by an overwhelming majority, almost solid of a *Muslim* population therefore **if it is to be a genuine Republic representing the majority of the population it cannot but be a Muslim State.**

This is the legal or constitutional position.

Now, from a political point of view, unless a person is raving mad he would prefer a State, which has world-wide sympathies and which has innumerable friends on all the Continents and has an international status of its own, to an isolated small State populated only by a little over the population of London. And who would voluntarily give up except a lunatic the leadership of six hundred million people spread all over the earth, to remain the leader of six or eight million persons only ?

Then, from a political point of view who would dishearten his own people and would create in their minds misgivings if not actual disloyalty without the least real compensating advantage ?

As regards the expulsion of the Ottoman Khalifa from Turkey even in that respect, considering the circumstances under which it took place, we would have excused the Turkish people. If we had been told that Vahiduddeen deserved a worse fate than to have been turned out—in fact he fled of his own accord in a boat of his masters,—we would have admitted it.

Although from a political point of view we think it was insane to have given up voluntarily the most valuable and covetable asset of the Nation and the country but if the Nation, not a few spiteful people at the head, had chosen to give up, for any national or racial reason, the Osmanli Khilafat, then any non-Turk Muslim would have had no right to grumble. The best course then open would have been to choose a non-Turkish Khalifa.

Although we believe that the institution of the Khilafat is a most important and beneficial part of the Muslim Constitution, and that if for no other reason then only for the sake of its solidarity and discipline a nation like the democratic, communistic Muslim Nation, spread all over the world and with its number and extent increasing by the grace of God, and because of its own intrinsic worth, every day and every hour and every minute, undoubtedly needs a connecting link or a centre of gravity, yet we know that Islam does *not* depend upon a Khalifa or *any* individual person whoever he may be.

Islam can certainly live without any Khalifa at all so even if it were in the power of the Turkish Nation to abolish the Khilafat altogether and it would have done that, it would not have committed any unpardonable crime or sin. Some people would rather say that from *a purely religious point of view* it would have committed no sin at all as the uncorruptible Quran and the ever-living Muhammad are sufficient to guarantee the safeguarding of Islam at least as long as the law of gravity safeguards the floating of our material earth in the atmosphere without a collision. But we confess that to our Pan-Islamic mind it would have been a great mistake in any case to have abolished the Khilafat more particularly in these days of scepticism and materialism when there are among Muslims also a few unthinking lads who find it difficult to believe in an unseen link—the cord of Allah. We think it is even more necessary now to have a human symbol of unity and solidarity of the Nation which must obtain for itself *such a powerful position in this world as to be able to command* what is right and to stop what is wrong for mankind in its individual or communistic capacity.

Because we think that a *disciplinaire* is essential for the Pan-Islamic progress of the communistic Muslim Nation as a whole therefore we go to the extent of tolerating even sectional leaders of the Muslim Nation. If a Shia Mujtahid or a King or an Aga Khan can organise one section of the Muslim Nation to its perfect state as its temporal and spiritual Head with a view of getting for the whole Nation its *due commanding position* in the World we would not mind even such sectional Leadership. In the case of the Aga Khan, because the Author knows him intimately, he is sure that His Highness does keep in view the raising of the position and the power of the Muslim Nation as a whole and because we know that he is *not* neglectful in developing that section which has accepted his temporal and spiritual Leadership we do not mind if the Aga Khan's influence is increased with his people. The strengthening of the part contributes to the strength of the whole.

How could we mind if the Ata Turk had taken upon himself, for the time being, to develop only the Turkish section of the grand Muslim Nation *provided* he had not lost sight of the interests of that Nation as a whole. If Turkey is governed by only one man in the name of a Republic, if she is denationalised in the name of nationalism, if her national culture or dress, etc., as an Eastern Nation is being destroyed and if an inferiority complex is imposed upon the proud Turkish Nation, it is not our business to protest. But when that section of the Muslim Nation, of which the whole Nation was proud and of which with its progressive march onward it would have been more proud notwithstanding its territorial losses, which intrigues and *force majeure* had inflicted upon it, is

being forcibly cut off, at least efforts are being made to cut it off from the rest of the Muslim Nation and it is expected, in fact its youth are taught, to be ashamed of being Eastern and they are not given the necessary opportunity even to learn Islam and when its representative character as a Muslim State is being forcibly taken away from it and it is called a "lay" State indicating that it does not belong to the Muslim people, we certainly do protest as a member of the Grand Muslim Nation—the Universal Brotherhood.

We also own up that the Author, as a Pan-Islamist, feels the more vexed by the nomenclature of "lay Republic" given to the Muslim State with the progressive spirit surging in its leaders, because if this arbitrary and unconstitutional change had not been made, its own Muslim people would have willingly assimilated the reforms and Turkey would soon have become a living model for the whole world of Islam while now we can only present dead models of Baghdad, or Cordova or Delhi or if of Turkey that too of the dead past—of the days of the Conqueror or of Sulaiman or Salim.

A really progressive Turkey on Islamic lines would have re-revolutionised the world as the Islamic Spain under the Arabs revolutionised the world before. But accursed be the inferiority complex that the present-day Rulers of Turkey cannot even think of becoming the teachers and civilizers of Europe as the Arabs were—they only think of sitting at the feet of Europe to learn more eagerly how to drink, dress or dance like Europeans.

VIII.—The Islamic Political Constitution.

We would call the Political Constitution of Islam, Pan-Islamism, to distinguish it from the mainly religious Constitution of Islam but both are so intertwined that it would not be possible always to differentiate between the two.

While dealing either with the Religious aspect of Islam or with its Political and Social aspect we must not forget the most unique characteristic of Islam, that from the very first day of its birth, its aspiration was to bring the whole world on to one platform not only for one generation but for all times. For the first time in history the idea of a world-wide Brotherhood under one God, with one kind of civilization and one constitution was conceived. We ourselves have been advocating for many years a "*World Federation.*" That was the Islamic conception, the Pan-Islamic view.

When Islam kept the whole world before itself how could it then be rigid in its religious creed or in its Political and Social outlook ? Islam has for this reason essentially an elastic Constitution. The Quran itself says that God wants to make everything "easy" يسر for man and *not* difficult. This elasticity is the unique characteristic of Islam as a Faith and also as an Institution. All the wide world is the Prayer House of a Muslim. Any Muslim can lead the Prayers. Any Muslim can perform the funeral ceremonies. Muslim Prayers can be said on the back of a running horse or on a flying aeroplane as devotedly, as piously as on *terra firma*. In the same way the government of any savage tribe in the wilds of Africa or the deserts of Arabia can exist under the aegis of Islam as peacefully and steadily as of an Englishman with his Constitutional Monarchy and a Frenchman with his Republic and a Bolshevik with his Communism.

No technically rigid particular form of Government was fixed under Islam. Only the fundamental broad Principle was laid down. It was :—

Amrahum shura bainahum (*XLII*: 38).

Whatever Muslims undertake to do must be after consultations and deliberations among themselves.

Which means that the responsibility for *every* act must be collective *not* individual. For example, in a modern Russian village all things political or social should be done after the deliberation of all the peoples of the village, men or women, *i.e.*, through the village Soviet ; in the African tribes the chosen Head must consult the whole tribe ; in England the King must take counsel with the people through the Parliament. Thus the basic principle was laid down and the form left to the circumstances and the conditions

of the people, and to their needs, talents, capacities, inclinations, surroundings and natural circumstances. The Principle of *collectivism and of consultation*, must remain unalterable. The form may undergo modifications according to the exigencies of time and place, just as feeding the poor may be substituted when one is unable to keep a fast, and pure sand may take the place of water for ablutions in a waterless desert, or the time or form of the Prayers while taking part in a war or while travelling or during an illness or on other such occasions, may be modified. Islam in fact was not revealed suddenly. It was evolved through a course of years under the inspiration of God.

During the time of the Prophet and his immediate successors, Government was carried on by consultation but there was *no* King and *no* President and *no* Governmental Official bureaucracy. In the early days in Medina a crier would call all the people to the Mosque for deliberations on every necessary occasion.

When the Empire extended to distant parts and Executive Governors, who were often chosen by the people themselves, were appointed, they were called to Mecca (the headquarters) every year during the time of the pilgrimage when people from those parts also came and the Governors had to give an account of their doings before the people in the presence of the Khalifa. If anything had been done against the wishes of the people the Executive was censured ; even dismissed. Nothing could be imposed upon the people by the Khalifa himself against the will of the people. The Governors were called *aamil—Commissars*, exactly as Bolsheviks call their officials. The first servant of the State was the Khalifa after the death of Muhammad. But even the Khalifa was not the Source of the Law. He had no real Sovereign Authority. The people themselves had all the Sovereign Authority in their hands. Nor did the Khalifa possess any Law-making power. He, after consulting with the people, could interpret the Law and see to it that it functioned properly. Any new law that may be needed was laid down after consultation with the people and even then it was restricted. It could not violate the fundamental principles as laid down by the Quran or the Traditions. The people entered into a *contract* with the person they chose as Khalifa. It was called *Baiat*. The first successor of the Prophet Muhammad made a public declaration after the *Baiat* (contract) in these words :—

"My fellowmen :—I have been elected as your Khalifa but I claim no superiority over you. The strongest among you is the weakest with me until I get the rights of others from him if they have been encroached upon in the least and the weakest among you is the strongest with me until I get all his rights. My brothers, I have to obey the Law as you have and I cannot impose upon you

any new law. I need all your advice and all your help. If I act rightly then lend me your support. If I commit any mistake correct me.

To tell the truth to a person commissioned to rule is faithful allegiance, to conceal it is treason.

No nation abandoned *Jihad* in the path of God but God abased it. Obey me as long as I obey God and His Prophet. In case I disobey God and His Prophet I have no right to obedience from you."

What a great blow to despotism was this speech delivered by Abu Bakr after his election to the Khilafat! The great Omar, the second Khalifa, who was called the leader of Muslims, *Amir ul mominin*, made it essential to obtain the consent of the people for every *Amir or Khalifa*. He went to the extent of laying down:—

"If any one should ever swear fealty to another without the consent of the rest of the Mussalmans both he that took the Government upon him and he that swore allegiance to him should be put to death."

As soon as Islam was established the *Rule of Law* was established, and the law was the same for one and all. The maxim, "The king can do no wrong", had no place in the Islamic Constitution. Every human being was accountable for all his actions even if they were of the weight of a "*misqual*," an atom. There were no special rights and privileges. There were no distinctions of *any kind* between man and man. There was no aristocracy, no bourgeoisie, no proletariat. When the State was formed the Government was given in the hands of the people. The State was of the people and for the people, not only for the majority but for one and all—the whole community. That is, the State was truly communistic. Even the majority had no freedom to tyrannise over the minority and make the laws to its own liking. All basic laws had a Divine origin. There was no majority or minority in making fundamental laws.

A House of Finance or Property under the name of *baitulmal* was established which was the people's own. All income was *collectivised*. Every individual had a right over it. All the supervision was in the hands of the people. The burdens of the orphans, widows, children up to a certain age, old and incapacitated persons, sometimes of people in debt who could not pay it off, were relieved by that House—The Public or State Treasury.

One of its duties was to emancipate "Slaves" and help the "unemployed.." It used to help the "way-farer." Even the Khalifa had no authority to use the least amount from it for any but the fixed objects. He had no right to take for himself even

a spoonful of honey for medicine or to give to anyone else anything from the *baitulmal* but by the consent of the people. It is related on the best authority that once somebody saw Omar (the "Emperor". whose dominions were formed of the territories of "four kingdoms") wearing a garment made of a stuff that had come into *baitulmal*. As usual, sheets of cloth of *equal* size had been distributed to all and the share of the Khalifa could not be any larger. But one sheet was not enough to make the garment of a man as tall as Omar was. So he was at once taken to task and asked why he had taken more than what he gave to others. He had to call his son as a witness. It was established that when his son had given him a portion of his share of the sheet of cloth, then and then only Omar was able to make a garment long enough for himself. As this fact was established Omar was "acquitted without a stain on his character" by the judgment of the people.

The Khalifa had no privileges under the law. Nor had he any prerogatives. He had no authority over the purse of the State. For judicial matters *Kazis* (judges) were appointed and a *Diwan-ul-mazalimin* or a High Court was instituted. Once Omar had to appear before the judge ; another time Ali had to plead his case against a Jew and it was the Jew who won the case.

Even in those Constitutions which are supposed to be the best in our days the King is supposed to be above the Law and is himself the fountain of the Law. Not so in the Islamic Constitution. The King or the President or the Amir or the Khalifa is as much subject to the Law as any ordinary man. What a contrast with the much boasted British theory of sovereignty! The King is the source of Law, yet he is absolutely impotent. He is responsible to none for his acts. He is the Head of the Parliament. He can dissolve it whenever he likes, yet he is *above* politics. This theory becomes more absurd in the mouth of Easterners or Indians. One may well ask why they should call him a King, if he is helpless and cannot redress the wrongs committed in his name by his representatives or by his Executive? Either he is not a King to be feted and respected or he must take the responsibility for the acts of the Executive as is the case in Islam. Even an autocrat like Aurangzeb warned his own son in his letters that the Sovereign will be held responsible by God for all the acts of his Executive—not for his own alone.

Names are immaterial in Islam. The Quran says :—"Say, call upon Allah or call upon the Beneficent One—By whichever name you invoke Him (is the same). His are the most excellent Names." (XVII : 110.)

The same is the case in all respects. The Head Servant of the State may be called Khalifa, or Amir or Shah, or Sultan or a President. He is as much, rather more, responsible for his actions

under the Islamic Law, as any ordinary, even the poorest of the poor, citizen of the State which belongs really to the *Malik-ul-Mulk* and *all* His children have an equal share in it—It does not belong to any King or Khalifa. There are no exceptions under the Islamic Law. The Prophet said that if his own daughter Fatima ("The Glorious" as she is called by Muslims) would steal anything her hands would be cut off.

The Prophet himself was neither the Fountain of the Law—nor could he change the basic Laws, nor disobey them. The Quran says :—

"Say, it is not for me to change it (the Quran) as mine own soul prompteth. I only follow that which is revealed unto me. If I disobey my Lord, I fear the retribution of an awful Day." (X : 16).

Even in respect of interpreting the Law the Khalifa had no ultimate powers.

Once Khalifa Omar laid down, at a public gathering, that the *Mahr* should not be high. Immediately an old woman stood up and repeated a verse from the Quran, which allowed unlimited *Mahr*. The Khalifa at once acknowledged his mistake and the woman's interpretation prevailed.

When certain mischief-mongers and enemies of Islam brought forward certain charges against Osman, the third Khalifa, during the close of his Khilafat, he called a general meeting of Muslims and addressed them and vindicated himself categorically.

We quote here a part of that eloquent and telling address from *Tabri* to show what was the position of a Khalifa in the Constitution of Islam. "By God", Osman said, "I have taxed no city beyond its capacity so that such a thing be imputed to me. And whatever I have taken from the people I have spent on their own welfare. Only a fifth comes to me. Out of this too, I consider nothing lawful for my personal use. All is spent on the deserving people, *not by me*, but by the Muslims themselves and not a farthing out of the public funds is misappropriated. I take nothing out of it, so that even what I eat, I eat out of my own earnings." He further said :—

"You know that before I was chosen to be the Khalifa I was the biggest owner of camels and goats in Arabia. During my Khilafat now I possess neither a goat nor a camel except the two camels that are kept to go to Mecca on pilgrimage."

The Executive indeed had very very limited authority under the Islamic Constitution. It could not transgress even by a hair's breadth from the written law. If it did, it could not be indemnified by anybody. Nobody could be pardoned for any crime except

by the person injured as even the Khalifa had no special prerogative. If there was any rigidity in the Law of Islam it was against autocracy.

Very strictly and scrupulously was all despotism and all autocratic authority crushed under the Constitution of Islam. Prof. Vambery, whom the Author had the pleasure of meeting in his own library at Buda Pest, and who was not only a great oriental scholar but who had spent a good part of his life in Islamic countries in close friendship with Muslims and lived the same life as Muslims did, has said:—

"Islam is still the most democratic religion in the world—and a religion favouring both liberty and equality. If there was any Constitutional Government it was that of the first Caliphs."

Under the Constitution of Islam such things as were of general human or animal use and benefit as salt and grass could not be taxed even by the State.

In India, under the Pax Britannica the Salt Tax, which weighs even upon a beggar, remains operative even though it is attacked in the Legislatures by the representatives of the people year after year. In poor India the Government taxes even the poorest of the poor and pays highest salaries to its officials of foreign birth.

All Islamic Laws have their foundation on (1) The Quran, (2) Hadith, and (3) Ijtihad.

It is the last one that makes Islamic laws adaptable to all countries, circumstances and needs. Ijtihad makes Islam a progressive religion. Of course the fundamental principles as laid down by the Quran and Hadith cannot be changed. They are in themselves Universal and Prophetic. But Ijtihad presents a vast field and gives a great scope for modern jurists to make Islamic laws consonant with the current thought and the exigencies of time and place. The uncorrupted and ever present Quran is a great check upon human cunningness or reason. It prevents it from running amock and stops occasions when, as Goethe says:—

Vernimft wird unsinn,

Reason becomes nonsense.

The Quran sets the standard, and free scope is given to human reason to make deductions and inferences.

To say that the door of Ijtihad has been closed or shall ever be closed as long as human intelligence is susceptible of developments and human needs continue to increase, is to do an injustice to Islam. It inclines weak-minded people try and open the barred and bolted door of prophethood after the Final Prophet—Muhammad.

When the Prophet of Islam himself visualised circumstances which may have not been met with in the God-revealed Quran or which may have not been given out by him, an inspired Prophet though he was, with the designed object of giving elasticity to Islam, how can any Imam or Mujtahid claim that all the possible circumstances which may arise generations after him and in places and surroundings which he could not even imagine, were anticipated by him in his codification of Islamic laws or in the interpretations of the Quran ? Of course the Imams enlarged the case law to a very great extent indeed by their *ijtihads* and researches but this did not close the doors of *ijtihad*. However, this does not mean that every X, Y, Z may lay down his own interpretations of Law according to his own whims. Standards and rules have been laid down for *Ijtihad* undoubtedly.

The great Jurists who were more conversant with the spirit of the Laws of the Quran and the Hadith have prescribed several methods for correct *Ijtihad*:—

(1) Quias—reasoning by analogy.

(2) Istidlal—deduction or reasoning by inferences.

(3) Istihsan—equity.

(4) Istislah—public good.

A kind of democratic constitutional check has also been put upon *Ijtihad* and that is *Ijma*, which means a consensus of opinion of learned Jurists.

Thus with proper safeguards against the misuse by any autocratic power, the constitution and the Laws of Islam have been made elastic and adaptable for all circumstances and all times. Here, however, we will point out in brief while reverting to the subject later, that Islamic constitution does not contemplate for Muslims a non-Muslim rule except as a temporary or abnormal incident and misfortune or a disease.

The Muslims must have an *ululamr* from themselves. الوالامر منكم

They must hold a commanding position and must possess merits for that.

Like the Faith of Islam, the Institution or the House or the Constitution of Islam also rests on Five Pillars:—

(1) Prayer, (2) Fasting, (3) *Zakat*, (4) Pilgrimage, and (5) *Jihad*.

With their high spiritual values *each one of these has a special political and social value of its own.* Even the Prayer with its particular features and forms has a political and socialist value in the Constitution of Islam.

(1) Prayer.

Take the Prayer first. We do not want to discuss here the spiritual value of the Prayer. We would deal with the Socialistic and Political value of the Muslim congregational Prayers. In the Quran stress has been laid upon nothing more than upon attendance to Prayers.

It was only to enhance its socialistic and political value that preference was given to Prayer in a Mosque to one said privately. In a Muslim Country when in a village the whole population meets at one place five times a day with a moral, serene, peaceful atmosphere all about, and with brotherly sentiments, it can well be imagined what social benefits can be derived from it. Early in the morning before the sun rises all men in the village hear the call: "Come to peace and security; Come to peace and security; Come to success; come to success." The atmosphere is calm. The mind and the body both have been refreshed by the night's rest. The man rises to attend to the Mosque—*not* at the bidding of any human being: He is a haughty Communist: He does not like to take his orders from his fellow men. When he hears the call in the name of the Great Allah—who is All-Powerful and there is nought as His likeness—*Hayye alal falah, hayye alal falah*—come to success, come to success, why should he not listen and respond to it? There must be very few people who would not respond to the call of success and prosperity.

The Call is in the Arabic tongue. There is no language which is so expressive as Arabic. The one word "*falah*" to which the *Azan* (the Muslim call to Prayer) invites, means and conveys volumes. *Falah* means "complete attainment of what is desired." And *Falah* is of two kinds—one relating to this life, the other to the next. Imam Abdul Qasim Al Hasan Ibn Abdul Fadzal Al Raghib adds that the former stands for the attainment of those nice things which make the life of this world happy which are *baqa* (being alive), *ghina* (wealth or freedom from want) and *izz* (honour). The *falah* relating to the next life includes four things that is, life to which there is no want, honour with which there is no disgrace, and knowledge with which there is no ignorance. Thus *falah* conveys the meaning of attainment of both the moral and material successes.

Probably a rank materialist or an anti-religious Bolshevist would like to know that when a man responds to the call to the Prayer early in the morning and comes to a Mosque what is the material good (*falah*) that he obtains? The answer is that he can get, not only one good but several. He can profit socially. He can also profit politically.

A great Social gain is that he begins his work after saluting and meeting his friends in a peaceful mood. (*Assalamo alaikum*), "Peace be upon you" is the Muslim salutation. A greater gain is that he meets with his enemy, if he has any, at that early hour which is the best time for making peace with anybody. At that time one's mind is generally free from malice. It is free from evil passions. It is free from excitement. If there was any misunderstanding, both have slept over it. Both had had an opportunity to calmly think over their differences—the viewpoints of one another. Both are wiser. Then, the atmosphere is of peace and brotherliness. Others are present who can persuade each to get over the ill-feeling or misunderstanding. Above all, the meeting is under the eye, the shadow, the beneficence, the patronage of the One who is the Cherisher, the Sustainer, and the Friend of both of them—of all of them. They are all brothers. Why should they not get over the mutual misunderstandings, if any, in an affectionate manner ? Why should they continue the quarrel? Why should they not get closer together ? Besides these advantages he gets other social and political advantages also when he stands to pray. Suppose he is a fool; suppose he is an atheist—only a fool can be an atheist ; suppose he is unable to draw any spiritual or moral advantage by saying his Prayers ; yet he gets sufficient secular, social advantages. When he helps in choosing an Imam—he himself might have led the Prayers, he gets a lesson in the representative system, in democracy, in human equality. When he stands in a straight line shoulder to shoulder with another man, whether rich or poor, black or brown, coloured or discoloured ; when to the call of the Imam he stands, bows, sits and prostrates ; when he utters the same language—the language which conveys in one word (for example the word *falah*) what every other language—Turkish or English or any other, can convey only by using two dozens, he gets a lesson in discipline and one-ness of humanity, in Communism, and one hundred and one other social advantages.

To get political advantages the gathering can be converted into a meeting of the whole village with an opportunity to discuss all matters after the Prayers are over. This village communistic Soviet or Parliament can meet five times a day at *right* times in the day and evening.

For physical advantage the Prayer meeting is a right sort of break in the daily work and a healthy stop in continuous labour which prevents overstrain. It gives a gentle exercise also and contributes to physical health with the spiritual one.

Thus we find that while in other religions the only advantages of Prayers can be spiritual, the Islamic Prayers confer advantages of very great efficiency to the individual as to Society.

The fact is that even the rituals or formalisms in Islam are based on rationalism—they are meant to do good to individuals as well as to Society.

The form of the Islamic Prayers demonstrates this Principle most clearly.

Prayer indeed is essentially a spiritual, silent communion with one's own Rabb. It is in Prayers only that this question can be answered:—

Allah is within your beings ; do not you see Him ? (LI : 21).

But because the same Allah has designed that man should live in a material body, in a material world, a form has been set for the Prayers which confers on men, both individually and socially, great many advantages—no other form of Prayer adopted by any religion confers so many advantages as does the form of the Muslim Prayer. The congregational Muslim prayers create in man a miraculous collective spirit and feeling. Spiritually also it fosters the idea in every mind that not his soul alone but the soul of all humanity has emanated from the One Soul and towards that One Soul all the souls, individually and collectively, should gravitate. Physically this demonstrates the equality and collectivity and brotherhood. For anybody who lives on this earth no better form could be given to Prayers.

By the form given to Prayers while the selfish craving of every soul to attain communion, salvation and blessings can be satisfied, an opportunity has also been obtained for the unselfish longing that not one soul alone but all souls should enjoy that bliss, because after all, human soul although imprisoned in the body of innumerable people is one soul—Humanity is really one.

In a Muslim Prayer every individual is expected to impress upon his mind the idea that he is in the presence of One to whom both his soul and his body are accountable. This attendance before an all-seeing and all-knowing Judge, if really believed in, would without the least doubt keep one away from all "indecencies and crimes" and this is one of the chief objects, so says the Quran, of Muslim Prayers. If this object can be served how much easier would become the task of the Executive of every State and how fit every citizen would become for a well-behaved Society. If people are trained from their childhood there is no reason that the idea should not get into the very being of all persons. Early training and education can certainly form the character of individuals and thus set the desired tone for Society.

Because Muslim Prayers were beneficial to Society therefore the Khalifa Omar was justified in fixing penalty for those Muslims

who did not attend to Prayers. If it were only an individual matter of holding communion with God then he would have had no right to interfere in it.

The truth is that Islam keeps an eye on the body as well as on the soul. That is its chief characteristic. And that distinguishes it from all other religions.

In its present form Muslim Prayer is as beneficial to the soul as to the body, individually and collectively both.

Therefore a well-wisher of Society should, even if he does not believe in the soul, adopt and encourage Muslim Prayers. It would do him good even if a non-Muslim joins in the Muslim Prayers. More, it would do good to Society. Every Communist, even if he is not a Muslim, although we think he must be a Muslim if he is a *good* communist, should join Muslims in their congregational Prayers if he really seeks the good of Society and Community.

(2) Fasting.

Like Prayer, Fasting also has been advocated by every religion but in this case again no religion has taken any Social advantage from it except Islam. Anybody who has lived in any place where Muslims live must have noticed how in the Month of Fast (Ramadhan) there is a social stir in the evenings when the fast is broken both in the Mosques and in private houses. In that month every Muslim is even more charitably inclined than in other months. The Poor are fed in large numbers. Free distribution is made of choice refreshments and light food in the evenings everywhere. Presents are exchanged. Relatives and friends meet each other in the evenings and break their fast together. In fact the evenings for the whole month see social festivities.

A poor, starving beggar and a rich, luxury-loving King come on an equal footing when they are Fasting. The Rich get personal experience of hunger; the Poor are relieved to find that hunger or want cannot be despised. They are considered meritorious even by the Rich in the month of Ramadhan. It is he who is *not* starving is ashamed of himself. Not only spiritualists attach very great value to Fasting, but medical men also consider that fasting at times is the only cure for certain diseases.

(3) Zakat or Poor-due.

While together with their spiritual value, Prayer and Fasting have more social value, *Zakat*, which is a special institution of Islam, has a very great Political value in the Constitution of Islam.

In Islam charity is of two kinds—One is for our moral and spiritual betterment, The scope of this charity is very wide indeed

in Islam. It is so wide that it astounds men of other religions. To smile in the face of one's brother is charity; to show the right path is charity; to clear the way of thorns or obstacles is charity ; to give gifts to your wife or to your kith and kin is charity ; to speak kindly is charity ; and so forth. This widest possible scope of charity is for one's spiritual uplift. But we want to deal with the second aspect of Islamic charity which has a political value also. That charity is called *Zakat*. That charity can have a political aspect must in itself sound strange to people who do not know Islam.

The object of political charity—*Zakat* as laid down by the Prophet himself is :—"To take wealth from the rich and to return it to the poor" (Bukhari). While the first kind of charity is optional, *Zakat* is not so. It is compulsory. While no other person, not even the Khalifa, has any right to compel any other person to perform personal obligations for the good of one's soul such as to keep Fast or to go to the pilgrimage, the Khalifa, the *Ulul-Amr*, should take from all the due proportion of *Zakat* (one-fortieth part of the annual income generally) and deposit it into the *Bait-ul-mal*—Public Treasury or Store for public services.

Its expenditure has been detailed in the Quran as follows :—

(1) Alms are only for the poor (*fuquara*) and (2) the needy (*masakin*), and (3) the Commissars (*aamilin*) appointed for collecting the *Zakat* and (4) those whose hearts are inclined to Truth (*al-muallafat qulubahum*) and (5) captives (*firriqab*) and (6) the indebted (*gharmeen*) and (7) in the way of Allah (*fisabilillah*) and (8) the wayfarer (*ibnas sabil*). (X : 60).

Thus the object really of *Zakat* was Social Service and to abolish poverty among those who could not work for their own living. The point which was most earnestly emphasized in this connection was that those who were giving help to their poor incapacitated brothers must not look down upon them as receivers of charity. *Zakat* was a tax which the rich had to pay for the good of the Nation. It was a charge on the accumulated wealth of every kind. It was an attack on Capitalism of every kind. A man may give voluntarily, in secret or openly, for the benefit of his soul as much as he liked to any charitable institution or for any benevolent object or to any deserving individual but the State will charge him all the same at a fixed rate—*nisab*, on everything which has been marked for the *Zakat* by the Islamic Law. Although the *Zakat* fund was raised from Muslims only but non-Muslims were also helped by it. It is related that once the Khalifa Omar saw an aged Christian begging for alms. He was awarded a *vazifa*, allowance, from the Public Treasury and was stopped from begging for alms. From that date old-age pensions were given to

non-Muslims also. Poor-houses for the weak and the disabled were open to the Christians just as to Muslims. Non-Muslims had to pay a small tax called *Jazia* but they were exempt from the *Zakat* and the military service. *Zakat* was a part of the Islamic Constitution for Muslims. It helped in circulating wealth among the people and in creating a non-Capitalist mind and a Communistic, collective spirit. That it was included in charity was to avoid compulsion as far as peoples' own conscience and their religious instinct could be induced to voluntarily give the *Zakat*.

The Law of *Zakat is* very judicious and just if it *is* properly worked. It circulates wealth in the body-politic, just as the heart circulates blood in the organs of the body, in *right proportions*. It is the duty of the State to see to its proper working.

On the death of the Prophet there were people who withheld the *Zakat* while they obeyed all other injunctions of Islam. But the Successor of the Prophet at once made war upon them. He declared:– "*Zakat* is due from the wealth of the people for the poor and by Allah if any people refuse it even to one lamb which was given during the life of the Prophet I will fight with them." (Bukhari). And he did make war and did get for the National Fund, *Zakat* from all from whom it was due. Now, this very important and very beneficial item in the Constitution of Islam has unfortunately become a dead letter in countries like India which have not their own *Ululamr*. The idea of the Author was to take the help of the *Khalifa* to revive it for the good of the whole Nation. Alas! circumstances intervened. Even now means should be adopted to organise *Zakat* on real Islamic lines. If that is done properly, then Muslims will not lack funds in India or anywhere for carrying out National movements for the good of the people at large and for the strength, and the spread of Islam.

Zakat, if well-organised, can give new life, new vitality to the whole Muslim Nation and will provide means for Social Services. It is one of the most wise and helpful items of the Islamic Constitution and every effort should be made to revive it. In India it shall have to be revived by voluntary efforts. In Muslim States the authorities should see to it that the *Zakat* is duly collected and also properly spent for the objects fixed under the Law of Islam—*Shariat*, for the expenditure of the charitable tax—the *Zakat*. Like other institutions of Islam *Zakat* is a wonderful combination for the good of the soul of the individual and to meet the needs of Society. Hence this amalgamation of charity and tax.

As a charity, *Zakat* is a test of the piety of the rich, to see if they will cry out or not:—

جان می طلبی مضائقه نیست زر می طلبی سخن دریغست

As a tax it is meant to discourage Capitalism and to provide funds for general public social services of a benevolent nature in an organised form very judiciously regulated and voluntarily prompted.

(4) Pilgrimage or Hajj.

The fourth pillar of the Constitution of Islam is *Hajj*. This means that at least once in his life-time every Muslim, who can afford to do so, must attend the annual International gathering which is held year after year on a fixed date at the birth-place of Islam—Mecca. Centuries before the Socialists or Communists instituted their international meetings and conferences the Prophet made a world-wide international gathering an integral part of the Constitution of Islam.

The unparalleled Greatness of the Prophet and his "always fresh modernity" is reflected in the institution of *Hajj* as a part of the Islamic Constitution as in other respects. The *Hajj* presents a sight, not seen anywhere else, in glory and beneficence. No one but a Prophet, and that of a miraculous farsight, could have instituted it and made it a part of the Constitution as Muhammad (may he and his always triumph) did. In *Islam and Socialism* we wrote thus about *Hajj*:—

"At least once in his life-time every Muslim is called upon to visit Mecca at a fixed time in company with thousands of his brother Muslims. This great gathering, in which hundreds of thousands of True Believers meet together, from far and near, at one central place, all wearing the same simple, unsewn garment, barefooted and bare-headed, Princes and Peasants, from different countries and places, of various colours and races, is an annual demonstration of Islamic Socialism and sets a grand practical example of brotherhood and equality. In this great gathering not the slightest difference can be noticed between a Monarch and his subjects, a plebeian and a patrician. The idea boldly forces itself upon every mind that all human beings are one people and that it is incumbent upon them to treat each other with perfect equality, as members of the same brotherhood. This annual gathering demonstrates not only outward and formal similarity and equality between man and man but it also declares an identity of purpose and oneness of object on the part of all Humanity. These myriads of men and women, old and young, come to that *Sea of Sand* bearing innumerable hardships and in great peril of life and property, with only one purpose, one object—to pay homage to one Allah, Whom they can find everywhere, nearer to them than the vein of their neck, yet whom they love to proclaim at a common gathering as their common Deity—the one Cherisher

of them all, the *Rabbulalamin.* The idea in assembling this vast mass of humanity is to demonstrate, at one and the same time, common fraternity and spiritual affinity, to impress upon the minds of every True Believer the idea of the "fatherhood" of God and the "Brotherhood of man."

In this institution of *Hajj* also, as a part of the Constitution of Islam, the Great Prophet kept in view both the spiritual or moral and political or social good of humanity.

This is not the occasion to deal in detail with the spiritual benefit every individual Muslim derives when he attends Mecca and then goes to Medina to visit the tomb of the greatest Spiritualist ever born. Sufficient to say that every True Muslim when he utters *labback, ya Rabbul Alamin, labback*—Present! O Evolver and Cherisher of the worlds, Present! and is reminded of the *first* call to the soul of man by Allah, he is overcome by an ecstasy indescribable in words and a spiritual uplift of unapproachable height.

Mr. S. H. Leader in his *Veiled Mysteries of Egypt* says:—

"The importance of the pilgrimage as a great bond of spiritual inspiration has scarcely been realized by most writers. There are from 60,000 to 70,000 pilgrims to Mecca every year. Its influence over the lives of those who perform it is often so great that it gives a new direction to characters; in every generation men and women have been aroused from spiritual lethargy to become missionaries and leaders of Islam in all parts of the world by the experience they have undergone in their Holy Land."

As to the political and socialistic significance of an International Institution like the annual gathering at Mecca it should not be difficult, particularly for the Bolshevists, to grasp it fully from a modern viewpoint. The Quran itself does not restrict *Hajj* to spiritual benefit alone. It says in Surat II. Ayat 198:—

"There is no blame in you for seeking bounty from your Lord."

Now, this "bounty" can be sought in many ways—commercial, social or political. It was again unfortunate that when arrangements were being made for seeking "bounty" in commercial and political ways from the *Hajj*, to utilize the bones, hair and skin, etc., of the slaughtered animals for the benefit of the Muslim Nation and of having Muslim-owned commercial marine, the War came on. There were and there still are innumerable political, social and commercial advantages which can be drawn, with the spiritual benefit, from the *Hajj*. In "*Pan-Islamism*" also a

mention was made of the other than spiritual possibilities of such gatherings, in these words:—

"The Friday Prayers every week or those of Id-ul-Fitr and Id-ul-adha twice a year, in which thousands of Mussalmans congregate at one place, offer their Prayers under the leadership of one man and embrace each other with brotherly amity and goodwill, were instituted on none but Pan-Islamic Principles, and that masterly idea of bringing together at one place in one kind of dress, thousands upon thousands of Mussalmans every year, from every corner of the world, had as its essential object the advancement of Pan-Islamism and true Socialism. The advantages that can be derived, and that shall be derived, Insha Allah (God Willing), in the very near future, from those annual gatherings of pilgrims in Mecca, are immense and make glowingly bright the future of Islam. The idea of establishing practically the brotherhood of man and the "fatherhood" of God by that Great and True Socialist is the germ and the basis of Pan-Islamism, while the unconcealable Truth that embodies the first Principles of Islam is a fire that burns in the heart of every true Mussalman and is bound to do its work of kindling others with the same flame. The fact is that whether a Mussalman openly styles himself a Pan-Islamist or not, he is in spirit and at heart a Pan-Islamist and is sure to be ready to serve the cause of Islam and even to spread it howsoever he can."

We have described at another place how a European lady looked at the great gathering and what were her own feelings when she personally took part in it.

Everyone is agreed on the point that the *Hajj* is one of the most useful pillars of the Constitution of Islam not only spiritually and morally but also politically, socially and even commercially.

It is indeed a pity that full advantages have not been derived for a long, long time from the grandest International annual gathering by Muslims.

(5) Jihad.

The last but certainly not the least in importance is *Jihad* as a part of the Constitution of Islam. No other part has been so much misunderstood by European writers who have failed altogether to appreciate its spiritual and moral value. And because it has been attacked by Europeans there are cowardly Muslim Writers who have tried to offer excuses for it and even to make apologies because of it. We boldly and confidently assert that *Islam or the Prophet do not need any apologists for any matter whatsoever*. Even offensive *Jihad* to extirpate the plague of *shirk* which is the main cause of a multitude of troubles in this world would be as necessary and as laudable as the extirpation of plague rats to save human beings from that dreadful disease.

Although *all* the Wars in the time of the Prophet and his immediate Successors were defensive yet there is no doubt that the *Law of Jihad* had its own value to *regulate and humanise* all wars, offensive or defensive. Islam was the first religion—the first institution, to set laws for the conduct of war when necessary, as well as for the enjoyment of peace. If the Muslim State or States had not neglected this part of the Constitution of Islam no combination of enemies would have succeeded in destroying Muslim Dominions and Muslim States.

Besides the moral courage, the physical vitality and energy and the spirit of defiance of death and trouble which *Jihad* creates, it also unites the whole Muslim Nation by one cord and makes every country as Muslims' own—as the Commonwealth belonging to the whole Nation which must be defended by the united power and resources of all. If one Muslim State is attacked by a non-Muslim State then it is the duty of the other nearest Muslim State to help its neighbouring State and if that is not sufficient the other nearer States should come to help.

"O you who Believe," says the *Quran*, "fight those of the unbelievers who are near you and let them find in you firmness," (Immunity; verse 123.)

Islam has inherent in it an all-conquering force. It is an invincible moral power. So it never needed an Asoka or Constantine for its triumph as a religion. Every Muslim was an Asoka, a Constantine or a Cyrus. Islam *did not need the sword.* But suppose there were Muslim Warriors or Kings or Generals who did use the sword to propagate Islam and they did make an offensive *Jihad* even then they performed a praiseworthy act, they discharged a great moral duty. Is it possible to conceive a better cause, than the spreading of Islam, for a war or for the use of the sword ? If compulsion to disinfect a place when there are germs of an infectious disease and if violent destruction of harmful parasites are praiseworthy acts and every civilised government has compulsory laws for these and for similar objects, why is it not as praiseworthy to spread something which gives health to body and to soul and which kills all the germs that cause soul's degradation or body's degeneration ? It is indeed a *Holy* War to fight against all those who exploit the weak and who suck the blood of the toiling millions. It is a *Holy* War to destroy tyrannical Imperialism and Capitalism. It is a *Holy* War to fight and endanger one's life to destroy *shirk*—to destroy conceited man-gods and the gods of racial and colour supremacy, the gods of material or military power who subjugate the poor or weak nations and suck the blood of helpless peoples who are unable to defend their hearth and home and who try to impose the autocratic might to annihilate liberty and freedom. **So it is a Holy War to**

fight for all that for which Islam stands—*for the Unity of an Ideal God, for the brotherhood of man, for the moral and spiritual elevation and economic salvation of humanity, for the phyical and mental progress and political freedom of all the Nations and all the peoples, for abolition of property, exploitation, oppression and bondage everywhere and for all times.* If admonition and persuasion and supplication fail what else remains but the *Sword* to achieve the noble objects, not for any personal or even National aggrandisement but for the good of the whole human race ? Gibbon says that "the victory of the Prophet at Badr changed the destinies of the whole human race. Not only did it save Islam, it enabled the Faith to rule the world in future." Was it then a crime to obtain such a victory that was beneficial for the human race ? When medicines fail to effect a cure, surgical operation sometimes becomes necessary. It is the humanitarian and moral duty of a Surgeon to amputate the diseased limb to prevent blood poisoning.

Every Muslim should be *proud* that *jihad* has been made a part of the Constitution of Islam —*jihad* not only in its literal sense of striving to the best of one's capacity for anything good—but *jihad* in its juristic or technical sense—that is fighting to the best of one's ability for the good cause.

How does Nature demonstrate life ? By motion, action, struggle and war. Non-resistance represents death and then decay. And life and growth are the greatest miracles of existence in this world. In fact this world is meant to be a place for exertion, for striving, for *jihad* to obtain Peace and Rest in *After Life.* **Jihad, Jihad, Jihad** should be man's watchword as long as he breathes on this material earth, to obtain the "Rest," later on, of the soul "well-satisfied with itself and with its Creator." Every Muslim should do *jihad* to obtain Peace which is the ultimate goal of Islam.

The fact is that Islam in its essence is truly *the* religion of Peace. The Quran says that "Peace is the Word of God Himself." Prof. Theodore Reinach said :—

"It (Islam) is therefore an agent of peace at once ordered and mystic towards all that is highest in human nature."

No religion or institution gives so high a value to life as does Islam. The Quran goes to the extent of laying down that "anybody who kills a person without a just cause kills as if *all* human beings and he who saves one life saves, as it were, the whole Humanity." But Islam could not ignore War as it intended to give guidance to man in *all* the walks of his life. So its jurists and commentators and military geniuses have developed a number of rules and laws of War. No other religion has produced a better jurist than Imam Abu Hanifa. His interpretations of the Law of Jihad or the Ethics of War are worth reading.

As to how Jihad should be conducted can be known by reading the orders given to the army going on Jihad by the Khalifa Abu Bakr. This was the first War after the death of the Prophet. Rules to the following effect were laid down by Abu Bakr.

(1) No children, women or old men should be harmed.

(2) Those people who had retired in life, Hermits and Recluses should not be molested and *no* places of worship, of whatever religion they may be, Churches, Synagogues, Temples (there were no Mosques then), should be destroyed.

(3) The fallen should not be mutilated.

(4) No houses should be demolished, no crops burnt, no fruit trees to be cut down. (Will those who drop indiscriminately bombs from the air over persons defending their liberty, their hearth and home, in this age of so-called civilization, please take a note ? M.H.K.).

(5) All Treaty obligations should be scrupulously respected.

(6) Those who give up fighting and accept peace or surrender themselves, should be treated as Muslims are with the same rights and privileges and with full liberty of conscience and with their lives and properties protected by Muslims even at the sacrifice of their own lives.

Just as the philosophy, rather the science, of *Jihad* was misunderstood by many people who did not believe in non-violence or *Ahimsa* in the same way many, and lately most, of the people who professed a belief in *Ahimsa*, did not understand at all its philosophy and did not act correctly according to the principle of *Ahimsa* even when they practised non-violence.

Among religious well-known personages only three men understood correctly the philosophy of *Ahimsa* and acted according to it—They were Krishna, Christ, and "The Comforter" namely Muhammad. And there have been only two persons who understood the science of *Jihad* and made use of it as it should have been and they were Krishna and Muhammad. In the same famous book in which Krishna has beautifully described the philosophy of *Ahimsa* he has also encouraged *Jihad*. In personal or even family matters he preached *Ahimsa* and peace and in fact took upon himself the mission of peace to effect a reconciliation between a quarrelling family. But when this failed and because the quarrel between the members of the family could not be confined to those persons or families alone but had become the concern of the whole Country he not only preached relentless war but killed with his own hand the chief mischief-monger.

Christ also preached *Ahimsa* and taught his followers to turn the other cheek if they were slapped on the one cheek with an idea to insult or injure them personally. But at another time, for the public good, he not only violently kicked a number of money-changers from the compound of the Synagogue but told his disciples to buy swords even if they had to sell their coats. As to Muhammad, he was a **perfect** Exemplar of both *Ahimsa and Jihad* with which history is replete. Throughout his life, although hardly any Leader or Reformer or Prophet met with such continuous, violent persecution for as many years as did the Prophet in the beginning of his career, he never retaliated even the *cruellest* personal or private wrong. Although a part of his life was spent in wars, and although he was always found to be at the most dangerous spot during the war, he did never hurt or kill anybody with his own hands. He not only forgave all those who had ostracised, persecuted and pelted and almost killed him, *when they were completely at his mercy*, but he also pardoned the brute who had killed his own daughter by dragging her when she was carrying a child in her womb ; he forgave the fiendish woman who had bitten with her teeth the liver of his uncle after he was killed in a battle, to satisfy her ghoulish spirit of revenge ; he pardoned the Jewess who had poisoned his food which is said to have been the chief cause of his death later. Who has a record of such glorious practice of *Ahimsa* in the whole history of the world ? Such examples of perfect *Ahimsa*, true and most correct *Ahimsa*, and most beneficial *Ahimsa*, can be multiplied to hundreds in the life of the great Exemplar.

But the practice of *Ahimsa* has a limit—the same limit which Sri Krishna has put to it. Beyond that limit, if practised, *Ahimsa* becomes a most cowardly crime against Society and against public interests, as it turned out to be in the recent misapplication of it in India as a creed by those ignorant of the true philosophy underlying it who were also devoid of political sense or sagacity. Instead of doing any good it has ruined, for many years to come, the cause of freedom in India. It has demoralized the people. It has emboldened the autocrats.

In the case of the Prophet how that limit was passed the great Sage of Chelsea has described thus :—

He (Muhammad) was now becoming an old man ; his friends sinking round him one by one ; his path desolate, encompassed with danger : unless he could find hope in his own heart, the outward face of things was but hopeless for him. It is so with all men in the like case. Hitherto Muhammad had professed to publish his Religion by way of preaching and persuasion alone. But now,

driven foully out of his native country, (in Hijra I, 622 A.C., the 53rd of Muhammad's life), since unjust men had not only given no ear to his earnest Heaven's message, the deep cry of his heart, but would not even let him live if he kept speaking it—the wild Son of the Desert resolved to *defend* himself *like a man* and an Arab. If the Quraish will have it so, they shall have it. Tidings, felt to be of infinite moment to them, and all men, they would not listen to these; would trample them down by sheer violence, steel and murder; well, *let steel try it then*! Ten years more this Muhammad; all of fighting, of breathless, impetuous toil and struggle; with what result we know.

"Much has been said of Muhammad's propagating his religion by the sword. The sword indeed: *but where will you get your sword*! Every new opinion at its starting is precisely in a minority of one. In one man's head alone there it dwells as yet. One man alone of the whole world believes it; there is one man against all men. That *he* take a sword, and try to propagate with that, will do little for him. *You must first get your sword*! *On the whole, a thing will propagate itself as it can.* We do not find, of the Christian Religion either, that it always disdained the sword, when once it had got one. *Charlemagne's conversion of the Saxons was not by preaching.* I care little about the sword: I will allow a thing to struggle for itself in this world, with any sword or tongue or implement it has, or can lay hold of. We will let it preach, and pamphleteer, and fight, and to the uttermost bestir itself, and do, beak and claws, whatsoever is in it; very sure that it will, in the long run, conquer nothing which does not deserve to be conquered. What is better than itself, it cannot put away, but only what is worse. (Trotsky has said to the same effect in his history of the Russian Revolution). In this great Duel, Nature herself is umpire, and can do no wrong; the thing which is deepest-rooted in Nature, what we call truest, that thing and not the other will be found growing at last . . . .

"They called him Prophet, you say? Why, he stood there face to face with them; bare, not enshrined in any mystery; visibly clouting his own cloak, cobbling his own shoes; fighting, counselling, ordering in the midst of them: they must have seen what kind of a man he *was*, let him be *called* what you like! No emperor with his tiaras was obeyed as this man in a cloak of his own clouting."

Indeed the Prophet was respected and obeyed because of his superhuman moral and spiritual grandeur and eminence.

It is obvious that it was a part of the Design of Nature (or *taqdir*) that the Prophet had to take to *jihad*. An example was

set how men should wage war, if they have to wage it, to protect the Truth, to protect any noble, humane, cause. Thus even Wars were spiritualised—made holy.

Every war should be condemned, it should even be stopped by all possible means at the disposal of mankind, *unless it is a duty under the Karam Yoga of Gita* **or the Jihad of the Quran.** In the same way a wrong practice and preaching of *Ahimsa* which is demoralising and harmful to the interests of a nation or a country or humanity at large must also be condemned.

All personal wrongs should be pardoned but wrongs against the people, Society and Humanity, must be heavily punished whether committed by individuals or nations. It is the duty of every individual and every nation to protect Society and to stop tyranny over the weak people. Exemplary punishment should be given to the wrong-doer.

It was thought that the old law of cutting off a hand for larceny was too severe. But now the Bolsheviks have also had to take recourse to severe punishments for crimes to protect Society and the Nation. For example, death sentence was imposed on two ring-leaders of a band guilty of embezzling £20,000 from the Eastern Siberian Trading Office of Irkutsk. Seven others were sentenced to varying terms of imprisonment up to ten years. The severity of the punishment was due to an effort to stamp out crimes of this nature which have recently been increasing in Russia.

Morally and spiritually *Jihad,* strenuous striving (not necessarily fighting with arms) for a cause beneficent to Society is superior to *Ahimsa* if the latter encourages the evil-doer and injures the interests of Society. And to live a life beneficent to Society although it may cause worries and unhappiness or even suffering to the individual himself is better than exclusive asceticism or monasticism. *An-aasakti,* work regardless of consequences, as Krishna said, is better than *aasakti.* Even when one forgives the wrong done to him and is non-violent to his enemies it should be a *Jihad* which he should practise against himself and his passions of anger and revenge, etc.

Confucius when asked if evil should be repaid with good, said, "Then with what you will repay good. No: Repay good with good and meet evil with Justice."

Ahimsa conveys the idea of weakness; it desires to arouse the feelings of pity and mercy in others; it means passivity and passivity means death.

Jihad, on the contrary, conveys the idea of power, courage and sacrifice, it demands respect from others; it means activity, mental,

moral and physical which means life in this world of matter and substance, where even the celestial soul is confined in the earthly body, where even the improvement of spirituality depends upon the proper regulation of the physical body.

If one is determined to become a *Sanyasi*, a monk or an ascetic, *Ahimsa* may be a good moral philosophy or theory for him but he will have no occasion to practise it if he lives in a cave or is completely unconcerned with Society. But if one is determined to live a life of beneficence not only to himself but to Society—to all his fellow beings, he will have to live the life of *Jihad*—*Jihad* against his own evil passions, which is called *Jihad-e-akber*, and *Jihad* against all disturbers of Society, *Jihad* against all tyrants and evil-doers and aggressors.

In fact even the philosophy, idealism or theory of *Ahimsa* elevates human character only if it is practised with the spirit of *Jihad* otherwise it degrades the character and makes one cowardly while it encourages the wrong-doer. There can be occasions when retaliation does good to the wrong-doer himself in this practical world which cannot subsist on philosophy or theory alone. **Ahimsa is noble only when one who has power to take revenge practices Ahimsa. Ahimsa from the weak or helpless has no virtue in it.**

Muslims have often and often been taunted by Europeans that Islam was preached with the Quran in one hand and the Sword in the other and they have timidly and apologetically denied the fact. We, on the contrary, defiantly say that yes, yes, yes, Islam was preached and should be preached in the future also with the Quran—a Divinely safeguarded, uncorruptible, inimitable, miraculous, "consummate wisdom," "Honoured," and "Exalted", and "Purified"; a "Guidance," a "Healing" and a "Mercy," "perfecting all moral principles and religions," "verifying the Truth and all the previous Revelations and with clear arguments," "*a Source of Eminence for the Nations*" and "prevailing over all," in one hand to raise the moral, mental and spiritual standard for Mankind and with the Sword, the emblem of power, chivalry, courage, material advancement and conquests and the instrument of defence and security against the brutes and barbarians, in the other. We say with emphasis that yes, yes, yes, Islam has had assigned to itself the double duty—to elevate humanity spiritually and physically both, to make it triumphant "over all that is between heaven and earth."

Yes, "Islam has been spread with the Quran in one hand and the sword in another," but how are the natives of Europe spreading their "culture and civilization" in the world? With

the bomb in one hand and the bottle of brandy in the other. At one time they kept the Bible in one hand but now they have dropped that altogether and have replaced it with the drafts of blood-sucking, mining or commercial concessions and pacts together with tracts on birth-control. The bomb now is supported with asphyxiating gases in "the benevolent mission of civilization." The Bottle of Brandy still remains the chief feature of European civilization and a trade-mark of European culture. Even the Bolshevist Russians had not the courage to uproot it for the benefit of Society and Community. The Americans tried for a few years but failed ignominiously. Islam and Islam alone has been triumphant. European civilization and culture may do without anything else but never without this poison for brain, for heart and for the soul. We do wish that the Sword of Islam could come into play again to save mankind from such integral parts of the European culture and civilization—the great curses for Humanity with all their consequential effects and thousand and one evils with which the European civilization abounds. We have not only admitted that Islam was spread with the Quran and the sword, we have urged that in the future also the dual objects and characteristics of Islam should be kept up—namely, *to elevate mankind, morally, spiritually and mentally* to the highest point and at the same time, *to protect* the cause of TRUTH and to make it TRIUMPHANT over all by every material means and measures with fortitude and honesty, with deliberate determination and enthusiasm and vigour, avoiding of course any inhuman or improper methods. Islam demands good thoughts to be translated into good actions and to be protected and defended with all the moral and even physical courage at the risk of their lives by all the True Believers.

The Prophet Muhammad was an idealist indeed ; but he was not a mere theorist. He was a practical man. He was a Prophet as well as a Statesman.

As soon as he could form a State and Nation he anticipated, under God's own guidance, all their needs and requirements.

It is difficult to assess the comparative value of all the novel and unprecedented gifts and blessings conferred on mankind by the greatest of *all* the Reformers and Prophets. Their number is so large and most of them are of such high beneficence and value that the assessor would get confounded but it can be safely said that his one of the most, if not *the* most, beneficent gifts was to teach mankind to value and to measure time and to enable the people to *regulate* their lives. For this purpose a time was fixed

for the five Daily Prayers to be said by the clock otherwise they would be *missed*. For the other four "pillars" also, a definite season, occasion or measure was introduced to create a sense of *Duty* and to destroy carelessness, lethargy or irresponsibility.

One of the chief causes of the present degeneration of the Muslim Nation is the loss by its members of the sense of *Duty*. Their indifference to punctuality and regularity, their lack of activity and of the spirit of *Jihad*, are also very grave causes.

When the Prophet and his few followers had had to leave their homes, properties and relatives to go in exile to Medina, the first step he took was to bind the *Meccan Muhajerin* and the *Medinite Ansar* (helpers) into a tie of Brotherhood which became as strong and as fraternal as the blood relationship between two real brothers. This was the first Communistic step ever taken in Nation-building. After this, all those brothers together formed a *citizen-army* to defend their Headquarters (Medina) which the Quraishites had sworn to conquer and to destroy. The Prophet and his few followers had to take recourse to *Jihad*. This was the first step to make the little State, stable and secure. Gradually the five pillars mentioned above were built up, and very wise, judicious and equitable Laws, most of which were quite original and all of which were a decided improvement upon the existing ones anywhere, were established for the conduct of the life of the citizens of the wonderful Commonwealth.

The Government was carried on by the people themselves after due deliberations and consultations. When the little Nation at Medina became the object of hatred for all the Arabs, it had to be defended by military measures. The Prophet triumphed ; the little Model Nation triumphed and the little Commonwealth, the Communistic State was saved. The Prophet did not die until he had completed his religious mission and until he had laid on a firm and permanent basis his ever-progressive international Nation and his ever-enlarging Communistic State. The whole of Arabia accepted the Islamic Constitution as well as the Islamic Faith. Truth came and falsehood fled away and falsehood is indeed to disappear. (The Quran). A miraculous change was effected in a miraculously short time. All the tribes which used to fight against each other; amongst which blood counted more than merits ; which had never acknowledged the headship of any one man ; which had never known a collective life ; which had no idea of nationhood ; which had never respected any law, became one corporate, communistic Body, every item of whose life was regulated by high moral principles, the whole Nation living and

working as one man. One can well imagine what a wonderful Constitution it must have been to have effected such a miraculous metamorphosis of the people—men and women, old and young, rich and poor, of a whole country.

The Prophet in his farewell address, which will be quoted elsewhere, gave directions about all important matters but he did not give any direction as to the appointment of his Successor. It would have been against the spirit of Islam if he had done so. It would have given a rigidity to the Constitution. It would have interfered with the free choice of the people. When he fell ill he asked Abu Bakr to take his place at the Mosque. But this could not have necessarily meant to be an indication of his Successorship. Nor could he, in any case, have thought of making his succession based upon heredity or personal relationship with himself. So, on his death, before even his body was buried, a discussion took place as to who should be his Successor and it must have been God's own will in the choice because it was the best that could be made in the circumstances. The manner of choice was also democratic and in harmony with the spirit of Islam. Abu Bakr, the oldest prominent friend and disciple of the Prophet, who had been his Companion on the same camel when he left Mecca and in the same cave when he hid himself on the way to Medina and who had earned the title of *Siddique* from the Prophet himself and was referred to as his companion in the Quran, was chosen as the Khalifa. The people made *Baiat* or Contract with him. Thus was introduced *Khilafat* in the Constitution of Islam. The Prophet Muhammad left no son behind. But he left his well-cherished daughter and her children whom the Prophet treated *most* affectionately. He also left his cousin and son-in-law, the valiant "Lion of God"—Ali, whose sword in the defence of Islam had played the most brilliant part. Ali's erudition and learning were unparalleled in those days. He had been called the "Gate of knowledge" by the Prophet who cherished the greatest regard and affection for him. He was a scholar of unrivalled merits ; his spiritual greatness is acknowledged up to this day by almost all the spiritual schools in Islam. But Ali was not elected as the *Khalifa* by the people when they met at Saqifa Bani Saida—a kind of Council Hall in Medina. This meant that blood relationship with the Prophet was not taken into consideration. Nor was any property which the Prophet left behind him recognised to be his private property. A garden which he possessed at the time of his death became State property. The Prophet himself had laid down :

"Prophets do not leave anything to be inherited and that what they leave behind must go to the public."

Therefore neither the Prophet's daughter inherited anything from her father nor did his widow who had had less resources of

her own than the daughter, nor did any other relation. Lady Aysha, the beloved wife of the Prophet, was Abu Bakr's own daughter but as the Khalifa, Abu Bakr had no hesitation in depriving her of the inheritance from the Prophet.

In this connection it should be noted that Prophets are considered to be the best men. That is, *the best men leave no personal property*. Their relatives do not inherit anything from them. Thus if the Bolshevists have abolished inheritance of property (they have abolished the inheritance of productive property), they have not committed any very grievous sin.

That the succession of the Prophet or the Khilafat was not hereditary was confirmed by the attitude of the world-renowned Hosain, son of Ali, when he refused to acknowledge the Khilafat of Moawiyah's despicable son. Hosain sacrificed his own life and that of several members of his illustrious family rather than owe allegiance to Yazid whom his father Moawiyah, in his own life-time, had declared as his successor as the Emperors of Rome and Persia used to do.

Unfortunately the principle that Prophets leave no personal or inheritable property and that blood relationship plays no part in choosing the successor of the Prophet, when acted upon in the case of the Prophet Muhammad, caused a great schism amongst his followers which was foolishly made permanent. Those who believe that Ali, the son-in-law of the Prophet, took it to his heart when his wife—the Glorious Fatima, was deprived from inheriting the garden of *Fidak* left by her illustrious father—the Great Prophet, and when it was made public property or that Ali began to cherish a spite and a concealed enmity, as a hypocrite, against the Khalifas who were chosen before him for the Khilafat, they really *insult and misrepresent* the extraordinary nobility and greatness and magnanimity of the personality of the Hero-disciple of the Last Prophet, who was, as the Prophet himself said, his own flesh and blood, and whose sublime character and celestial spirituality were indeed the best work of his Prophetic mission as Ali was the youngest of the Prophet's disciples and hence most impressionable. It would *not* be wrong to say that Ali developed into a mirror of the Prophet's own heavenly character. To say or to imply by any act that this Hero-disciple was so intimidated or was so self-seeking that he led a life of utter hypocrisy and of continuous false pretences during the Khilafat of his predecessors in that office is a heinous and unpardonable crime not against that Great Man himself, but also against the Mighty Prophet and his teachings and Islam. The great and just Omar at least never bore any ill-will against Ali, who was treated throughout Omar's own Khilafat as his companion and counsellor in whom he had fullest confidence. When Omar went to Palestine he even made Ali

his susbtitute at Medina—the Headquarters. Omar did not hesitate to say publicly that he would have been utterly lost but for Ali.

It is a pity that those who profess to love Ali are blind to his chief *forte*, which was his grand spirituality not statesmanship, his miraculous saintliness and scholarship not administration, his *unworldliness* not the desire of power and position in this world.

The election of the first Khalifa by the people after due deliberation and discussion saved Islam from being torn to pieces on the death of the Prophet. Khilafat at that time became a very beneficent factor in the Constitution of Islam. In fact it played an important part in developing a Constitution which remains unequalled up to the present day. As has been said before, the Muslim Empire of the time of Omar was the very best on earth. It was also a large, and extensive Empire ; it was a cosmopolitan Empire representing people of different races, colours, countries and even creeds. But all its citizens breathed like one man.

On the lines laid down by the Prophet himself, Omar evolved a Religo-socio-political Communistic Constitution.

The Author of "Social Contract" and "Rights of Man" while condemning the Christian Constitution has praised the Islamic Constitution thus :—

"Soon this pretended Kingdom (Christian) of the other world became under a visible chief most violent despotism in the world . . . . Muhammad had very sound views. He thoroughly unified his political system and so long as his form of Government subsisted under his successors, the Khalifas, it was quite undivided and in that respect good."

The Muslim Constitution had in it the best of the Constitutional Monarchy: It had the best of a Republic: It had the best of Communism.

We do not deny that other Prophets and Great men beside Muhammad had also thought of human equality and brotherhood but this was only in theory or only on a moral or spiritual plan. **Scientific and economic Communism or Socialism combined with religious universality and human equality, was unknown before Islam.**

Omar worked communism on a large scale and established an extensive State—an "Empire". It is true that the religion of Islam united an Arab, an Egyptian, a Syrian and a Persian in one moral or cultural cord. But it was the office of the Khalifa which became a political link between peoples of different races and colours having different traditions and histories, living in different countries and speaking different languages. What was most

essential for a Nation like that of the Muslims, with an international, and extremely democratic outlook, each individual of which was self-conscious and self-respecting, and imbued with the spirit of freedom and equality, was to keep it under a strict *disciplinarian*, if it was intended to make the whole Nation work solidly and unitedly. This disciplinarian was the Khalifa. Again, it is true that Islam as a religion itself brought strict discipline into play five times a day, but for political discipline and organisation the office of Khilafat became very helpful. And so it was for the organisation of *Zakat* and the conduct of *Jihad*.

We therefore do not agree with the view that the institution of Khilafat was or is not of much use—the less so in modern days. In fact it is *more* necessary in modern days than it was ever before. It is easier now to draw full advantages from such an Institution as the Khilafat than ever before.

We go to the extent of saying that if Bolshevism succeeds in its fundamental object of a *World-Revolution* and if it spreads to different parts of the world, *it will find it necessary to establish something equivalent to the office of Khilafat for itself at some central place*, to be a link between different peoples and nations of the World. The office of Khilafat, as it was constituted at the time of Abu Bakr or Omar, is necessary even now if it is desired to have a *Federation of the World*—or a model *Universal State*. Without a centre of gravity the component parts of the *Universal State* will not develop that mutual harmony which is necessary for *World-Federation* and *World Peace*. Indeed the institution of Khilafat was a blessing and it can be made the same now if properly organised.

In the early period but later, a new department for the Muslim State was introduced. It was called "*Hisba*." This fixed the price of the necessities of life, stopped profiteering and the use of fraudulent weights and measures, or the sale of bad food. It performed the office of the Board of Health. It guarded against the overloading and the illtreatment of pack animals and it prevented cruelty to children.

Those who say that Islam, like other religions, is a personal matter for every individual, obviously do not know Islam or they are not intelligent enough to understand even simple facts and truths.

Let us repeat that Islam is both a Religion and an Institution. Collectivism and communism are inherent in Islam. Even Prayers of Muslims are Socialistic and Congregational. Pan-Islamism is an undetachable part of the Constitution of Islam and Pan-Islamism is for the *whole Muslim Nation of the world*—nay even for those non-Muslims who desire

Liberty, Communism, Internationalism and Universal Brotherhood to become the life-emotions and active principles for Humanity.

Pan-Islamism has its own culture and civilization, even its own science and philosophy, its own angle of vision for looking at things in this as in the other world and its own outlook of human life and work.

The Islamic Constitution as well as Islamic Laws are based mainly on the God-inspired verses of the Quran. But the interpretation of the verses and the precedents for legal cases are sought in the sayings of the Prophet and the examples set by him in his life or by the four of his closest Companions whom the overwhelming majority of Muslims all over the world believe to be the best authorities.

Besides other numerous authentic sayings of the Prophet, his Farewell Address at Mecca shortly before his death, is considered to be the greatest Charter of Liberty and Equality and is valued by every Muslim and the whole Muslim Nation. It has been described thus by a Biographer of the Prophet.

On his arrival at Mecca, after completing the rites of pilgrimage, Muhammad addressed the multitude from the top of Mount Arafat in solemn words:—

"O ye people, hearken to my words, for I know not whether after this year I shall ever be amongst you here again.

"Your blood and your wealth and your property are sacred (and inviolable amongst one another), even as this day of yours is sacred in this your city during this month of yours.

"The Lord has ordained to every man the share of his inheritance; a testament is not lawful to the prejudice of heirs.

"Verily, all blood-vengeance of (the days of) Ignorance is forbidden, (and all blood-feud abolished), commencing with the bloodshed in (the days of) Ignorance of (my nephew Ayas), son of Rabiah, son of Harith, son of Abdul Muttalib, who was confided for nursing to the family of Leith, and whom the tribe of Hudheil killed.

"No criminal shall be charged except for (the crime) that lies against him; and no father shall be charged with regard to his son, nor shall the son (be charged) with regard to his father.

"Verily, all usury of (the days of Ignorance) is forbidden: ye shall only have the capital of your money. Wrong not, nor be ye wronged; and the usury of (my uncle) Abbas, all of it, is cancelled.

"Verily, a Muslim is brother to a Muslim; and nothing which belongs to his brother is lawful to a Muslim, unless what he acquires from him lawfully."

"A Muslim is brother to a Muslim: let him not wrong him, nor forsake him, nor despise him. It is evil enough for man to despise his brother Muslim. Everything that belongs to a Muslim—his wealth, his blood, and his honour—is sacred to a Muslim. Take care! let there be no commercial transaction against one another amongst you; but be all servants of God and brothers to one another.

"Ye men! ye have rights; and ye women! ye have rights. Husbands! love your wives and treat them kindly. Verily, ye have taken them on the security of God and have made their persons lawful to you by the Word of God. Mind ye that the thing most disliked by God is divorce.

"And of your slaves (or workers)? Take care that ye feed them with such food as ye eat yourselves, and clothe them with the stuff ye wear, and order them not to do a thing beyond their power, and if ye do order such a thing ye must yourselves assist them in doing it. Whoso among you beats his slave without fault or slaps him in the face, his atonement for this is freeing him; and mind ye that man who behaves ill to his slave will be shut out from Paradise. Forgive thy slaves seventy times a day, for they are not to be unjustly treated. Nothing pleases God more than the freeing of slaves.

"Ye shall surely meet your Lord, and He will ask you concerning your works. Take care! ye do not return to unbelief after I am gone, striking off the necks of one another among you.

"Let him who is present tell it to him who is absent; haply he that is told may remember better than he who has heard it."

Then looking up to the heaven he cried. "O Lord! I have delivered my message and fulfilled my mission." And the multitude answered. "Yea, verily hast thou!" "O Lord, I beseech Thee, bear Thou witness to it!" said the Prophet.

The lasting effect and the permanent grip of the democratic Constitution of Islam can be judged from the fact that it could not be altogether shaken off even under autocratic Muslim Rulers. In the present age Sultan Abdul Hamid II was undeniably a very powerful Ruler. He held autocratic powers like the Czars of Russia. But while there was no trace of democracy left under the Czars, in Turkey the spirit of democracy persisted.

In his life of Kemal Pasha Mr. Armstrong writes:—"*His success depended on himself. In Turkey each man must rise from the bottom by his own ability. There was no Ruling class, no schools specially reserved for the rich and well-born, no preference given to sons because their fathers had succeeded or been born in the purple. That Mustafa Kemal was peasant-born would not clog his rise if he had the character and the brains.*"

And this was the case under a Ruler upon whom European writers have piled abuses as upon no other person in our days. Mr. Gladstone, who was foremost in his curses upon Sultan Abdul Hamid II, and who was supposed to belong to a democratic nation and to the "Liberal Party," never felt ashamed of those social and colour distinctions and special privileges for the natives of Europe and of that hideous autocracy which characterised the British Rule in India when he was the Prime Minister. No wonder that he failed to understand or appreciate that democracy in a Muslim country which made no distinction of colour and race and offered equal opportunities to all without the least class distinctions.

When this sort of real democracy was possible under an autocratic ruler what must have been the case under a true Islamic Constitution !

What more could be expected of any State or any nation, than to offer equal opportunities to all its citizens without any restriction as has been mentioned by Mr. Armstrong ?

Even the Bolshevik Communistic Constitution did not do any more. Nor could it aim any higher.

Now that the Russian Bolsheviks have quarrelled among themselves, the Bolshevik Constitution has also suffered. Lenin in his book "*Stalin*" quotes Dmitrevsky thus :—

"Stalin is a victim of the strangling centralized bureaucracy which he himself has created. One recalls the horror with which Nicholas I exclaimed, "Who said I was the Ruler of the country?—the country is governed by my bureaucrats." (With much greater force Edward VIII, and now George VI, can say the same about India up to this day. M. H. K.). So far Stalin is still the Ruler. He sets the general course. But the basic force surrounding him consists of practical adventurers, who are waiting for Stalin to go so that they may become the undivided masters of the land."

If we deliberate over the Prophet's Farewell Address we will then come to understand why the Arabs led by the aristocratic clan of Quraish fought so fiercely against a man whom they had always respected and trusted before. They had called him *alamin*, the Trusty. They never wavered in their faith in his truthfulness, honesty, selflessness, and wisdom.

Yet the Quraish led the other Arabs against him and gave him battle after battle.

They fought no doubt for their idols with a fanatical zeal but they also fought against the Economic and Social Revolution which the acts and orations like the above Address implied and which the Prophet initiated side by side with his Religious reforms. Although a scion himself of the proud, aristocratic Quraish clan,

the Prophet began, from the very start, to try to raise up the proletariat. The Quraish did not like this movement in favour of the Proletariat. They did not like the Prophet's "trampling down under his feet" the Social conceit or the pride of birth and they fought desperately against the Prophet to uphold their own old Social and Economic Systems.

So the political cause of the enmity of the Quraish against Islam was about the same that made Bolshevism the target of "white" Russians and of the Capitalist and Imperialist European Powers.

Islam introduced quite a new Social order and changed also the Political outlook. It put the programme of raising the proletariat to the status of the aristocracy and tried to displace the considerations of heredity by merits. It wanted to establish law and order without any personal discretion or privileges. It was somewhat for the same reasons that later on Omaiyyads fought against the Son-in-Law of the Prophet and his descendants who were also socialistically inclined. That quarrel really was also a quarrel between two Principles—Despotism and Socialism. Unfortunately Despotism triumphed.

IX.—Fundamental Similarities between Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism.

If one compares the Islamic Social and Political Constitution with Bolshevism he will find fundamental similarities. The objects of both are almost identical. Both seek the good of the whole humanity ; both aim at the general distribution of wealth ; individualism is merged into Communism by both ; nationalism gives place to Internationalism in both ; collectivity and Communism form the basis of both so much so that even the "Head of the State" has no legal status in any respect better than an ordinary citizen. He does not possess even the prerogative of vetoing, or of a casting vote. He is only a servant of the State—a servant who has greater responsibility than an ordinary citizen. When Omar was asked to nominate his own son as his successor for the Khilafat he said that it was enough that one in the family had been burdened with that office. When there was *one* poor old woman starving in the State, Omar felt himself responsible for the neglect and when he came to know of it he took on his own back the sack of meal from the *Bait-ul-Mal* and sought her forgiveness as it was the duty of the State to look after its infirm and old.

Va yusaroon ala anfusahim va lan kana behim khasasah. (Al-Quran).

"And even if it caused them privations or difficulties they gave preference to others," was the key formula of conduct for all the Muslims.

Even Muslims' daily Prayers were collective ; the *Hajj* was international ; the *Zakat* was communistic—the State distributed the accumulated wealth to those individuals who did not possess it. The defence of the State was a duty incumbent upon one and all—there was a "citizen-army" and the Law of *Jihad* for that purpose. The "Sovereignty" of the State rested with the people whose voice prevailed in all matters. The "majority," even if it so desired, could not interfere with the basic Laws and tyrannize over the "minority." In Islam all the fundamental laws were *God-made*. Man-made laws could not be allowed to outrage them. They could only be in consonance with them. Even the Prophet could not interfere with the principles of the "God-made" Laws which were impartial to all—the Rich or the Poor, the King or the Peasant, the Worker or the Labourer—the Prophet himself was under them as any other person.

Socially both Islam and Bolshevism aimed at establishing a classless Society. Politically both aimed at giving all authority in the hands of the people without recognising any limitations of colour, class or country.

Long before Bolshevism arose or Lenin was heard of, Prof. Noldeke wrote about the Constitution of Islam thus:—

"Omar organised a complete military religious Commonwealth, the precepts of religion were strictly maintained—the Caliph lived as his meanest subject. But the enormous booty and the tax levied on the vanquished, supplied the means of giving adequate pay to every Arab. This pay, the amount of which was graduated according to a definite scale, and in which women and children also participated, was raised as the income increased for the *leading principle was that everything obtained from enemies and subjects belonged to the Muslims collectively* and therefore all that remained over and after payment of common expenses, had to be divided."

Islam laid down the principle of *collectivity* centuries before Marx or Lenin were born.

Just as the enemies of Bolshevism call it to be against nature so did Noldeke call the Islamic Constitution to be "contrary to human nature." And Noldeke was happy to write as would every anti-Bolshevist of to-day under the same circumstances, "It was bad for Islam but good for the world that this military *Communist Constitution* did not last long."

The reason for its not "lasting long" according to Noldeke was that "the principle also that the convert of foreign nationality must be placed on a level with the Arabs was not yet capable of being fully carried out."

It is Noldeke's imagination that the Islamic Constitution was militarist or Arabs continued to look down upon non-Arabs with contempt. It was certainly *bad for the world* that the Islamic Communistic Constitution did not last for ever in its full practice. Noldeke, however, was right when he said that Islam established a Commonwealth and that the Islamic Constitution was *Communist* as the Bolshevist Constitution is. The position of the Khalifa was no different from that of a Bolshevik Commissar, say of Lenin, under the Bolshevik Constitution. An allowance was fixed for him by others beyond which he could not draw anything for his personal use. He was like other servants or Commissars of the State. A Khalifa could not, in fact, be half as domineering as Lenin was before or as Stalin is to-day. The Constitution of Islam is so all-comprehensive that in the end of the reign of Ibrahim (1648) the question was put to the *Mufti*, "Is it lawful to dethrone and put to death the *Padshah* who confers all the posts of dignity in the Empire not on those who are worthy of them but on those who have bought them for money?" The *Mufti* replied by a *Fatwa* in the affirmative,

Under the true Constitution of Islam a Khalifa could not be one-hundredth part as despotic as the life-president of the Ankara so-called Republic is to-day. And a true Muslim Khalifa was called upon to live a very highly moral life. Because Yezid was not so, the Prophet's own grandson rebelled and fought against him.

The similarity of Bolshevism with Islam has been noticed by the enemies of Bolshevism. The Right Honourable Mr. Fisher says in "A History of Europe" :—

"Though Russian Communist denounced religion as opium for the people it bore, *like Islam*, the marks of a religious faith. It was cosmopolitan, militant, propagandist. Lenin was its Prophet, and the Communist Party its Church."

Professor Massignon has formed a more correct view of Islam and also of Bolshevism when he says :—"Islam has the merit of standing for a very equilitarian conception of the contribution of each citizen by the tithes to the resources of the Community. It is hostile (like Bolshevism) to unrestricted Exchange, to banking Capital, to State loans, to indirect taxes on objects of prime necessity, but it holds to the rights of the father and the husband, to private property, and to commercial Capital. Here again it occupies an intermediate position between the doctrines of bourgeois Capitalism and Bolshevik Communism."

The fact is that of all the Political, Social and Economic Reforms which the world has seen within the last thirteen hundred years, Bolshevism has reached nearest to Islam. But to every *impartial* observer, Islam still offers a *superior* constitution to all others. For instance, while Bolshevism has only taken upon itself, for the time being anyway, to establish the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, Islam has rejected Dictatorship of every kind. It has abolished the distinction of even proletarian and bourgeois. *It has established Universal Brotherhood.* In other respects also Islam has adopted a better course. Prof. H. A. R. Gibb says in "*Whither Islam*" ? "Within the Western world Islam still maintains the balance between exaggerated opposites. Opposed equally to the anarchy of European Nationalism and the regimentation of Russian Communism, it has not yet succumbed to that obsession with the economic side of life which is characteristic of present-day Europe and present-day Russia alike."

To make it impossible for the majority to tyrannise over the minority is one of the unique triumphs of Islam.

Muslims have been called by the QURAN

"UMMATAL-VASTA."—The Intermediate Nation. So what wonder that it "maintains the balance" as Mr. Gibb calls it.

The Communistic Constitution of Islam produced a bolder spirit in the people than even what has been produced by Bolshevism in Russia.

In the days of Omar when a Muslim envoy Muadh was sent to the Court of Cyrus and asked to sit on a magnificent carpet he refused to do so with these Bolshevist words:—

"I do not want to sit on a carpet which has been made by sweating the poor." Muadh preferred to sit on the ground and when he was told that only slaves sat on the ground he replied, "who would more like to be a slave of God than myself ?"—In modern phraseology this would mean that Muadh preferred to be thought as a worker in the service of humanity.

While Islam adopted the middle course and allowed individual's liberty to a certain extent, Bolshevism has made its Constitution much too rigid—*i.e.*, "regimentation", as Prof. Gibb calls it, has been a little overdone. The life of man has become too artificial and too servile. Man has almost become a machine.

But while to make Robots Men is praiseworthy, to make Men Robots is far from being applaudable. Thus although Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism are similar in almost all respects, Islam possesses a soul which Bolshevism does not and to that extent Islam is superior as Man is superior even to the cleverest and the most ingenious Robot.

While the Constitutions of Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism are very similar, no doubt the possession of soul by one and not by the other, and the elasticity and individual discretion and the assertion of personal liberty and will on certain occasions in one and the strict "regimentation" and mechanisation of the other which has made Man himself an automaton has brought about the differences in the working of those Constitutions which should soon be removed for the benefit of Society.

X.—Special Similarities Between Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism.

(a) *World Revolution aimed by Both.*

From the very first day of his *call* the Prophet Muhammad's Mission was for the *whole* world.

The QURAN said that the Prophet was sent for *kaffatan linnas*, for all mankind.

The announcement on the part of the Almighty Himself was :—We have not sent you, O Muhammad, but to all men as a bearer of good news and a Warner. (XXXIV : 28.)

Again it was said :—*Wa ma arsalnak illa rahmatan lilalamin*, "and We have not sent thee but as a Mercy for the worlds". (XXI : 107.) It should be noted that "worlds" have been mentioned not world, which means that the Mission of the Prophet was not limited to this earth only.

When the Author was invited by Mahmoud Effendi Kazi Asker to breakfast at his home in Istanbul in 1906 he was struck to notice no other decoration at all in his room except the last given verse of the QURAN which declared the all-comprehensive Mission of the Prophet, in the most concise and suitable words possible. Muhammad even to-day is the real Mercy for the worlds. It is impossible to find more appropriate words to describe the Mission and Work of the Prophet than to call him *Rahmatul lilalamin*. It is impossible to give more concisely the gist of Islam.

The object of Islam is no other but to be a blessing for not only this world but for all the worlds imaginable.

The most befitting title for the Great Prophet is in truth *Rahmatul lilalamin*, "Mercy for the worlds," as a Messenger, a Warner, a Guide for all humanity, for all times, from the *Rabbul alamin*—the Cherisher and Sustainer and Evolver, of all the Universe. The *Rahmatul lilalamin* is indeed the worthiest Messenger of the *Rabbul alamin*, to remove all distress, affliction, poverty and bondage.

On 6th December, 1918, under the heading "Muhammad and the League of Nations" we wrote thus about the Universal Mission of the Prophet—and about the fundamental objects of Islam :—

For him (Muhammad) there was no question of Nations. For him there could be no question of more than one Nation, the whole Mankind *all* the world over. For him there were no frontiers between country and country. For him there were no distinctions between race and race. He was far and above all colour and class prejudices. His ambition was to see the whole

humanity as *one* Nation. He preached that there was One and Only God above and that all the human beings formed one brotherhood on this Earth. The distinctions of race, country, colour, etc., were only superficial. They must not be encouraged. Every man should consider himself as the *citizen of the world*. His patriotism should not be limited. Every man can change his domicile. An Englishman can become a Chinaman, but no man can cease to be a man. God made us men before we made ourselves citizens of this country or that. On our planet, probably on all the planets, this Universalism was first taught by the Prophet Muhammad over thirteen centuries ago in a country where the people were divided in innumerable clans where each clan had its own traditions and scruples of honour and where generally one clan was in a state of perpetual and hereditary War against the other.

The Prophet was a man of action. He took all steps to accomplish his World-Revolution—his Mission. He sent his disciples in all directions to invite peacefully the wild tribes of Arabia to Islam. Lanepoole says :—

"The taking of Mecca was soon followed by the adhesion of all Arabia. Every one knows the story of the spread of Islam. Every part of the Peninsula sent embassies to do homage to the Prophet. Arabia was not enough. The Prophet had written in the bold uncompromising way to the Great Kings of the East and West, to the Persian Khusro and the Greek Emperor, and these little knew how soon his invitation to the faith would be repeated and how quickly Islam would be knocking at their doors with no faltering hand."

At least one of the letters sent by the Prophet to the Kings is still in existence in the original. Everybody was invited to Islam. Islam was for the world. There has been nothing so revolutionary in the world upto this day as was Islam when it shook the earth to its foundation. There has been nothing upto the present date which had been so world-wide in its effect as has been Islam—as has been the Pan-Islamic Revolution.

The Revolution which Marx wanted to make was also meant for the world and it came nearest to the scope of Islam, in theory at least, but even that nearest was hundreds and thousands of miles short.

The Bolshevik Revolution was based on the theories of Marx and it was also meant to be world-wide.

The object of Marx's Revolution was the "violent overthrow of the contemporary social order."

The slogan of the Bolshevik Revolution was :—"Arise ye prisoners of starvation : Arise ye wretched of the earth."

Trotsky was always for the "permanent Revolution" *i.e.*, for the "World-Social-Revolution." Lenin, at the time of the Brest-Litovsk Peace, wanted to confine his attention to the Revolution in Russia. But his object was to get a "breathing time" for the World Revolution. So it is difficult to agree with Stalin that "Lenin struggled against the theory of Permanent Revolution to the end of his days." If Lenin had done that then the Author of these lines would have lost all respect for Lenin. But Lenin did *not* do that.

In the very early period of the Revolution, Lenin wrote in his "programme article" that "there is no power on earth which can prevent the Bolsheviks, if they do not let themselves be frightened and if they succeed in seizing the power, from holding it, until the victory of the world-wide Socialist Revolution."

One of the objects given in the "Declaration of Right of the Toilers and the Exploited Peoples" drafted by Lenin was the "establishment of a Socialist Organisation of Society and the victory of Socialism in all countries."

There is not the least doubt that like Islam both Marxism and Leninism or Bolshevism were meant for the world but while the ever-victorious Prophet succeeded to the fullest possible extent in effecting as he desired a World-Revolution not only for his own time but for all time both Marxism and Bolshevism have failed in their object of World-Revolution upto the present moment.

Writer after writer has recorded about the dazzling triumph of Islam. During the life-time of the Prophet, Islam had spread all over Arabia. Within a dozen years after his death it had reached Africa and it had triumphed over the Empires of Rome and Persia. Within a hundred years it had reached all the three Continents. Now, there is hardly any populated place in the world where its Call has not reached. It is daily and hourly on the increase. Islam is a recognised world force. In his "Authors of History" Mr. H. G. Wells, who is blind to the virtues of the Prophet, has admitted that "the stress Islam lays on the equality of all men without any distinction of creed and clan and the practical domestic brotherhood of Muslims has made the faith one of the greatest forces of the civilised world to-day."

Islam in fact is not one of the greatest forces but *the greatest force* in the world to-day to unite Humanity by one cord. Islam is also *the best* civilising agent and the most effective power known to Humanity: Not only of the Past or the Present but also for the Future.

As compared to this continuous world-success of Islam for about fourteen centuries the dismal failure of Bolshevism to win places beyond Russia looks very ignominious.

But it must be said that on the early rise of Bolshevism it tried its best for a world Revolution. The world circumstances offered then a good opportunity. The condition of the proletariat everywhere was bad. The masses of the world needed a drastic Reform. But the world-revolution on Bolshevist lines has not been achieved. It is, however, not the fault of the Bolsheviks that it was not achieved. Revolutions in Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, which were parts of the old Russian Empire and not very far from the Capital of Russia—St. Petersburg—Petrograd—Leningrad, whatever it may be called, "were quenched in streams of blood."

In Germany itself circumstances were at one time very favourable for a Bolshevik Revolution. Ruhr was invaded. France was rattling her sword. German currency was falling. People were starving. It seemed that she was "rotten ripe for a revolution." And the Revolution did "burn into a flame" in Saxony and in Hamburg but "it was fiendishly smothered."

In Asiatic countries, like Java and China also, Revolution had "raised its head with a sweep of terror but came to grief." In short everywhere else excepting Russia, and there also at a tremendous loss of blood and property, Revolution was "hacked to death."

Now the Bolshevists seem to have been themselves disheartened. Stalin seems to have lost all courage like the Ataturk.

Says Mr. Maurice Hindus:—"It was expected that experience with practical affairs and contact with outside nations would dampen the Communist ardour for world revolt . . . . . The Russian Communist under the hegemony of Stalin has been slowly withdrawing into his own nationalistic shell and seems content enough to leave the cause of World Revolution. The expulsion of Trotsky from the party and from Russia would seem to lend colour to the theory, for Trotsky is the burning flame of the so-called "Permanent Revolution" which he is so violently championing . . . .

The Social Government may yet become the ascendant power in Russia and keep the Communist Party subdued. Even now there is a cleavage in policy . . . Kellogg Pact was denounced by the Commissars as meant to blind the eyes and dull the mind of the masses. But Russia, despite the control of the Soviet Government by the Communist Party, hailed the Pact with greatest enthusiasm."

Nobody can deny that Mr. Hindus is an impartial observer of the Russian situation, so weight must be given to his forecast

when he says :—"The time may yet come when the Russian Communist will become the most conservative radical in the world."

We also are afraid of that. The trend is obvious. As to the hopelessness of any World Revolution the Communists themselves "sadly but frankly admit," says the author of "*Humanity Uprooted*," "that there is no imminently Revolutionary situation anywhere in any land." Not only this. The Communist acknowledges that, "it is beyond his power to bring or conjure it (the Revolutionary situation) into being." Another impartial, rather Pro-Bolshevik author, Mr. Louis Fischer, says :—"The observer notes a mounting disinterestedness in foreign affairs and foreign revolutionary possibilities and the more revolutionary policy at home marches hand in hand with greater indifference to developments abroad. In the Trotsky-Stalin controversy Trotsky contended that Socialism could not be built in one country and that so backward a country as Russia. Stalin defended the contrary view. Stalin won."

Thus for all practical purposes Bolshevism is now almost dead to the outside world. In this respect its similarity with Islam has ended.

Bolshevism is now confined to the four corners of Russia. There also it has been kept going at the point of the bayonet. In Russia itself the Bolshevik, or the Communist, Party is *not* yet in the majority. All the Russians have *not* yet got faith in Bolshevism. Instead of winning all the world over, a reaction in Russia itself is setting in as is evident from Russia's going to the Imperialist League of Nations and making pact with Capitalist France. There are other indications of the weakening of the Bolshevik principles.

There is no doubt that instead of accepting a World Revolution on Bolshevik lines the World is falling under the domination of Dictators and Imperialists. There is a *reaction* against Democracy itself.

In Italy, Turkey, Germany there are deadly and dreadful Dictators. In England the Liberal and Labour Parties have been wrecked and Conservatism *rules supreme*. In India and Palestine which are under "democratic" Britain, despotism and personal rule and repression have been triumphant.

Instead of Democracy and the Proletariat getting more power in their hands by the rise of Bolshevism even republicanism has degenerated into autocracy almost all over the world.

The giants of Bolshevism are gone. Lenin is dead. Trotsky is in exile. The Bolshevik leaders are "frightened" as Lenin feared might happen. They are seeking the shelter of the apron of France. They are thinking of rapprochement with England.

The Bolsheviks have not only failed in their object of effecting a World Revolution, they have been forced even to give up all propaganda for their cause. And this happened years back when Lenin was alive and Trotsky was also in power. Lord Curzon carried this feather in his cap that he had compelled the Bolsheviks to pledge themselves not to do propaganda for Communism in the British Empire.

During the Lausanne Conference Lord Curzon had a talk with Comrade Checherin. As usual Curzon adopted his superior tone. "Communist propaganda," he said, "could not be tolerated." Checherin meekly explained that "The Bolsheviks were prepared to guarantee that the Soviet Government would indulge in no propaganda hostile to Great Britain, and that no Soviet agents would engage in anti-British activities abroad."

Curzon was not satisfied and on 7th May, 1923, he sent his famous ten days' ultimatum. The Bolsheviks again yielded. Lord Curzon exultingly wrote to Lord Crewe, "I think I may claim to have won a considerable victory over the Soviet Government and I expect them to behave with more circumspection for some time to come."

Bolshevik Communism remains unlawful in almost every country. The Bolsheviks have done nothing to protect their creed and their cause even in France with which they have made a pact.

However, our point remains, that the object of Bolshevism at its rise was (and theoretically it probably still is) to effect a World Revolution as it always was and remains upto this day of Islam after having successfully carried it on for the past about fourteen centuries. Pan-Islamism remains the chief ingredient of Islam, though we must admit that it is not properly organised. That Islamic Revolution could not be "hacked to death" was because it was clothed in the indestructible and "unhackable" armour of spirituality. One can hack the body but not the spirit. The pace of the world triumph of Islam has unfortunately slackened. It was no more "hurricane" like. But it has remained there all right and is slowly doing its work. Pan-Islamism is engaged in its Mission of World-Revolution upto this day and no earthly Power can "hack it to death."

No earthly Power will ever be able to hack it to death. The light of Islam will continue for ever and ever and ever to illumine this World and all the Worlds. All efforts to extinguish it shall fail.

It shall be perfected—*Utimma Nurahi.* IX. 32.

Islam, Pan-Islam, will surely revolutionalize the World again and yet again. It will outshine all other systems, all other creeds.

Li yazharahu alad din kullihi, XLVIII. 28.

(b) No Special Rights and Privileges Recognised.

The aim of both Islam and Bolshevism has been to denounce and abolish all special rights and privileges. Both aimed at a Classless Society. In the eyes of both, Merits and Merits alone are worthy of consideration.

The QURAN says:—

O, mankind, surely, We have created you of a male and female and your families and tribes so that you may know one another. Surely the most honourable of you with Allah is he who excels most in good works and piety. XIII. 49.

And the Prophet said:—

God has revealed to me saying show humility so that no one may rise above another, nor pride himself above another. (Iyad bin Hemar in Abu Daud).

And again:—

Verily God has now taken away from you the vain glory of ignorance (pre-Islamic days), and boasting of forefathers. (Abu Hurrairah in Abu Daud).

From the very first Islam abolished special privileges by words and deeds.

It has been authoritatively related that a King named Jabala was a new convert to Islam. He came to the HAJJ. His *ahram* (the simple unsewn garment which the King and the Peasant all wear during the HAJJ), was accidentally treaded upon by another fellow-pilgrim. To the King it was a great impertinence that an ordinary man treaded on his robe. He could not tolerate it and slapped the offender. But Islam had already established a *Rule of Law.* And Islamic Law was the same for one and all. There were no special rights and privileges. The sufferer at once approached the Khalifa. The King was immediately called before the High Court of Justice. He not only admitted his guilt but violently protested against the audacity of a common man to have trampled upon his garment. To him it was no guilt on his part. To him that man was guilty who had treaded on the King's dress. But the Khalifa ordered the complainant to "pay the King back in his own coin" if he so chose to do. The poor King was dazed. But he persuaded the complainant to postpone his retaliation for a day. In the meantime he ran away. Islam thus lost a Kingly convert in those early days but it confirmed its Rule of Law and refused to recognise any special privileges even of a King.

Another case was, that when Jerusalem was beseiged by the Muslim army the Patriarch sent word to the Muslim General

that he would deliver the town only to the Khalifa. This message was sent to Medina. Omar, as usual, called a Conference and when it was decided that the request of the Patriarch should be granted, the Khalifa entrusted the Khilafat work to Ali who was his righthand man throughout his Khilafat and whom he consulted on all occasions. Omar started on his camel with only one servant (really a companion). They rode on the back of the camel turn by turn. It so happened that when they reached the Holy Place it was the turn of the servant to ride and that of Omar to walk on foot. So the Khalifa arrived walking on foot and the servant riding on the camel. It was thus that he was received by the Patriarch and the keys were delivered to him.

Another instance was when after Amir Ibnal Aas conquered Egypt he was made the Governor of the place. Once his son struck a Copt. Before Muslims conquered Egypt, Romans used to treat Copts as slaves and behaved to them as they liked. But times had changed. Islam had brought Law and Order and had abolished all special privileges or domineering by classes. The Copt, when he was beaten, went straight to Medina—to the Khalifa Omar. He lodged his complaint. The Governor and his son were at once called to Medina. The son was found guilty and duly punished. The Governor was censured with the following immortal words:—

"How dare anybody enslave and ill-treat man born to be free ?"

These are the instances of the time of a Ruler who was the Greatest Statesman and one of the most just and impartial men known to history. The third Khalifa Osman is supposed by some writers to have been a weak man. He is also said to have been partial to his relatives. But history records that when one of his kinsmen Wahid Bin Aqba was appointed Governor of Kufa he was once accused of having taken liquor. Because liquor-taking hurt Society therefore it was made a crime. The punishment of those who took intoxicants was stripes. The Governor, the near relative of the Khalifa, could claim no special privileges and was given stripes publicly like any other.

When Muslim messengers were sent to the courts of Kings or of their satraps they refused to recognise any special privileges or to extend any special honour to anybody.

Before the fateful battle of QADSYA Muslim envoys in their tattered garments and with erected heads attended the pompous Court of YAZDJERD—the Emperor of Persia. They remained unimpressed by the pomp and show of the Court and walked on the carpet piercing it with the point of their spear.

Later when Mughira went to the Emperor's General, the well-known Rustam, he went straight to his throne and sat by his side. When Rustam's courtiers protested, he rebuked them by saying, "It is not the custom among us that one man should be seated on a throne as if he was an object of worship while all the rest should sit below with their heads bowed down."

There can be traced a similarity in the demeanours of these Arab envoys to the Roman and Persian Courts and Russian delegates to the old Imperialist Powers. Although in 1934, when Russia degraded herself by joining the League of Nations, the Author had the pleasure of meeting M. Litvinoff, the Commissar for Foreign Affairs, at the dinner-table of a renowned Prince at Geneva, *in immaculate and stylish dinner suit*, the Russian delegates at Brest-Litovsk are said to have been quite "Bohemian" in their manners and dresses, etc. For instance, when the Russian delegation to Brest consisting of Joffe, Kamenev, Madame Bitzenko, Prof. Pokrovsky, Karakhan, Veltman-Pavlovich—four military experts and one worker, one peasant, one sailor and one soldier went to a dinner, the scene at the dinner-table was described by General Hoffman thus:—

"I shall never forget the first dinner with the Russians. I sat between Joffe and Sokolnikov, the present Commissar of Finance. Opposite me sat the Worker who was obviously embarrassed (The Arabs never felt embarrassed as they were convinced of their moral superiority, M. H. K.) by the large quantity of silverware. He tried to catch this and that with the various utensils, but he used the fork exclusively for the purpose of cleaning his teeth. Diagonally opposite, next to Prince Hohenlohen, sat Madame Bitzenko, and next to her the peasant, a thoroughly Russian Phenomenon with long grey locks and tremendous forest-beard. On one occasion, the orderly could not refrain from a smile when he asked whether the guest wanted red wine or white and the latter inquired which was stronger, for it was the stronger brand that he would want . . . .

"Joffe, Kamenev, Sokolnikov, above all the first made an exceptionally intelligent impression," adds the General and says further that "they spoke with enthusiasm of their task of leading the Russian proletariat to the peak of happiness and prosperity." General Hoffman adds that "the Bolsheviks even confided to him their plans of World-Revolution." As Bolsheviks are now frightened to talk of "World-Revolution" they would probably be ashamed now of the unceremonious and non-fashionable talk, dress and behaviour of their representatives

at the dinner table of the bourgeoisie at Brest. Times have indeed changed, as times are always changing. In a few years we may have "snobs" among the Bolshevists ?

(c) No colour or race conceit allowed.

Like Islam, Bolshevism discouraged all colour or race conceit. Islam was the first to demolish the colour and race barriers between man and man. It forbade all conceit and boasting.

The Quran says :—

And do not turn your face away from people in contempt, nor go about the land exulting over much. Surely Allah does not like any self-exulting boaster. (XXXI. 18).

The Prophet said :—

Thou art not good Abu Dharr because of thy red or black complexion but thou art more worthy because of thy good acts. (Abu Dharr in Imam Hambal).

And again :—

Verily, God looks not to your figures, nor bodies, but He looks into your hearts and works (Abu Hurrairah).

While upto this day a negro is lynched in America which is supposed to be the "most advanced, civilised and cultured country," a negro in the time of the Prophet was given the highest place in the Mosque to call Muslims to Prayers. Upto this day all Muslims cherish great regard, respect and love for Bilal—the negro slave of Abyssinia. When in 1934 the Author visited his dear friend Dr. Bhedget Wehby, at his well decorated and well furnished house in Cairo, he was struck when he noticed the legend of "*Ya Hazrat Bilal*," "O, saintly Bilal," framed and illumined, on the chief door of the sitting room. These Europeanised, well polished, thoroughly educated "White" gentlemen continue to respect the memory of a Black "Abyssinian slave."

It is related that when the conquering army of Amir Ibnal Aas reached old Cairo the Roman Governor-General asked the Muslim General to send delegates to discuss Peace terms. It so happened that among the Muslim delegates was a negro named Ibada. It seems that Europeans even then were as conceited of their colour,—rather discolour, as they are to-day. To them all "coloured" people were barbarians then as they are to Mussolinis to-day. So the inclusion of a coloured man was objected to by the Roman General. But it was not the twentieth century after Christ when Europe dominated Non-Europeans. Nor was the Arab Nation such as to feel ashamed of its Asiatic origin or to be over-awed by Europe as are their brother Turks of to-day.

Those were the days of the ascendancy of Islam. The Roman snob was plainly told that Islam made all men equal. There was no conceit of race or colour in Islam. As the Negro was the most talented so negotiations would have to be carried on with him. And the Roman "had to eat the humble pie" and to negotiate with Ibada.

Pivoted on the QURANIC conception of One Universal God—The RABBUL ALAMIN, the Muslim Nation spread all over the world and made not only a miraculous progress in evolving the most refined and intellectual culture and civilization, it also succeeded in democratizing the whole basis of man's social and political institutions and in exhibiting a tolerance of race, colour and even creed which no human institution exhibited either before or after the Great Prophet, upto this day. Islam remains upto now the *best* agency to unite mankind. It was one of the most wonderful miracles of the Prophet to have demolished all the differences and created one Solid Nation—one closely attached *Brotherhood*.

The Author honestly says that when the Arabs are shot and bombed in Palestine he feels as if his own brothers are being slaughtered.

A Zoroastrian high priest—Dr. Dhalla says in his book "Our Perfecting World":—

"Muhammedanism alone among the religions of the world has remained free from the colour bias . . . . It welcomes all converts with open arms, whether they be negroes or pariahs. Without reserve it accords them their rights and privileges and receives them into its social circle as much as into its religion that excludes all barriers of birth and colour, and admits its converts within the community on the basis of complete social equality."

Islam's freedom from all colour and racial bias has been acknowledged by all European honest writers. Says Dr. Dennison:—

"It was among these people (the divided Arabs) that the man was born who was to unite the whole known world of the East and West."

The Author of the "*Ins and Outs of Mesopotamia*" also writes of the same *miracle* thus:—"A more disunited people it would be hard to find (than the Arabs) till suddenly the miracle took place. A man arose who by his personality and by his claim to direct Divine Guidance, actually brought about the impossible—namely, the union of all those warring factors."

The fact that the Prophet succeeded—and succeeded in such a complete and permanent measure, where *all others* had failed—is in itself a proof that Muhammad worked the

miracle through God's Guidance. Lady Evelyn Cobbold, known personally to the Author, who herself made the *Hajj* recently (1934), writes in the introduction to her book "*Pilgrimage to Mecca*," which was very favourably recommended by the British Press, about the naturalness and the unifying force of Islam. She begins "The Introduction" with these remarks :—"I am often asked why and when I became a Muslim. I can only reply that I do not know the precise moment when the truth of Islam dawned on me. It seems that I have always been a Muslim. This is not so strange when one remembers that Islam is the natural religion that a child left to itself would develop. Indeed, as a Western Writer once described it, "Islam is the religion of commonsense."

In these few words Lady Cobbold has given the reason for Islam's being a Great unifying factor. When one keeps in view that human nature all over the world—in Europe or Africa or Asia or America, is the same what wonder that the "Religion of Nature" and of "Commonsense" succeeds in uniting an African to a European, and an Asiatic to an American, appealing to their human instincts. Lady Cobbold further describes in the following graphic words the most Universal International Conference which efficiently destroys all differences of class, race and colour, etc :—

"The influence of *Haij* cannot be exaggerated. To be a member of that huge congregation gathered together from the four corners of the earth on this sacred occasion and on this sacred spot(made immortal by the memory of the father of three religions —Judaism, Christianity and Islam), and to join with them in all humility in the glorification of God, is to have one's consciousness impressed by the full significance of the Islamic ideal and is to be privileged to participate in one of the most soul-inspiring experiences that have ever been granted to human beings. To visit the birth place of Islam, to tread the sacred ground hallowed by the memories of Muhammad's long toil and sufferings, to his struggle to call erring humanity back to God, is to re-live those glorious years of sacrifice and martyrdom, is to have one's soul kindled by that Celestial Fire which lighted up the whole earth. But this is not all. The *Hajj*, above everything else, makes for unity among Muslims. If there is anything that unifies the scattered forces of Islam and imbues them with mutual sympathy, it is the pilgrimage. It provides them with a central point to which they rally from all corners of the earth. It creates for them annually an occasion to meet and know one another, to exchange views and compare experiences and unite their various efforts to the common good. Distances are annihilated; Differences of sect are set aside. Divergences of race and colour cease to exist in this fraternity of Faith that unites all Muslims in one Great Brotherhood and makes them conscious of the glorious heritage

that is theirs. Then, when the religious duties are over, merchants from all lands discuss trade and commerce, and transact business with each other, theologians and jurists discuss questions of religion and jurisprudence, scientists, the latest advances in science, men of letters, literature, and financiers, problems of finance, politicians and statesmen, questions of national and international politics. The institution of *Hajj* does not represent to the Muslims merely a sacred institution but also a League of Nations, an International Academy of Art and Science, and an International Chamber of Commerce all in one."

The Bolsheviks have been organising on European lines, their own Congresses, Conferences and even Internationals to discuss Political, Social and Economic international matters. These gatherings are meant to be on similar lines with this Great Gathering of Islam instituted about fourteen centuries ago and continued year after year. The Bolshevists will find out on consideration, the superiority of the Islamic Ideal to the modern European one. The old Islamic Ideal would suit the creed and aspirations of the most upto date Bolshevist much better than the latest European Ideal whether in respect of internationalism or the League of Nations.

Thinking Europeans themselves admit Islam's superiority in these respects.

Dr. Stoddard has said :—

"Islam is a wonderful and gigantic force which ignores all the petty distinctions of tribe, class, race and nationality—so disastrously universal in modern Europe and so conspicuously absent in Islam—and unites the sons of the Prophet into one potent Nation—a unity of aims and ideals which the League of Nations and European Statesmen have so ignominiously failed to accomplish in the limited sphere of Western Empire."

Professor Snouk Hurgronje calls Islam itself a League of Races thus :—"The ideal of a League of Human Races has indeed been approached by Islam more surely than by any other, for the League of Nations founded on the basis of Muhammad's religion takes the principle of uniting of all human races so seriously as to put other communities to shame." Islamic people act upto what they preach. Islam is a living force. Says a Rev. Englishman :—

"It has to be remembered that Islam is a living power to-day among many races of mankind which neither Buddhism nor Christianity had been able to reach in their greatest period of expansion.

It has also appealed in modern times by its very simplicity and directness to master men of America, Europe and Asia. Above all it has impressed men by its virility as a great and noble creed."

Russian Bolshevists also claim to have formed a League of Nations of their own.

The words of M. Litvinoff still ring in the ears of the Author when on entering the so-called League of Nations at Geneva he eloquently said that the Union of the Soviet's Socialist Republic was in itself a League of Nations comprising different races and peoples and colours and creeds with fullest equality of status and privileges.

It must be admitted to the credit of the Bolsheviks that they have continued to keep themselves above race or colour prejudices. In fact, they have suffered because of this freedom of theirs from all race and colour prejudices.

"Moscow's sympathy for and encouragement to Nationalist movements in the East," says Mr. Louis Fischer, "destroys many attempts at diplomatic conciliation with the West, but Moscow does not modify its strategy."

In relation to Turkey, Persia and Afghanistan, as has been shown before, and also to Outer Mongolia and Kuomintang China, the Soviet Government continues to adopt a friendly policy, although it thus jeopardises its friendship with the Western Powers and even with America.

As has been related previously, England offered Russia the same "Zone Influence" in Persia as she possessed during the Czarist régime, but she refused it as unthinkable.

It is undoubtedly a wise policy on Russia's part to keep friendly with Asiatic peoples and States besides its being in harmony with the principles of Communism. "Moscow wishes to see," says Mr. Fischer again, "those (Eastern countries) united and strong enough to resist the efforts of other Powers to penetrate and dominate them and perhaps use them as spring-boards for attack against Russia."

Bolshevik Russia and the Islamic States of the Near East can form a bulwark for one another against the Imperialist greed of European Powers. And if they come to be inspired by identical ideals they can then save the whole of Humanity from becoming a prey to the haughty, exploiting and sweating Imperialism of the West.

Though their aim of "World Revolution" is gone, though there might even be some "special privileges" for certain persons now in Russia, yet the Bolshevists have remained true in practice, in the matter of freedom from colour or race prejudice.

Mr. Hindus testifies the fact in these words:—

"In the youth of Russia there is nowhere a sign of race or colour discrimination."

Bravo good, old Bolshevist youth!

(*d*) *Anti-Capitalism.*

Another point of complete similarity between Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism is that both disfavour Capitalism.

Islam attacked Capitalism in three ways. First, by the Institution of *Zakat.* A portion from all the accumulated income was taken away by the State to be given over to the poor and those deserving of financial help.

Secondly, by strictly interdicting *Riba* (usury). *Riba* was a very disastrous form of interest-taking on capital which prevailed among the Arabs. *Riba* doubled and redoubled the Capital in no time resulting in the early bankruptcy of the debtors who had to pay enormous sums as interest.

Islam forbade it thus:—

O, you who believe do not favour usury, doubling and redoubling, and be careful of your duty to ALLAH that you may be successful. (III. 129.)

The Quran further says:—

ALLAH has allowed trading (*baia*) and forbidden (*harruma*) usury (*riba*). (II. 275.)

Jabir relates that the Prophet strongly denounced the "taker" of usury, the "giver" of it, the "writer" of a usurous loan deed, and the "witness" to it.

The interdiction of Usury was a very great blow to Capitalism. But another blow was dealt to it. This was the third blow to Capitalism, when all amassers of wealth were denounced:—*Va jamaa fa asa.* Who amass wealth and then shut it up (LXX.. 18). All those who hoarded gold and silver were threatened with punishment.

The QURAN said:—

Val lazeena yaknizuna zahaba, va fizzate va la unfiqunha fi sabilil Lahe fabashshirhum bi azabin alim.

And those who hoard up gold and silver and do not spend it in the way of ALLAH (*i.e.*, for the benefit of humanity) announce to them a painful chastisement. (IX. 34.)

Abu Hurrairah says that the Prophet confirmed this by his own saying. The Prophet added that the punishment on the

day of judgment shall be "branding of the side and forehead and back of those who hoarded gold and silver, not paying therefrom the dues."

This was perhaps the severest blow to Capitalism. It took a very serious turn in the history of Islam in the time of the third Khalifa. There was a very saintly Companion of the Prophet named Abuzer Gaffari. He was so affectionate to the Prophet as to call him "my Beloved," "my Comrade." He went to Syria after the Prophet's death when that country came under Islam. Muawiyah was the Governor of the place when Abuzer Gaffari arrived. The Author feels inclined to use harsh words against this despotically minded Governor, and later on a Ruler, who wrecked the political Democratic Constitution of Islam by his own examples, but as all the associates of the Miraculous Teacher had developed in them by that association some redeeming features he will take a charitable view of Amir Muawiyah also. And that will be the correct Islamic view, the view set by "*the Mercy for the Worlds*" who forbade reviling even pagan gods. Abuzer found that the Governor was giving to the Islamic Society the tone of the Imperialists of Rome. People were amassing wealth and indulging in luxuries. He was shocked. He took at once upon himself to preach against this trend which he thought was not in harmony with the teachings of the Prophet. He began to attack Capitalism, private property and wealth in the strongest language. He preached Socialism, Communism or Bolshevism.

It is remarkable that the two extreme stages of Socialism were reached early in Islam by certain Muslims in their practical form. Bolshevism was reached in the third Khilafat and Anarchism in the fourth. The fourth Khalifa himself fell to the dagger of an anarchist who proclaimed, with a large group of companions, that no Khalifa or Head of the Islamic Government was necessary at all. God alone was sufficient. The Group was called *Khawaridge*. They wanted to kill the Governors of Syria and Egypt also with the Khalifa Ali on the same anarchist principles. Unfortunately the noble Khalifa Ali was killed while Amir Muawiyah and Amru Ibnal Aas were saved by luck from the daggers of the extremely advanced Socialists—the Anarchists.

At the time of the third Khalifa—Osman, Abuzer had arisen to preach the other extreme form of Socialism—*i.e.*, Bolshevism. The historian Tabri says that his preachings went home into the minds of the masses—the proletariat, as they would be called in the present ideology. He based his preachings on the text of the QURAN and the tradition of the Prophet, given above, relating to the hoarding of gold and silver and its punishment. When a rich man passed a street, people would shout at

him "branded", "branded". Their lives were made miserable for them by the taunts of the public. They were looked down with contempt very much like a rich man, even a "Nepman" is to-day in Russia. Under the stress of the public opinion aroused by Abuzer Gaffari and his followers, many men who had amassed wealth had to distribute it among the poorer people.

Hafiz Amru bin Abdul Barr writes that Abuzer's condemnation of *Kunz* (wealth) included everything except the bare necessities of life. It is obvious that if the condemnations were not so general, Abuzer's propaganda and preachings would not have made the sensation they did make.

Abuzer's personality was no ordinary one, nor did he preach his Communistic theories without the highest authority. He preached from the QURAN and the Traditions of the Prophet. Like other Companions he got his allowance from the BAIT-UL-MAL—public Treasury. Personally he was a man of great merits. His piety was of the highest. His character was the purest. He had been one of the oldest converts of the Prophet. People naturally attended to the preachings of such a man. Abuzer's Communism became contagious. Others took it up. The Governor was upset. Moawiyah lacked that spirit of Islam which worked with full force in the selfless and saintly Abuzer. Moawiyah was himself despotically inclined. It was he who ruined the democratic Constitution of Islam later by making the Khilafat hereditary—by nominating his own son as his successor. He could not tolerate Abuzer Gaffari when people began to follow him.

Unknowingly Lenin followed Abuzer Gaffari after thirteen centuries. Moawiyah tried to argue out Abuzer from his Communistic preachings. But it was in vain. He sent a deputation, including a learned lady, to discuss with Abuzer. That too proved of no avail. Communism or Bolshevism began to make strides in Syria. The cry for the division of all privately amassed gold and silver and property and wealth grew louder and louder. People were ordered to boycott Abuzer, but they would not. He grew more popular instead. He himself lived a simple life—the life of the propertyless, poorest of the poor. Amir Moawiyah tried to put him to test. He sent him a large sum of money. Abuzer distributed it at once. He was not the man to preach what he did not himself practise. After that, the Governor asked the Khalifa to call Abuzer Gaffari away. He was called to the Capital—Medina. He obeyed the orders and came to Medina. But he stuck to his convictions. In Medina as well, he began to preach Communism. His anti-Capitalist mission and the denunciation of the amassing of gold and silver he continued to carry on. When asked to stop his propaganda he declared that if a dagger were

drawn at his jugular voin even that would not prevent him from preaching the truth. He repeated what his "Comrade the Prophet" has taught him. Tabqat Ibne Saad and the Musnade Imam Hambal relate that in Medina also the anti-Capitalist preachings of Abuzer made a great sensation. Some people asked the Khalifa Osman to stop it. He called Abuzer to his presence. Abuzer at once presented himself. It is related in the Tafsir RUHULMAANI that the Khalifa asked KAAB AHBAR to argue with the Communist Leader. Kaab put forward the argument that when the Law of Moses which was very strict did not compel people to distribute all wealth and property how could Islam order such an unnatural distribution when Islamic Laws were in harmony with human nature and did not burden anybody beyond his capacity.

Another argument urged against Abuzer's interpretation of the Quranic verse upon which he had based his anti-Capitalism and Communism was, that if Islam had made distribution of all property compulsory, then no Laws of inheritance and devolution or transfer of property would have been laid down in the Quran.

Alas ! Abuzer refused to enter into arguments with a person like Kaab. His reply with a raised up cane was "O son of a Jewess how darest thou talk to me like this." The fact was that there were very few persons, if any, who could question the authority of Abuzer. So he got vexed when a man, whose knowledge of Islamic principles was as nothing when compared with that of his, started an argument. It is a pity all the same that an authority on Islam like Abuzer Sahabee who preached Communism, anti-Capitalism and abolition of private property should have not given other reasons for doing so except quoting the above verse of the Quran and a Hadith. How do we wish that Abuzer Gaffari had met Kaab's and others' arguments and their interpretation of the verse and the tradition relied upon by Abuzer and had given his reasons for holding the view that Islam desired the distribution of *Kunz* (all wealth and property) among the people. Perhaps it was because Abuzer did not condescend to give any arguments that his interpretation of the Quranic verse and of the Hadith was not accepted and not tried by the Khalifa Osman, and the world had to wait more than thirteen centuries for the trial of a full-fledged Communism or Bolshevism and for Islamic arguments in its favour as given in these pages.

It is obvious that later when the Khilafat was usurped by despots like Yezid how could such Communistic interpretations be accepted as those of Abuzer Gaffari ? But the mere fact that a Sahabee of the position of Abuzer Gaffari preached most extreme Communism under Islam should be enough to incline one to make

researches in Communism and no Muslim has a right to call Communism or anti-Capitalism off-hand to be un-Islamic.

Abuzer himself never accepted any other view. After that visit to the Khalifa when he had raised up his cane on Kaab, he made another visit and either of his own accord or under orders from his Khalifa, he retired or was exiled to a very small village called Rabza, which was near a State pasture and where a few Commissars (Ummal) under the *headship* of a "slave" were stationed, as the Post was on the way of pilgrims from Iraq.

As usual, Abuzer lived in Rabza also, in woollen tents with his family. The Khalifa ordered milk to be supplied to him for his living from the State Camels. There was nobody at Rabza to whom Communism or any other system could be preached and Abuzer engaged himself in religious pursuits. When he died he did not leave sufficient even for his coffin or shroud.

Thus died the *first* man who was a confirmed anti-Capitalist in his practical life as well as preachings, and who made a vigorous propaganda for the distribution of all wealth and property, and who suffered exile and privations for his Communistic convictions. And this man was the Companion and favourite of the Prophet himself, and nobody, not even the Khalifa, could deny his authority as a pious and devout follower of Islam.

Abuzer would have been the last person on earth to hold anti-Capitalistic and pro-Communistic views if he had the least doubt on the point that Islam supported and advocated those. He sincerely believed that Islam was anti-Capitalist and Pro-Communist. Nobody could shake him from those views—not even a noble Khalifa like Osman who was himself a Companion of the Prophet and also closely related to him.

Another point to be kept in view is that there is no Muslim Scholar or Historian of repute and status who doubts the sincerity of Abuzer Gaffari or who attributes any other motive to him for his advocacy of extreme Communism and anti-Capitalism except his conviction that Islam taught the same.

The attacks of the Bolshevists on Capitalism are well-known to need any discussion here. We have only to record that Bolshevism has cooled down in this respect also as in that of its mission to effect a World Revolution.

"Bolsheviks are too realistic," says Mr. Louis Fischer, "not to see that Western Capitalism has temporarily stabilised itself."

At another place he says:—

"The old notion (of Trotsky or Bokharin) that the Soviet Government could neither persist, nor succeed without Revolution in other lands is considered obsolete (by Stalin and the

present-day rulers of Russia). Moscow to-day submits to the proposition embodied in a Soviet resolution at the International Economic Conference in Geneva, in May 1923—that the Capitalist and Communist worlds may live side by side in peaceful co-existence. *Instead of concentrating their energies on the overthrow of world Capitalism Bolsheviks are bent on making it good themselves.*"

(*e*) *Labour and Work Encouraged.*

Bolshevism has extolled labour and work as Islam had done before. Before the advent of Islam, Labourers and Workers were looked down with contempt all over the world. All manual work was done by people who had a low place in Society. It was one of those other dozens of revolutionary moves on the part of the Prophet which he adopted to renovate the whole fabric of human society that he raised up the social status of Labourers and Workers. All the old civilizations, whether in Rome or Greece or India had taken no notice of the condition of the toiling millions. In Rome as in Greece manual work was allotted to the slaves who were treated no better than beasts of burden. In India all labour and work was the duty of the conquered Dravidians imposed by the victorious Aryan invaders. These workmen were "*untouchables*". Their very shadow polluted the "Caste Hindus." The Workers and Labourers were not allowed to draw water from the same well from which a Brahman did. They were not allowed to walk on the same path or pavement. Of course they could not read or touch the sacred books of the Hindus or the sacred gods and goddesses of the Hindu pantheon. The same is the case upto the present moment. Millions of people—over seventy millions, are treated in India upto the present day as *untouchables*. While a *peepul* tree, or the water of the Ganges and even the dung and urine of an animal—a cow, is sacred even to so-called educated persons in India, all the working class of people have been grouped into castes that are considered lowest in the Social ladder. Most of the Workers and Labourers are treated as untouchables. Reformer after reformer tried to raise up their status but he always failed. Many leaders are trying to do the same now. They have failed so far. However, the proverbial worm is turning now. Some of the educated among the depressed, untouchable classes have revolted against the beastly treatment meted out to them by the "Caste Hindus" since centuries past. They are trying to appeal to the conscience and the self-respect of the Dravidians who are said to be the original inhabitants of India to give up Hinduism itself. When they found that the Hindus, in spite of their desire for political reasons to keep the untouchables in the fold of Hinduism, were unable to give them equal status, they began to think of their adopting some other religion which would

give them equal rights and status with their fellow men. This would be a catastrophe for the political-minded Hindus because if the depressed class of people in India joined *en masse* the Muslims, who have a population of about ninety millions, they would form then the majority in India. Therefore desperate efforts are being made to keep the untouchables away from joining *the one faith* which has successfully abolished all the social barriers which divided man from man and whose spiritual position is also the highest.

The untouchables (Workers) are now told by some Hindus (though *not* by the Orthodox) that they can obtain equal status with the Caste Hindus therefore they must not go out of the Hindu religion. This is a gross deception—a "pious" fraud. Just as in Christianity labour and work was supposed by the Orthodox to be the "wages of the original sin," in Hinduism the people of the working and untouchable castes were believed to have been born in these wretched castes, as a punishment for their sins in their past life. Unless and until the past *karma* is obliterated after innumerable rebirths the position of the untouchables cannot be raised to that of those castes that have a cleaner record of their *karma* in their past life.

Under Manu's Laws, the lot of working castes in India was as wretched as could be. And Manu was one of the wisest law-givers and the Hindus are one of the oldest civilized peoples. But they treated their working caste not much better—rather a little worse than the European Romans and Greeks treated their workmen—the slaves. All honour is due to the Prophet Muhammad that his reforms included the betterment of the treatment of the Workers and of raising the status of Labour itself in Society in those far off days.

There was never any caste or class distinction in Islam at all. So the question of touchable or untouchable, high or low did not arise. All men were equal in Islam. All belonged to one class.

One of the first reforms which the Prophet took up was to ameliorate the condition of the workers (slaves). He raised slaves to the status of freemen. While the Jews had been hard upon slaves; while Christianity had been completely indifferent to the fate of slaves; while Roman legislation had failed to meet the situation, the Prophet boldly changed, in various ways, the destiny of the Workers—the slaves. In fact nobody could change it for any better.

The destiny of the workmen and labourers, indentured or even non-indentured, has not been made any better even upto the present day anywhere.

The Prophet at once laid down not less than a dozen rules to remove the evils of slavery. For example the following rules were set:—

(1) No Muslim could be made a slave.

(2) In wars, captives could be taken but they became automatically free if they accepted Islam. If they did not they could be ransomed or emancipated contrary to the Mosaic or other laws under which prisoners of war were usually killed.

(3) Freeing of slaves was made a very laudable religious duty. It absolved from many sins.

(4) One of the legal punishments was to compel the criminal to free slaves.

(5) No distinction was to be made between the "master" and the "slave" in respect of food and clothes, etc.

(6) A "slave" could marry the daughter of his "master."

(7) If a "bondswoman" bore a child to any "freeman" she became at once free, and the child was treated as a legitimate free born child.

(8) A "slave" was not to be meted out with any contemptuous treatment.

(9) A worker ("slave" as he was called) was not to be given more work than he was able to do, and the employer was himself to share the work if it was very hard.

(10) Public money from the *Bait-ul-mal* was to be used for emancipating slaves.

(11) If a "master" failed to carry out any part of a contract made between him and his workman (slave), the violation could give an opportunity to the "slave" to get his freedom.

As if all this was not enough, the Prophet very forcefully advocated the complete abolition of slavery by declaring:—

(12) **"A person who trades in human beings is an outcast of humanity."**

Could it be possible to condemn slavery in any stronger terms? Is it possible to do so now?

It was not by words of mouth alone that "slaves" were uplifted. Actions at once followed. The Prophet emancipated his own "slave," who was one of his first converts also. The "slave" was married to the Prophet's own distant cousin—a high born lady and, later because of the incompatibility of

temperaments when she was divorced, the Prophet had no scruples in marrying himself a "slave's" divorced wife. Slaves were maed Commanders-in-Chief over armies, which had in their ranks the best born Muslims.

Mr. Bannerji, a Hindu Scholar, has been impressed, as other students of history have been, by the unparalleled efforts of Islam to uplift the workman (slave). He quotes Islamic authority and then says:—

"These words were not only restricted to the pages of the QURAN but they were translated in the life of every Muslim throughout Islamic history. No parallel of such a kind, respectful and dignified behaviour to the slaves and inferiors in general can be found in any other Society. Nowhere but in Muslim States alone could a slave cherish the hope for a crown. Nowhere but in Islamic States a slave could demand the love of a princess."

What Mr. Bannerji has said has been witnessed by history in all Muslim lands. Slaves (workers) became members of the family of haughty monarchs. They succeeded on the throne of Kings and Emperors. They instituted kingly dynasties. Nobody took exception to the kingship or headship of a Muslim because he or his father was a "slave" or he was born of a "bondswoman." In Delhi stands up to this day a tower, one of the wonders of the world, built by a King who belonged to the Kingly dynasty of Slaves (workmen). Where is the man with any pretension of knowing history who does not know of the Mamlukes or the Ayubi dynasties of the Near East?

Only a little over two hundred years ago (in 1727) the Bishop of London wrote to the American Colonists that conversion to Christianity did not affect the status of a person. The letter quoted in Reinhold Niebuhr's "*Moral Man and Immoral Society*" is as follows:—

"Christianity," wrote the Bishop, "and the embracing of the gospel does not make the least alteration in civil property or in any of the duties which belong to civil relations; but in all these respects it continues persons just in the same state as it found them. The Freedom is from the bondage of sin and Satan and from the dominion of Men's lusts and passions and inordinate desires; but as to their outward condition, whatever that was before whether bond or free, their being baptised and becoming Christians makes no manner of change in them." This was meant to reassure the slave-drivers of America that the "slave" would remain a "slave" even if he had been converted to Christianity. What a contrast with the teachings of Islam! A Muslim could never be a bondsman.

Islam has raised the status of all Workers and Labourers.

The QURAN says:—

Va naima ajral amalin. And excellent is the reward of the Worker (III: 135.)

In fact the QURAN lays down that man is born to work.

Va an laisa lil insane illa ma saa.

"And surely nothing for man except his labour or work." (LIII: 39.)

Islam is the religion of action—not confined to dogmas or commandments, as others are.

The QURAN says:—

"God has preferred those who strive with their property and person to those who sit still." (IV: 95.)

Instead of being the wages of sin and a punishment for the past evil *karma*, work in Islam is noble.

The Prophet himself was commanded to proclaim:—

"Say, O, my people, work ye in your place, surely I am a worker." (XXXIX: 39).

Miqdam relates that the Prophet said:—"Never has any one eaten a better thing than when he eats of the work of his own hands. (Bukhari.)

It was due to such teachings that early Muslims like the Great Ali laboured and worked for their living. Centuries later even powerful Muslim Emperors like Aurangzeb did some work with their own hands for *Akle-Halal* (lawful, clean food and living).

How beautifully work was popularised by Islam when it was said:—"A Muslim dies with the sweat on his brow" (Tirmizi and Nasai).

The up-to-date practical Reformer also urged:—

"Pay the worker his wages before his sweat is dry."

In modern days a weekly payment of wages is considered early but the Prophet did not consider that early enough.

The similarity of Bolshevism with Islam on this subject becomes very clear when we see that what the Bolsheviks have done now to make work compulsory was done thirteen centuries ago by Islam in its own way. Now work is the main qualification for franchise and for the right of voting under Soviet Russia. All able-bodied men must work. There is a saying of the Prophet for exactly the same purpose:—

"He who is able and fit and doth not work for himself or or others, God is not gracious to him."

No Red Army, no Cheka, no Bolshevik Party's Iron discipline, no O. G. P. U. could induce Russians to consider work as obligatory a duty as did the above saying of the Prophet to the Arabs. His injunctions and advices are considered as binding even to-day by all true Muslims of whatever country and position, as they were 1356 years ago.

The HOLY QURAN itself provided incentive for work by such verses as the following:—

"I will not suffer the work of any worker among you to be lost, whether male or female, the one of you being from the other. (III: 194)."

The spirit underlying these commands is the same as that expressed thus:—"No work no bread". Or as was the wish of Lenin to make the whole world "One office and one factory." Or as Marx had laid down:—

"The Life process of Society, this meaning the material process of production, will not lose its veil of mystery until it becomes a process carried on by a free association of producers under their conscious and purposive control."

And a British Bolshevist says in his latest book:—"There is no force on earth which can long prevent the Workers of the world from building a new and stable civilization for themselves upon the basis of ownership of the means of production."

The Prophet was the very *first* man born to raise the dignity of "Labour and Work" not only by words but by actions. He always set a personal example for every Reform. On the occasion of building his first Mosque in Medina he was his own mason. To protect his volunteers from a sudden attack from the enemy he helped them with his own hands in digging up a trench. The Prophet stitched his own shoes; he swept his own floor, he milked his own ewes.

Thus by the practical example of the Prophet himself as of his early followers, the dignity of work was raised to the highest possible standard with the result that Islamic history has produced many illustrious men who plied some profession and were workers.

What wonder that his followers are sympathetic towards Labour upto our own days and we read such news announced by a Daily Paper in India.—

"The second Conference of the Nizam's State Railway Employees of the Purna section was held at Purna on 6th August, 1936. Mr. V. V. Giri, M.L.A., the Labour Leader who presided,

asserted that "it was no less due to the sagacious and sympathetic interest of H. E. H. the Nizam that the betterment of the condition of Labour in the State was done."

In his own time the Prophet personally taught men to engage in some labour or work.

Among many occasions Anas relates the following:—A man of the *ansar* (Helpers) came to the Prophet begging of him. The Prophet said "Hast thou nothing in the house?" The man said, "Yes, I have a woollen sheet with one part of which we cover ourselves and spread the other, and a cup from which we drink water." The Prophet said, "Come to me with both of these." The man came to him with both, and the Prophet took them in his hand and said, "Who will buy those two?" A man said, "I will take both for one dirham." The Prophet said, "Who will give more than one dirham." This he repeated twice or thrice. A man said, "I will take both for two dirhams." Then the Prophet gave both of those to that man and took two dirhams and gave them to the man saying, "Buy food with one of those and let it go to thy family and buy a hatchet with the other and come to me with it."

The Prophet (when the man came with the hatchet to him fixed a handle to the hatchet with this own hands and then said, "Go, cut wood and sell it and let me not see thee for fifteen days." The man did as he was bidden. Then he came when he had already got ten dirhams and he bought a garment with a part of the same and food with part. Then the Prophet said, "This is better for thee than that thou shouldst come on the day of resurrection with black marks on thy face."

By such practical lessons the Prophet taught his followers to work.

In Russia also people are made to work. The fact is, that in this case both Marx and Lenin have followed the Prophet, though not knowing this themselves. When they uplifted the worker and made work the pivot of the life of both man and woman they only did what Muslim leaders had done centuries ago, when they taught that man must learn to get his bread by work and "not to eat it in laziness."

While the Great Prophet **originated** the idea and gave it a **practical** shape in his time, Marx and Engels put the same in modern phraseology, Lenin worked it in a Socialist State and Trotsky saved that State in its infancy from its numerous and powerful enemies. But Marx and Engels were only theorists. Lenin and Trotsky were practical politicians. But it is a historic fact that neither Lenin nor Trotsky was the founder of the Workmen's Party. The foundations of the Party were laid in 1884 by

a group of revolutionaries, to which Lenin's elder brother joined and was executed by the Czar's orders, prominent among whom were George Plekhanov, Paul Axelrod and Vera Zasulich. The name then given to the party was "Liberation of Labour Group." Those were the school days of Lenin and Trotsky.

In 1889 Plekhanov made a prophetic speech at the first Congress of the second International when he said:—

"The Russian Revolutionary movement will be victorious as a revolutionary movement of Workmen. There is and can be no other alternative."

"It was only in Petersburg," writes one of Lenin's admirers, "that Lenin came in touch with the Working Class (years afterwards) and became himself an active worker of the Revolution."

In England the father of the Labour Party was Keir Hardie, a personal friend of the Author who was his guest when he came to Lucknow.

In the Indian Central Legislature the Author with his friends Diwan Chaman Lal and Mr. Tulsi Charan Goswami formed the first Labour Group of which the Author was elected to be the President.

(*f*) *Landlordism Attacked.*

The theory of Landlordism is that all land belongs to the King who conquers it. It is the King who gives it to his parasites —Dukes and Lords, whom he likes. They on their turn rent it, sometimes on very exacting terms, to their serfs. This was the Roman and Persian system unknown to the Arabs who had mostly sandy soil, not of much value for cultivating. Arabs had no Kings. How could they then have feudal Chiefs or Lords? Therefore, Landlordism, as a system, was not known in Arabia. But Muhammad's prophetic genius anticipated, as in other respects, the evils of the system. He cut down its very root.

The QURAN has given the name of *Malik-ul-mulk* to God and has declared repeatedly that every place, *i.e.*, every millionth part of an inch of land belongs to God. It says:—*Lahul mulk*. His is all kingdom. Thus the King himself (or any other head of the State) has been deprived of the *ownership of land* or of the country.

The Prophet further declared:—

"All land is of God, the creatures are the creatures of God. Whoso quickens dead land is best entitled to it." (Abu Daud).

After the death of the Prophet new territories beyond Arabia were conquered by Muslims even in the time of the immediate

successors of the Prophet. The system of Landlordism which prevailed there before the conquests was *not* adopted. Instead, all of the conquered territory became the State property under the *Malik-ul-mulk*. God was the Overlord, not any King or any other man. People cultivated the land from the State and paid the rent direct to the *Bait-ul-mal*—generally one-tenth of the produce. The Khalifa had no right to it personally except to the fixed allowance which almost all other Muslims got from the State. The Islamic Law had no primogeniture system. Therefore the land of the peasants was divided up generation after generation for several heirs. This made large dukedoms impossible. No individual peasant even could have large farms after generations of division among several members of the family—woman not excluded. Thus "Kulakism," which has given Bolshevism so much trouble, was non-existent in Muslim lands. As Muslims mostly lived a family life, a kind of collective farming came into vogue.

Describing the conquest of Spain a scholarly Muslim says: --

"The Reforms were at once set on foot. Judges, Governors, Tax Collectors (of fixed reasonable taxes), and other officials were chosen by the Spanish people from among themselves. Women, children, helpless people were exempt from the tax . . . The defeated clergy and nobles fled north and abandoned their lands which came under direct Muslim rule. These lands had their compliments of serfs and slaves. Then started a turning point in the lives of those who had been so long and so mercilessly oppressed. The Muslims considered both serfs and slaves as one class—agriculturist. They tilled the soil and gave only one-tenth of the crops to the Muslim State, which in return guaranteed law, order and peace. At the same time, there commenced a Social Democratic Revolution. The power of the clergy and nobility was shattered and their abandoned states were divided among the people. Then peasant land-owning was instituted." (Islamic Review, October 1918).

While describing the conquest under Islam the late Rt. Honourable Justice Ameer Ali wrote in his classical book the "Spirit of Islam":—

"A change came immediately over every country which the Muslims entered. Cities sprang into existence. Industrial towns sprang up (as in Russia since the rise of Bolshevism. M. H. K.). Order took the place of anarchy. The peasantry and petty landowners, trampled under foot of an insolent oligarchy and regarded with contempt by the priesthood, hailed the Muslims as the forerunners of their salvation.

Those countries where the Muslims established themselves remained exempt from the disastrous consequences of the feudal

system and the feudal code. Admitting no privilege, no caste, their legislation produced two grand results—that of freeing the soil from factitious burdens imposed by barbarian Laws and the assuring to individual perfect equality of rights."

It may be said in passing that while Islam discouraged landlordism, the Christian Church itself occupied the position of landlords in many places and supported landlordism.

"The Author of "A History of Labour" says:—

"The break-up of the Roman State marks the beginning of a struggle both in England and in France between the Landowner on the one hand and the Worker on the other, the one contending for complete mastery and the other for at first partial and later for complete freedom . . . . .

At first, of course, there was no Christian Church, but when that Church became established it did endeavour to ameliorate the condition of the unfree classes. Little by little, however, the Church itself became a great land-owner, and almost invariably we find it supporting the land-owning classes in their oppression of the land-worker."

Two other sayings of the Prophet regarding land are as follows:—

(1) Whoso quickens a dead land is his, there is no right of expropriation (against him).

(2) Whoso cultivates and inhabits a land which its owner is not able to do and has left to die, shall have it.

(g) *Human Equality Established.*

Bolshevism like Islam has taken upon itself to establish Human Equality.

Hinduism and Judaism make no claims of establishing "Human Equality." Hinduism is caste-ridden. It does not establish equality even in the higher castes in its own fold. A Brahman is a far superior being than any person belonging to any other caste. Those "Hindus" who are born in the low castes are treated worse than animals. There is no idea of "*Human Equality*" among the Hindus either in their religion or in society.

Jews openly call themselves to be "the chosen people." Gentiles have no status. Like a Hindu, a Jew is also born. As a non-Hindu cannot become a Hindu, so a Gentile cannot become a Jew.

Unlike Hinduism and Judaism, Buddhism and Christianity both claim to establish some sort of Human

Equality. Nirvana is obtainable by every Buddhist through "good actions" by self-immolation in successive re-births. Buddha revolted from the Brahmanic caste system, and his religion was turned out of India—the place of his birth, by the Brahmans, as a punishment for his revolt. The difficulty with Buddhism is that it is too theoretical a cult. The good actions which can take one to Nirvana mean self-torture and self-immolation. A new convert to Buddhism has to suffer torture with fire when he is branded. Asceticism and self-immolation may or may not take one to Nirvana after his death, they certainly cause one to die socially while he still breathes. Buddhism does not have a collective view of humanity at all. It is altogether individualistic. Even the great teacher Buddha who is supposed to be the wisest and best could not qualify himself for Nirvana until he renounced his kingdom, his wife, his family, the whole world and devoted all his time to meditation and asceticism. Thus for a Buddhist on this earth, society does not exist for all social purposes—for all the purposes in this world, Buddhism is of no help in our daily life.

The claim of Christianity that she establishes Human Equality is only a camouflage. Even "good actions" of the people who lived before Christ was born, or of those who have not heard of Christ or do not believe him to be the son of God (and an overwhelming majority of the people of the world are such) did not guarantee salvation to them. It is through Christ alone, through baptism even for a Christian, that salvation can be obtained. Then, there is not much personal responsibility. Christ gave up his life for all Christians. The belief in atonement has wrecked all personal responsibility. So, as far as religion is concerned there is *no* justification at all for claiming that Christianity aims at establishing Human Equality. Socially, as the Bishop of London wrote two hundred years ago to the American slave-drivers before Christianity was influenced by modern notions regarding Society and Social obligations, and as we see every day in India, the fact of anybody's accepting Christianity as a faith has no effect on the original *social status of a person.* Barbarous colour distinction in "Christian" America which spends millions in sending Christian missionaries all over the world, exposes the falsity of the claim of Christians that Christianity really offers Human Equality.

Barring Bolshevik Russia, the whole of Europe and America is steeped with colour and race prejudices.

It is the distinguishing characteristic of Islam and Islam alone that complete Human Equality has been made its cardinal religious, social and political principle.

No religion, no institution upto our own days, has done so much to accomplish complete "Human Equality" all over the

world as has Islam. The Bolsheviks in their short life have done much but not as much as Islam did to establish Human Equality. Prof. H. A. R. Gibbs says in his *Whither Islam* ?—

"But Islam has yet a further service to render to the cause of humanity . . . it possesses a magnificent tradition of inter-social understanding and co-operation. No other Society has such a record of success in uniting in an equality of status, of opportunity, and of endeavour so many and so various races of mankind. Islam has still power to reconcile apparently irreconcilable elements of race and tradition. If ever the opposition of the great societies of the East and West is to be replaced by co-operation the mediation of Islam is an indispensable condition.

* * * * *

We must wait upon Islamic Society to restore the balance of Western Civilization upset by the one-sided nature of progress.

* * * * *

For the fullest development of its own cultural, and economic life, Islam cannot do without the co-operation of European Society and for the further development of its cultural life Europe cannot do without the forces and capacities which lie within Islamic Society."

The most novel but very firm step adopted by the Prophet in this respect was to open the door of salvation to all who did good deeds.

The Christian Hatim and the fire-worshipping Naushirwan, one for his generosity and the other for his justice, are better known and more respected in Muslim Society than many Muslim Philanthropists or Kings of old. They are better known than many Muslim Rulers—several Khalifas.

The QURAN and the Prophet laid the foundation of this Unique tolerance and equality. The Prophet was directed to tell the unbelievers (*Kafirun*), *Lakum dinakum valiya din.* To you your Faith, to us, ours. (CIX : 6).

The Quran says :—

Surely those who believe (Muslims), and those who are the Jews and the Christians, and the Sabians, whoever believes in Allah and the Last day and does good they shall have their reward from their Lord, and there is no fear for them, nor shall they grieve. (II : 62).

Here it must be specially noted that Muslims, Christians, Jews and even star-worshipping Sabians have been put *exactly* in one and the same position. The Prophet Muhammad was for the whole world, for all peoples, *not* for Muslims alone. ALLAH was the RABB (Evolver and Sustainer) for all not for the Arabs

or Muslims only. All Human Beings were equal—none had the monopoly of reward for good deeds calling oneself by this name or that, as belonging to this persuasion or that, made no difference. Good works and good works alone could distinguish one from the other. The Quran pointedly asks "Do men imagine that they will be left alone to say, we believe, and not to be tried." (XXIX: 2.)

At another place the QURAN makes this more clear:—"They say none shall enter paradise except they who are the Jews or Christians. This is their fancy. Say produce your proof if ye are speakers of truth. Ay, he, who resigneth his face to God and doeth that which is right, he shall have his reward with his Lord and there is no fear for him nor grief."

These are not the only Islamic Charters of liberty of conscience and of social freedom. Every man has been made equally responsible for all his acts.

The QURAN lays down: -

"A warning to mortals, to him among you who wishes to go forward or remain behind. Every soul is held in pledge for what it earns. (74: 36-38).

And again: -

"He who has done an atom's weight of good shall see it, and he who has done an atom's weight of evil shall see it" (99: 7-8).

The idea that any Saints or Priests or even Prophets shall intercede without God's will and save any person from the due consequences of his acts has been rebutted thus:—

"That no bearer of burden shall bear the burden of another and that man shall have nothing but what he strives for, and that his striving shall soon be seen, then shall he be rewarded for it with the fullest reward" (52: 21).

Every man must carry his own responsibility for all acts. Says the QURAN:—

"Every man is responsible for what he shall have wrought." (52: 21).

It must be kept in view that in Islam turning one's "face towards the East or the West" in Prayers is not sufficient. Social services, which have been described in detail in the QURAN and we will quote them later, are necessary. In Islam "good-acts" mean Good Social Services done by a Muslim, a Jew, a Christian or anybody.

Such an establishment of complete *Human Equality* astounded the opponents of the Prophet as this idea from a person who claimed to be a religious reformer was quite unprecedented. Gibbon, the philosophic historian, himself writes in a sceptic vein thus:—

"By Muhammad's intolerant adversaries he is upbraided for extending, even to themselves, the hope of salvation, for asserting the blackest heresy, that every man who believes in God and accomplishes good works may expect in the last day a favourable sentence. Such rational indifference is ill-adapted to the character of a fanatic, nor is it probable that a messenger from heaven would depreciate the value and necessity of his own revelation."

Yes. It might be strange, but it is a fact that while Muhammad taught the people the best religious faith that could be conceived and the religion most acceptable to Allah naturally because it taught to discover the laws of Nature, he at the same time impressed upon his own people, as upon others, that mere belief does not help a man much unless it is accompanied by good acts. Muslims were further taught that by doing good acts also their position will not be any superior to any other person who would do a good act while if they do wrong their responsibility will be greater because they claim to be Muslims.

Baron Rolf Ehrenfels of Austria, a special friend of the Author, made a comparison in the German language "of modern European thought in special regard to the characteristics of Islam." We quote here one portion of it as regards "the Social Form," as translated by another friend of the Author—Dr. Zaki Bey of Egypt. He wrote:—

"The rich people and the intelligents of Islamic Society have never as in the West segregated themselves from the poorer classes because of racial pride, class or family exclusiveness. They have rather endeavoured through affectionate treatment to include and incorporate them in their cultural life and aims. Poverty and manual labour are not despised in Islam as they were in Europe in the Middle Ages, (We would have said as they were until the rise of Bolshevism. M. H. K.) but neither are they overestimated, as in modern materialism, communism, socialism and Bolshevism.

Bolshevism maintains that religion is an opium for the people, stupefying them, because Bolshevism believes only in the earth and materialism. The European of the Middle Ages wished to deny the reality of the earth and body. But Islam has no room for these two errors,—it unites the "lower" classes with the representatives of the higher classes in one mode of living (in fact there is no distinction whatever of lower or higher class in Islam). The spirit of the people as well as the earth and body are well respected in Islam, whereas in Europe there existed at first a suppression of the people by the rich and higher classes and now a suppression by the people of lower classes, such as by the Proletariat in Russia, of the formerly high class. It is only in Islam that we find a golden middle way."

We have shown before how the class and colour differences were removed and complete Human Equality in these respects was established. We have also shown how all special rights and privileges were abolished for the sake of Human Equality. Now we have shown that the Prophet, although he came to preach a particular religion, did not confine salvation or reward or happiness and prosperity to the followers of that religion alone but he opened the gates of felicity in Heaven and earth for all *good* men who *acted rightly*, who did good services to their fellow beings—even to birds and animals. We shall describe later how Islam equalised the position of the other half of humanity—women—with men.

In short, in *every respect possible* Islam has established Human Equality.

Would any man with any justice in him, if he be even a Marxist or Leninist, hesitate to acknowledge the debt humanity owes to Islam in this respect? Would he not accept at least such teachings of the Prophet as completely equalised Mankind?

While a Bolshevist cannot justly and reasonably find any fault with such Islamic teachings, a Muslim can say that in certain respects Bolshevism is too narrow. For example, the condition laid down by the Communist Party for its membership that the member must not belong to any religion is extremely narrow.

Islam and Bolshevism are similar in accepting the principle of Human Equality but here again it is Islam which scores—it allows the liberty of conscience to all the people and shows greater spirit of toleration.

Suppose a Muslim accepts all the principles of the Bolshevik Communist Party but he thinks that the Islamic Conception of God is such that every sane man on this earth must accept it: that it is *good* and even *necessary for a fully Communistic Society* to accept the Islamic Conception of God so he feels that he will not do justice to himself or to the Communistic principles of *Human Equality* and *Human Freedom* if he gave up his belief in Islam, or in the God of Islam, what will the attitude of the Communist Party be towards him? If he will not be allowed to join the Communist Party will it not be against the interests of the Communist Party? What right has the Party to be so dictatorial—so autocratic as to refuse to accept a man though he believes in all Bolshevik Principles? What right has the Party to put shackles, like religious bigots, on the freedom of opinion, freedom of conscience, freedom of

belief? What has a belief or disbelief in a religion, unless it puts obstacles to the political or social uplift of man, or hinders him in social equality, got to do with a political body like the Communist Party? Why should a man's anti-religiousness be made compulsory for his communism? It is very much like the stress laid in India by certain leaders, who lack all political sense, on their personal idiosyncrasies as *ahimsa* or *khadder* and so forth, while they should have concentrated themselves first on political emancipation of the country by a united and solid effort of the ***whole*** Nation.

If Lenin were alive and he were to come to know that hundreds and thousands, even perhaps millions, of persons keep themselves out of the Communist Party only because this extraneous matter has been introduced as the condition of its membership, that a member must not believe in a religion, he would without doubt have at once taken steps to have this clause, this obstacle, in the establishment of complete Human Equality and Human Liberty, removed even though he had allowed it in the beginning because he did not know much of Islam and its Conception of God.

This narrow-mindedness is more similar to that of the Christians who would not accept anybody in their fold unless he had been baptised. Or like the British King who was to curse the Roman Catholic creed, or like certain religious zealots and ultra Orthodox peoples.

What the (Bolshevist) Communist Party should see to is that its members are Communists in their politics whether they believe in any religion or not. And surely they should welcome Muslims who are Communists not only politically and socially but also in their religion. In fact it is their religion which teaches them such high principles of Communism and of Human Liberty and Equality that the Bolshevists themselves should imbibe them instead of expecting that Muslims would give those up.

Nothing has done more harm to the cause of Bolshevism than this narrow-minded, bigoted, *fanatical and uncommunistic* condition imposed by the Party and this attack upon the Principles of Human Equality and Liberty.

(*h*) *Internationalism Encouraged.*

Unlike other European Nations, but very much like the Muslim Nation, the Bolsheviks, on their rise, laid very great stress upon Internationalism, rather than on narrow, hide-bound Nationalism. In this respect they made a revolution in the

current mentality of the people as Islam had done, thirteen centuries ago, when it laid down the highest Internationalist principle :—

"Mankind form one Nation."

Kanan nas ummatun vahidatun.

The QURAN has laid down this principle not only once but repeatedly. Thus was indicated a remarkable revolutionary mentality at the time, particularly in Arabia.

We wrote in the Islamic Review of December 1918 thus :—

Arabia at the time of Muhammad represented in a miniature form the present-day National differences of the world. Each clan had its own characteristics then, as each Nation has its own characteristics to-day.

If one clan was conceited, the other was ruthless. If one loved money, the other debauchery, another power and so forth. Each of them made every effort to keep its demarcations intact. Each one looked down on the other with a sort of contempt and rivalry. It was not less difficult to bring all these divergent people under one League, one system than that of bringing *all* the different Nations under one League to-day.

It would have been a grand and noble work if Muhammad had devoted all his life to achieve that object alone in his own Country. But Muhammad was a Superman. His ideas were highest and noblest. To his mind the idea of binding different clans under one League was not elevated enough. He aimed at obliterating the boundaries that separated one clan from the other. It was an impossible feat, yet Muhammad performed the miracle. What he did in Arabia he aimed to do the same for the whole world . . . . .

The miracle of Muhammad's personality consisted in the fact that while he entertained the highest, the grandest ideals which ever any human being cherished, he at the same time actualised them, or at least brought them within the range of practicability. . . . . Thus the moment Muhammad entertained the highest and noblest conception of removing all those differences and distinctions which divided man from man, nation from nation, he took steps to make his idea an established fact, and he performed the most wonderful miracle by producing a model. He did more than produce a model. He made it comparatively easy for others to enlarge and multiply that model. He showed them the way to produce it. He laid down rules and laws to make it easy to work upto that model. It was for the first time under the Sun that an *International* Nation was produced which was not divided by any sort of distinctions—of race, colour, country, class, language, creed.

The same Arabs who had been divided in hundreds of clans —who were so proud of heredity that they not only kept the chronological trees of each clan from its first founder—from Adam himself—but also of their horses; to whom every non-Arab was an Ajami, an inferior person altogether, were changed by the miracle of Muhammad into one worldwide Brotherhood comprising men and women of every class, race, country, and colour. All of them became one Nation, bowing to only One Supreme Being (Allah), regulating their life by one Law, following one Prophet, studying their religion in one language, imbued with one spirit and having one common object of life and existence.

In spite of worldwide conquests later, for Muslims only one Nation existed all over the world, with common rights and privileges, without any kind of distinction or difference. A Chinese, a Persian, an Indian, an Egyptian, a Spaniard, a Turk, a Kurd could be as much a member of that Nation as an Arab himself. The State of Islam was as much the heritage of a Persian as of an Arab. Patriotism of each was not confined to the boundaries of his own Country, but it was worldwide. Wherever a Muslim lived he reckoned that as much his country as that of any other of his brethren living thousands of miles away. It was the aspiration of the Prophet to universalize and internationalize the whole of humanity as he universalized one portion of it.

Later on, Muslims were Internationalized under one Khalifa. Then, one Internationalized State broke up into different States. But the Khalifa remained as the Head of the whole International Nation. To the overwhelming majority of the Muslim world, Khilafat was the cynosure. Now each Muslim State is trying to nationalize itself. That in itself is not objectionable. Muslim States have been forced to do this by the stress of circumstances. They have taken upon themselves to copy the West. It is due to the inferiority complex no doubt but it is likely to be temporary —just a passing phase—even though for the time being it may be thought a necessary phase. If it is only a temporary phase it may do good ultimately and become a means of strength to the Internationalism of Islam provided the Internationalism is not lost sight of under the dark shadow of narrow Nationalism.

This nationalisation of each Muslim State has been adopted for three reasons. One was due to the desire of the Leaders to copy the West in every respect good, bad or indifferent, So even when the West began to realize the defects of the hide-bound Nationalism the Eastern States began to adopt Nationalism, thinking that the present power of the Western States was due to their Nationalism. But times have changed. There are no people who

were so much attached to Nationalism as were the natives of England. To them Nationalism was everything. Every individual would have sacrificed everything for his Nation. He would probably do the same now. But lately we have been hearing from the lips of nobody more than from those of the British Statesmen, a talk of "Collective Security." No one has expressed a greater love for the "League of Nations" than the British Statesmen. A few more shocks like that given by Sig. Mussolini and England will have to seek refuge as much in International Pacts as is France from the fear of Germany. The policy of "splendid isolation" which denoted uncommon strength and self-confidence and trust in nationalism is dead.

The "New Roman Empire" will soon become a menace to the British Empire (and the chief support of the British Empire is the Milch-cow—India).

It is hoped that the "Ata-Turk" will also realize soon that his Nationalisation of Turkey, at the expense of the Internationalism of Islam, will jeopardise that little of Turkey also which has been left by the European robbers. Now a mighty Power like Britain has come to feel that she cannot leave the appendage of the "League of Nations" because of the newly born menace to her Eastern Empire, and her young Minister for Foreign Affairs has "collective security" on his lips as probably he has the face of a certain Dictator on his brains. Turkey also will have to think Internationally soon. For the present, however, Turkey talks of Nationalism just because Europe talked of Nationalism.

The other reason for the adoption by Muslim States of Nationalism is a good one in its own way.

In the East unfortunately too much importance was being given, since many centuries past, to individuals. The East has long been under the thumb of autocracy. The more strong and personal autocratic rule was, the more it killed national spirit in the people.

The Muslim States were for centuries past governed *quite against the spirit of Islam*, by Kings and Sultans. That had had a very harmful effect upon the mentality of Muslims all over the world. The Author is ashamed to say that Muslims of India feel less hurt by the autocracy of the Rulers than do now the Hindus who are becoming more sensitive to their self-respect and therefore greater lovers of Liberty.

To uplift the Muslims from the slavish, sycophantic abyss and to change that un-Islamic mentality, which the despotism and personal rule had created, the idea of Nationalism may prove a useful one. It may foster self-respect in the Nation as a whole. Unfortunately it does not seem to do so in Turkey. The Turkish

masses submissively yield to the despotism (too severe a despotism in certain respects) of Kemal Pasha as they did of the Sultans.

There is less freedom of speech and of conscience under the so-called republican Turkey than what it was under the autocratic Turkey.

The third reason for creating a national spirit in Muslim States is that it may do them good industrially. In this respect also the Muslims of India have kept themselves behind the Hindus. Since 1903 the Author has been drawing the attention of his countrymen to use home-made things, to manufacture all that was needed by a progressive people and to nationalise their Industries. The Hindus have been attending to it for many years past. But the Muslims, although it would have done them more economic good, were so foolish as not to attend to it much. However if all the Muslim States take upon themselves to use only home-made things this Spirit of Nationalism would become a veritable blessing to them. Alas! in this respect also Turkish Leaders have failed to adopt the right policy when they have been denationalising their peoples in their dress, etc.

If they thought it necessary to Europeanise their people in dress, etc., they should have first opened State factories to make European hats and boots and the material for suits and ties, etc. They should have industrialized Turkey first as Russia has been.

It is a fact that the way Kemal Pasha has introduced "Reforms" in Turkey reflects no credit upon him. Even good Reforms have lost much of their charm, much of their beneficence because methods adopted have been bad and unpopular and not far-sighted.

We have said before and repeat it that not only Mustafa Kemal but even Lenin and Stalin could have introduced all those Reforms which were really beneficial to humanity under the aegis of Islam. Then they would have made a World-Revolution indeed as Islam had done before. At least the Muslim World would have taken up those Reforms voluntarily.

However, it is a mistake to think that all the Turkish Nationalistic Reforms are un-Islamic. Despotism is much more un-Islamic than Nationalism. Of course, restricted and unjust, patriotism which makes one cry out, "my country whether right or wrong" is not favoured by Islam, but the love of one's Country is not discouraged. There is a saying:—

Hubbul watan minal iman.

A Muslim Poet goes to the extent of saying:—

Khare watan as mulke Sulaiman khushter.

To defend one's own Country, to do all that is necessary to raise the status of one's Country in the world, to obtain National

freedom and prosperity, all these are obligatory upon Muslims. What a Muslim must not do is to forget his Pan-Islamism—that Pan-Islamism which makes a Muslim a citizen of the World and not indifferent to the happiness and well-being of the whole human race when he is seeking those for his own fellow-countrymen. Pan-Islamism or Internationalism must remain the salt of a Muslim's life even as a Nationalist.

A contemporary Historian, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, writes about the present-day Nationalist current in Muslim lands thus:—

"In a world of Nation States (as we have said with the solitary exception of Bolshevik Russia all the European States are Nationalistic *not* internationalistic, M. H. K.) Islam has taken to Nationalism.

Where before the dominant antagonism was between Muslim and infidel, Sunnis and Shiahs, it is now between patriot and foreigner. The repudiation of the foreigner has been carried to strange lengths, Capitulations which had been tolerated since the first day of the Ottoman Empire are gone and the Englishman who in pre-War days was *persona grata* in most Muslim countries is to-day discredited and distrusted more than any other infidel.

The Nationalism which has meant less political tolerance has created a new spirit of religious tolerance. Sunnis and Shiahs work together in Iraq, Sunnis (?), (Shiahs) and Zoroastrians in Persia, and Copts and Muslims sit side by side in the Egyptian Cabinet."

Another Writer says:—

The breakdown of the Disarmament Conference (and more recently the utter failure of the "League of Nations" to protect weak Nations and States from brutal bullies) and the growing aggressiveness of the European Nationalism and Imperialism itself have now forced Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan and the Arab countries to turn from the West to the East, and from pure politics to religion. Historical schisms are becoming less prominent and are being bridged over. The Shah of Iran has visited Turkey; the Turanians and Iranians have been reconciled; the PAHLAVI AJAM has officially recognised SAUDI PURITAN ARAB, the SHARIFIANS of IRAQ and Transjordon have made their peace with the SAUDIANS of NEJD and the HEDJAZ; the frontier disputes between Iran and Afghanistan have been fraternally settled by the Turkish Arbitration Commission of Fakhruddeen Pasha; the SUNNI and the SHIAH have made a rapprochement; the SUNNI SAUDI ARABIA has concluded a perpetual Treaty of Islamic brotherhood and ARAB Unity with the SHIAH Yemen through the intervention of the members of the World Muslim Congress; and a SHIAH Imam—Kashful Ghata of Kerballa

led the Prayer, and delivered the sermon on the Unity of Islam at the second World Muslim Congress at the Harum-al-Aqsa—Jerusalem, in 1931. The Persian Education Minister has recently founded several schools specially for the *Hanafi Fiqah*, the Persian Government has issued a FIRMAN which forbids the practice of *Tabarra* and enjoins the need of Islamic Solidarity in face of the foreign Imperialism which is threatening the Muslim States.

Then there is the new Muslim Youth Movement, with its centre at CAIRO, and branches in all parts of the Muslim World with the following objects :—

(1) To search for means to strengthen Muslim Solidarity between different countries.

(2) To fight atheism and defend Islam.

(3) To establish a League of Islamic Nations for settling Islamic disputes.

Translations of the Quran are being done in the Japanese and Urdu languages at Al-Azhar, Cairo. Lecturers for these languages have also been appointed. An Egyptian Cultural Deputation is touring (1937) in India. The famous Shaikh Soalabi of Tunis was the Author's guest recently at Lucknow while on his fraternal Mission of enquiry regarding the *Achhut*.

We give here the address delivered by H. H. the Aga Khan to his followers as it also establishes the Solidarity of Islam of All sects and schools and prompts and prepares the Muslim Nation to take her due share in Internationalism. The Aga Khan said :—

"Bear witness that Allah is One. Muhammad is the Prophet of Allah; Quran is the Book of Allah; you are Muslims and should live with Muslims; greet Muslims with Assalamo allaikum (Peace be on you) ; give your children Islamic names; pray with congregations in Mosques ; keep Fast at regular times ; solemnize your marriages according to the Islamic rules of Nikah and treat all Muslims as your brothers."

In this connection it must not be forgotten that Imamat among Ismailis has a much greater importance than what Khilafat has among Sunnis. The Aga Khan is the Imam of the Ismailis, the Spiritual *and* Temporal Lord of the age. He has his followers spread in many parts of the world. He has an international status of his own. Even certain "Hindus" are among the followers of the Aga Khan. These facts increase the value of his address to his followers and forge an unbreakable link in the International Solidarity of Pan-Islamism. Every Pan-Islamist will bless the Aga Khan for this Khutba to his followers.

To keep up the International characteristic of Reforms in the Muslim States and the Muslim Nation as a whole, our idea was that a Commission formed of Muslims from different countries

should travel all over the Muslim World, study the situation at the spot, and then hold a World Muslim Congress. In that Congress all the interpretations of the QURAN and of Traditions of all the *recognised* Muslim Schools, HANAFI, SHAFAI, HAMBALI, MALIKI and the SHIAH, should be discussed and for the modern Muslim States and Society those interpretations should be accepted *for the time being* which may be most up-to-date, while keeping all the interpretations intact for the coming generations that may care to make their own interpretations. Schemes should also be prepared for the financial, commercial and economic mutual co-operation and betterment and for industrial international development of Muslims and their countries. Practical measures should also be adopted to make the Khilafat and the Holy Places of Islam immune, through the assistance of all Muslims, from all attacks however formidable.

The great Muslim philanthropist, H. H. the Aga Khan, promised to finance the Commission. But Kemal Pasha was in a hurry. He broke loose from the Islamic Internationalism and the Indian so-called political Reforms monopolised the Aga Khan's attentions for the moment. So the plan did not mature then (1928).

It may yet be taken up either with Turkey or without her. If it will be without Turkey then the Arab Khilafat will have to be restored. In no case, as far as it lies in human power, the Internationalism of Islam should be allowed to die out. **Pan-Islamism should be thoroughly organised as an active and living power.**

We admit that it is not a very easy task. The Bolsheviks are also finding it difficult to keep their internationalism alive. They are now talking of patriotism and are concerned with the fate of Russia alone. Because they have given up their object of effecting a world-revolution and of spreading their social and even economic programme everywhere the sympathy with them, and the expectations which other nations had from them, have also lessened.

Mr. Louis Fischer admits that Russia has been "eclipsed as a dominant factor in international affairs." In fact the dominant factor in the Russia of to-day is more nationalistic than internationalistic.

Paradoxical though it may seem but the very fact that Bolshevik Russia has joined the League of Nations is a positive proof that its own idea of internationalism has weakened.

Nor has Russia played that part in the League of Nations which might have made some amends for her downfall from the real internationalistic spirit. It is true that she is almost alone with that international spirit since Turkey committed international

suicide before she joined the League. Otherwise Turkey as the Leader of the other Muslim States in the League, inspired with the real international spirit of Pan-Islamism, would have helped Russia, even encouraged Russia, to take up her position "as a dominant factor in international affairs."

For instance, it should have been the duty of Turkey (we think it was the duty of Russia also if she meant to be true to her love of international justice) to have taken up the case of the Mandates over Syria and Palestine because the Mandatory Powers were treating the Covenant of the "League of Nations," which permitted only temporary Mandates over these countries whose "independence was recognised," as a mere scrap of paper. If Turkey had taken the matter up she would have received the support not only of the Muslim States but also of Russia. And though the League has proved an utter failure in saving its own weak member—ABYSSINIA, from a stronger one, we do not think Russia, and Turkey as the Leader of the Muslim States, would have failed in having the wrong done to Palestine and Syria redressed if they had attended to it earnestly and seriously. To our mind such failures by the Bolshevists to apply their Principles when the time of trial came have injured the cause of Bolshevism even more than what Fascism or Nazi-ism have. The most glaring instance of this failure, from an international point of view, is the indifference of Russia to the case of Palestine where the "League of Nations" is allowing the deliberate destruction of a small Nation, in its own homelands.

We hold that INTERNATIONALISM *and not Nationalism shall be the salvation of the modern world.* Let Turkey remember this: Let Bolshevists remember this: Let all Europe and all Asia and Africa and even isolated America with its "Monroe Doctrine" remember that Nationalism and Racialism are fatal for good-will and harmony among the people of the world. In his book, *The Problem of Race*, Sir A. Keith says:—

"And now man is awakening to the fact that Nature's primary end—race building, is incompatible with the necessities of the modern economic world, and is asking himself: What must I do? Bring race building practised hitherto by Nature to an end and have eternal peace? Or permit Nature to pursue her old course and have as a necessary consequence—War? Man has to choose the one course or the other. There is no intermediate course possible."

Sir Arthur is not quite correct. There *is* an intermediate course supplied by the *Ummatul wasta, i.e.*, the Intermediate Nation. The intermediate course is the adoption of the principles of Pan-Islamism. Pan-Islamism, while encouraging the development of

each Nation on its own lines best suited to its own needs, supplies a uniting cord—*Islam*, and a centre of gravity for all the National States—*the Khilafat*.

It was the most miraculous Prophetic genius of Muhammad alone which did clearly see about fourteen centuries ahead that a time will come when "Nature's primary end—race building," will become "incompatible with the necessities of the modern economic 'world"—in fact with the whole political life, and it was his unparalleled and unique statesmanship that found out the means to make the two as *compatible* as could be. The Mighty Prophet used his usual formula in meeting this "race building" purpose of Nature which causes schisms and also wars among different races and was immensely disruptive of human harmony and brotherliness—not to defy Nature but to regulate it so as to get good out of it for mankind.

Islam allows a Chinese Muslim to live the "national and racial" life of his fellow-countrymen, to put on the same dress, to speak the same language, to adopt the same means for national defence, even to have national names, yet to keep his international personality intact as a brother of an Arab or a Turk, or of an Indian or a British or a French Muslim and not to forget that after all there is a unity in diversity and the whole of humanity is one —*only one Nation*—thus all the people of this globe are *one* family —the Head of which is one Allah. And it is to demonstrate this *oneness* that a Chinese Muslim, as a Muslim of any other country of the World, is desired to say his Prayers in the Arabic language and to conduct his personal life in as much harmony with one another as is practicable—avoiding even in their drinks and food, on hygienic and spiritual grounds, intoxicants and swine's flesh, obeying the laws of *shariat*, not only the socialistic laws such as of inheritance which Von Kremer calls "supremely original branch of Muslim law," but also economic laws as of *Zakat* and anti-usury. Edmund Burke has said about the Muslim Laws:— "The Muhammadan Law is binding upon all—from the crowned head to the meanest subject; it is a law interwoven with a system of the wisest, the most learned and the most enlightened jurisprudence that ever existed in the world."

A Muslim may go to the strangest place possible but if there is a Mosque anywhere there he will feel *quite at home* when he enters it—all racial and national distinctions, all differences in dress and language and colour, will be nullified by the magical words "*assalamo alaikum*" "peace be upon you," and he will be sure of a *brotherly* welcome at the hands of every one present in that Mosque.

We would draw the attention of all the Rulers of States, whether Commissars, or Presidents or Kings or Cabinets and particularly of Kemal Pasha to the following comment by an American writer on Mr. Stead's book, *If Christ Came to Chicago.* He said:—

"The lesson to be learned from Mr. Stead's book is that the great evils from which humanity is suffering to-day are evils that can be handled only by religious sentiments, that the handling in the great part of these evils has been surrendered to the State; that the State has itself been delivered over to corrupt political machines; that such machines are not only unwilling, but unable to deal with those evils; and that nothing but a religious awakening of the citizens to their public duties can save countless millions from misery and the State itself from degradation."

Pan-Islamism is the best form of Internationalism and Universal Communism and the only tried and successful remedy for racial and national prejudices and antagonisms.

(i) Equal Opportunities Offered.

Throughout the long development of Civilization and Social institutions the first and foremost object of all Social and Political Reformers has been to afford equal opportunity to every man born on this earth. The Legislation, in all Western countries ande now also in Eastern, has been trying to achieve that object.

Law after law has been promulgated to distribute wealth evenly and to give every new born child equal opportunity to rise to the highest rung of the ladder.

Lord Snowdon (who once frankly admitted in a letter to the Author that his Country did not always respect pledges and promises), says in *A Living Wage*: "The trend of all industrial and social legislation for more than a century has been in the direction of the establishment of "a living standard." Various motives have entered into the support of such Legislation. The moral appeal, the industrial and social economy of healthier conditions and of a better educated working class, the political and Trade Union pressure of labour, have all contributed."

Before the Reforms of 1832 a responsible Russian lady described the condition of inequality of opportunities in England thus:—

"The aristocracy rolls in wealth and luxury while the streets of London and the highways of the Country swarm with miserable creatures covered with rags, barefooted, having neither food nor shelter."

The same was the case everywhere when in France came the Revolution. In three days the Monarchy was overthrown there.

Men like Place, Attwood, and Cobbett took up the work of destroying inequalities in England and reforming the political Constitution.

On 25th January, 1830, Thomas Attwood formed an Union at Birmingham "to obtain by every just and legal means such a reform in the House of Commons as may ensure a real and effectual representation of the lower and middle classes of the people in that House." But the Monarchical autocracy of George IV triumphed until "the battle of English Liberty was fought and won in Paris."

The greatest obstacle to the democratic Reforms in England was the Duke of Wellington. His Grace declared that "he was fully convinced that the country possessed at the present moment (1830) a Legislature which answered all the good purposes of Legislation and this to a greater degree than any Legislature had ever answered in any country whatever." How characteristically English the last portion of the declaration was!

But Revolution was in the air. In France the people had won. In England when Lord Grey, who championed the Reforms, fell, neither rioting nor disturbance broke out, says a Historian, "but work was suspended, and up and down the country all classes were organising so that rebellion might be universal and complete immediately the reactionaries (Wellington's Party) entered office." But what happened was again one of the characteristics of the British. The Duke could not form the Cabinet and Lord Grey came in again, and without bloodshed or rebellion the Reform Bill was passed on 4th June, 1832. It laid the foundations of democracy. As the French Revolution won the liberty for the English and others in the same way the British Reforms of 1832, although not worth much from the present advanced point of view, laid the foundations of the structure of Parliamentary Democracy and set an example to all countries.

"To-day", says the Historian quoted above, "with the passing of the various Franchise Acts of 1918 and 1920 political power is exercised by the vast majority of the adult members of the Community. The battle which long raged over women's suffrage has been fought and won, the question of adult suffrage for men has been settled. It can now be said that, so far as Great Britain is concerned, she is a true democracy. The same tendency towards a wider and wider Franchise is visible in other countries also."

There are people in England itself who would not agree with the view that Great Britain is "a true democracy." That Great Britain has the most representative Government or Parliament is being questioned almost everywhere, as has been discussed elsewhere in this Book.

' Besides this, a new School has sprung up which does not think that the Parliamentary System itself meets the present demands of the people or has the capacity to remove the inequalities or to offer equal opportunities to every citizen or a State or is international enough to satisfy Humanity as a whole. The Bolshevik School is an established fact now as Mr. Phillip Kerr writes:—

. . . . . "The disciples of Karl Marx have succeeded in creating and maintaining for twelve years—(now it is more than 12 years) a State of 150,000,000 people (very virile people they are) on a communist basis, and that there are no signs of an impending dissolution of the Soviet State."

He further predicts that something has happened in Russia which is going to have just as much effect over the world in the long run as the French Revolution a century and a quarter ago. For Russia ha. dethroned. Usury from the altar on which it now stands in Western civilization, she has rendered it impossible for anyone to live or at least live comfortably, except by the fruit of his own work, and has made the huge engine of economic production and distribution function for the general good and not for private profit.

There might be two opinions as to different reforms and innovations made by Bolshevists but there cannot be two opinions as to the fact that they have adopted the most stringent measures to give equal opportunities to all and to distribute all wealth evenly. This has been their highest object that all persons should have equal opportunities. They have taken up first the cause of the proletariat and are devoting their whole attention to it. If anything, they have exaggerated the point as in *dekoolakization* and in their fiery zeal for *Kolhoization* or collective farming. In these respects they have indeed overdone the thing. But in other respects their actions have been noble. For example, every man, woman or child, if unwell, can get the *best possible* medical aid while in other places in Europe the expert physicians, the "Harley Street" doctors, are available only to rich men who can afford to pay the specialist's fees. Or now every child in Russia can get the same education as any other. There are no Harrows or Etons in Russia, nor even Oxfords or Cambridges.

These are some of the very laudable practical efforts on the part of the Bolsheviks to give equal opportunities to all without distinction. This will bring all to such an equal status as nature will permit and the wealth in the country will also be distributed evenly.

It was the aim of Islam also that all human beings should have equal opportunities and all mankind may become one family —the family of ALLAH, as the Prophet has said.

Islam claims to be the religion of Nature. There are inequalities in Nature. In the same tree there are large and small fruits. In the animal kind also there are different capacities. Every horse could not run as fast as "Bahram" or "Mahmud." It cannot be denied that trainers of the racing horses have also their say in the matter. But though the trainer was the same he could not train "Taj Akbar" (which came from the same stable and had the same owner as had Mahmud, the winner of the 1936 Derby) to get the first or the second place in the Derby race. Heredity also plays some part. A "Blenheim" who was the Derby winner produced a son Mahmud, who also has won the Derby. In their zeal, Bolsheviks are sometimes inclined to forget the natural inequalities in man. They try to defy nature. Islam never does that. That is why its success has been so phenomenal. It regulates nature for man's use. It turns its harm into good. But it does not defy it.

Islam says that even the Sun and Moon can be made subservient to man. But this can only be done in their "natural courses." It is impossible to make the Moon go round the earth the other way or the Sun to move from its position as the Moon does. It is possible to invent some things to be fire-proof but it is impossible to take away from the fire its natural burning capacity. In the same way a man may learn to restrain his anger but it would not be possible to make him never feel angry.

Therefore what Islam undertakes to mitigate are natural human inequalities and to give all equal opportunities as to enable every person to rise to his or her fullest possible capacity. It also adopts the best possible measures to improve, as far as nature allows, the human capacity itself.

Gibbon writes:—

"But the millions of African and Asiatic converts who swelled the native lands of the faithful Arabs must have been allured rather than constrained to declare their belief in one God. By the repetition of a sentence and the loss of a foreskin, the subject or the slave, the captive or the criminal, arose in a moment, the free and equal companion of the victorious Muslims. Every sin was expiated, every engagement was disallowed, the vow of celibacy was superseded by the indulgence of nature, the native spirits who slept in the cloisters were awakened by the trumpet of the Saracen, and in the convulsion of the world, every member of a new Society ascended to the *natural* level of his capacity and courage."

It was in truth the Prophet who originated the idea of giving every one equal opportunities to "ascend to the *natural* level of his capacity and courage." It was the Prophet who caused a

"convulsion of the world," who blew "the trumpet that awakened the sleeping spirits," and who formed quite a "new Society" in which every person started level.

In his recent "History of Labour" Mr. Gilbert Stone says:— "But the Romans, though freed from subjection, had, in winning that liberty, gone far to create a proletariat of slaves. With the downfall of that Empire the levelling system commenced."

Every student of history knows that it was the rise of Islam that was the main cause of the downfall of the Roman Empire and that it was Islam through which "the levelling system commenced" which has now culminated in Bolshevism that aims at establishing the dictatorship of "the proletariat of slaves"—(workmen).

Islam aimed at a world "proletariat" (in fact a world Brotherhood), in which every one was given equal opportunities to rise as his "natural capacity and courage" would allow.

Rev. S. K. Sarkar after making researches in different religions says:—

"I had little doubt regarding the social side of Islam. A little research made it clear to me that Islam is the perfect religion as far as the ideal social polity, the ideal social economy, the ideal political constitution and the ideal human brotherhood are concerned.

"There is no example in human history of any other religion, civilization, commonwealth which has done so much practically in the conquest of race, class and colour and the achievement of social justice for the poor, the weak, the orphans, the widow, the slave, the women and the depressed classes of humanity."

(j) Encouragement to Knowledge and Learning.

The Bolsheviks can be justly proud of nothing more than of adopting measures, during the short time that they have been in power, for spreading knowledge and education in Russia.

They have really done wonders in this respect. They have done in Russia in fifteen years what the British have not done in India in 150 years in the spreading of education. Schools have sprung up like mushrooms in almost every village. Every effort is made and all possible measures are adopted to teach the people, even the very small children, how to read and write.

While in the days of the Czars very little was spent on education, and military expenditure was heavy as is the case upto this day in India under the British, who in their own country have been giving free and compulsory education since generations past, the Bolsheviks spend large sums on giving education, in uplifting the

masses, and in industrialising Russia to make her self-sufficient. In five years Russia has been far and far and far more industrialized than India in 150 years of British domination.

Education figures in Russia available upto 1932 are as follows :—

In 1913 literacy was less than 33 p.c. (under Pax Britannia the percentage is much less in India), in 1928 it was raised to 53.9 and in 1932 to 90 p.c. And it has been on the increase every year without a break. The number of students in schools has been increased from 8,000,000 in 1913 to 22,000,000 in 1932. The same is the case in Bolshevik Russia in all matters like sanitation, etc. The progress in the condition of India remains worse in all such matters that relate to the well-being of the people when compared to that made under the Bolshevik régime in Russia.

Yet every Indian is expected to bless the British with every breath of his life and to curse the Bolsheviks.

Admittedly not on such a gigantic scale but certainly with the same zeal and enthusiasm the dissemination of learning was undertaken in Arabia over thirteen centuries ago when Islam arose to end the "days of ignorance" as the pre-Islamic period has been called.

Learning was made obligatory "for all men and women". Even the prisoners of war were freely released if they undertook to teach Muslim youths. The use of the pen was very little known in Arabia then but the very first revelation to the Prophet from his God was :—

"In the name of Allah, the Rahman and the Rahim. Read thou in the name of thy Rabb (Evolver and Sustainer),—Created man from a clot of blood. Read and thy Rabb is the most Bounteous. Who hath taught the use of the pen. Hath taught man what he knew not." (XCVI : 1—5).

When Omar was the Khalifa he sent such distinguished Companions of the Prophet as Abu Ayyub, Abu Darda and Abu Ubaida to Syria in order to organise Muslim education in that newly conquered Country.

Wherever Muslims arrived one of their first acts was to build a mosque, and all big mosques were used as schools and contained a library. Not only was education free in those schools but students very often were also given free board and lodging. It was considered to be the duty of the State, as it is in Bolshevik Russia to-day, to pay for the education of its citizens.

"Even during the Rule of the Sultans of Turkey," says Davonport, "Islam has outstripped the enlightenment of our age by making instruction a fundamental law. Every child must be put to school in his fifth year.

"It is the duty of the State to instruct the citizen, that he may understand the laws he has to obey and of the family to teach their child the means by which he may acquire his livelihood. Every scholar is instructed in a handicraft, and some have earned thereby their subsistence."

"At Constantinople," says the same Author, "when a quarter is burnt down, which is by no means an infrequent occurrence, the inhabitants are obliged to build the school, but the Mosque is not restored until provided for by its own endowments or by some pious person."

Regarding Spain, Renan wrote:—

"The Mosques of Cordova, where scholars were counted by thousands, became active centres of scientific and philosophical studies."

It should be noted that the harmony established between religion (Islam) and science was so great that Science and Philosophy were taught in Mosques (religious places for the worship of God).

Renan further says:—

"All the barriers which separate men had fallen, all worked with one accord for the progress of their common civilization."

The Bolsheviks in Russia are trying to do the same though upto the present moment in Russia itself all the people have not accepted all the Bolshevik principles.

From the time of Khalid Bin Yazid Bin Muawyiah, Muslims began to collect books by all renowned authors. Khalid himself was a great scholar. He surrounded himself with Greek philosophers and got translated into Arabic, Greek and Coptic Works not only on art but also on industries and on medicine, and astronomy, etc. The world-renowned Khalifa Harun-ar-Rashid established BAIT UL HIKMAT (the Abode of Science) which contained, besides a very large number of books in Arabic, numerous books in Greek, Coptic, Chaldian, Persian, and Sanskrit. His Prime Minister Yahya Burmaki invited Hindu Pandits and physicians from India and it was through Baghdad that Hindu writings were introduced for the first time in Europe.

Islam has produced encyclopaedic writers. Al-Kandi alone wrote two hundred books on such varied subjects as arithmetic, philosophy, meteorology, medicine, geometry, etc., etc.

Bu-Ali-Sina (Avicenna) and many others were very prolific writers. Islam conquered not even one-tenth of the world by the sword but it brought under its sway or influence the whole of the world, for generations, by the development of the intellectual and mental powers of its followers. The illiterate Prophet

himself was the greatest known propagandist for enquiry, knowledge and learning. Muslims were told to go round the world for enquiry and experience. They were ordered to acquire knowledge even in distant China which was famous for its scientific and technical culture in those days. Some other sayings of the Prophet on the subject are as follows:—

"He who leaves his home in search of knowledge works in the path of God."

Be it noted that in Islam there was no work better than that done in the path of God, and that acquiring of knowledge was put on the same level with it. That means that acquiring knowledge, even leaving one's home for that purpose, is the best possible work a man can do.

In Islam, rather in every religion, and every system, martyrdom and self-sacrifice are considered to be most sacred. But the Prophet beautifully says:—

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

Another most remarkable saying of the Prophet is:—

Kun aaliman ao mutallimun va lalakin alsalis falhahlaka. Either be an *aalim* (learned) or a student. Any third position is disastrous. Some other sayings of the Prophet which have encouraged learning are as follows:—

"*He dieth not who takes to learning.*" "To listen to the words of the learned and to instil into others the lessons of science is better than religious exercises." "Seek after knowledge though it be in China." "The acquirement of knowledge is incumbent upon every Muslim man or woman," and so forth.

No one has prompted the acquirement of knowledge and learning in a more beautiful, more forceful, and more convincing manner than did the Prophe when he said:—

"*Acquire knowledge—it enables its possessor to distinguish right from wrong, it lighteth the path to heaven, it is our friend in the desert, our society in solitude, our comrade when friendless; it guideth to happiness, it sustaineth in adversity, it is an ornament among friends and armour against enemies.*"

Guizot says in his *History of European Civilisation*, "Islam stands alone among religions in discountenancing the reliance on tradition without argument . . . . It demands that its votaries should undertake the investigation of the great work of their Faith."

We shall give in another chapter in the next part the result of Islam's having made, contrary to other religious systems, the acquirement of knowledge and learning free and compulsory for all men and women. It gave with its Conception of God, an

impetus to science, research, and experimental learning and knowledge. It was Islam which revealed to man for the first time the scientific fact that the great Evolver and Designer Himself has made Nature subservient for man. He has only to find out the Laws of Nature and to learn how to utilise them for his own good. This in itself was the greatest incentive for research, enquiry and experiments and it resulted in the discovery of many scientific truths, and many inventions of great benefit to man were made.

The Holy QURAN, although essentially a book for religious guidance, has drawn the attention of man repeatedly to natural *phenomena*, like the changing of the winds, the falling of rain, the production of vegetation and other living things, the production of different colours, the evolution and growth of man himself, and so forth.

We read in the Quran repeatedly Verses like the following:— "Most surely in the creation of the heaven (the atmosphere or ether or "vapour" as the Quran calls heaven in XII: 11) 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 rain that ALLAH sends down from clouds, then gives life with it to the earth after its death and spreads in it animals, and the changing of the winds, and the clouds moving subserviently between the heaven and the earth, there are signs for a people who understand. (II: 163-164)". . . . . "He causes to grow for you thereby (by the rains) herbage, and the olives, and palm-trees, and the grapes, and all the fruits; most surely there is a sign for them who reflect" . . . . .

"And what He has created in the earth of varied hues; most surely there is a sign in this for a people who are mindful. And He it is who has made the sea subservient that you may eat fresh flesh from it (who can appreciate this better than the natives of the British Isles with their large fishing-fleet ?) and bring forth from it ornaments which you wear (this obviously refers to scientific pearl-fishery) and you see the ships (gigantic steamers like the "Queen Mary") cleaving through it, and that you might seek His bounty (who has profited most by "ships cleaving through" than the British ?) and that you may give thanks." (XVI: 14—15—16). "Then We made him a small life-germ in a firm resting-place." . . . ; Then We made the life-germ in a clot, then We made the clot a lump of flesh, then We made (in) the lump of flesh bones, then We clothed the bones with flesh, then We caused it to grow into another creation, so blessed be ALLAH, the best of the Creators." (XXIII: 13—14.)

"And in your (own) creation and what He spreads abroad of animals there are signs for a people that have self-confidence," (XIV : 4.)

"That you shall most certainly enter one state after another" (LXXXIV : 19), and so forth.

All these Verses urge man to probe into the secret of Nature and to bring as much of it in his use as possible by increasing his knowledge of the law. Islam has even given directions how to acquire knowledge. A Muslim Author says :—

The QURAN suggests some of the ways that will help us to perfect our knowledge. They are as follows :—

(1) The cultivation of the art of reading and writing. It was, as it were, something unknown before Islam. In fact, our attention was drawn to it in the very first revelation to Muhammad, from God, when he was told, "Read in the name of thy God . . . . who teaches man to write with the pen, Who teaches him things he knew not before." (XCVI : 1-4). (2) To keep the ear open ; to make a right judgment on everything we hear (XVI : 65). (3) To remember things for our future guidance (XVI : 13). (4) Observation of the universe (XVI : 15-16). (5) To study history and biographies that we may learn therefrom (XLIII : 6—8). (6) To travel with an eye observant of the relics and remains of those nations that rose and fell in days gone by (VI 11). (7) To learn lessons from hardships and trials (III : 139—141). (8) To study the Divine Revelations (II : 4). (9) Contemplation and meditation.

The QURAN speaks of four ways of contemplation. The Book uses four different words to convey each sort of contemplation, and the words have shades of difference in their meanings ; but unfortunately languages other than Arabic do not possess appropriate synonyms for them. We will, however, try to explain them here. These four aspects of contemplation are called (1) "Tafaqquh" ; (2) "Tadabbur" ; (3) "Tafakkur" ; and (4) "Taaqqul."

"Tafaqquh" means to use all organs of knowledge to acquire the truth of things. Those who did not do so have been described in the Holy QURAN as blind, deaf, and dumb. They have also been condemned as worse than animals. The QURAN speaks in III : 155, 156, 157; IV : 78; XXVIII : 15 ; of those who use their physical organs aright and then make a right judgment and add each new experience to their knowledge.

"Tadabbur," to observe things, or acquire knowledge about them that may enable us to find out the object that has brought them into existence ; in other words, to understand the ins and outs of things that come within our cognizance.

"Tafakkur," This refers to our constantly pondering over a matter to ascertain what will enable us to reach to the root of it. It also refers to our observation of Nature in order to find out the

ways of God, under which things come into existence and exhibit their properties. "Tafakkur" is the first and necessary process of a mind engaged in scientific research. In fact, Tafakkur means the observation and study of things in the universe to find out the laws of Nature. This second characteristic is referred to in the fourth aspect of contemplation, which is "Tnaqqul." It means to acquire that kind of knowledge about things around us which will enable us to make a right use of them in life. It demands from us not only a knowledge of the properties of things but also of the proportions in which they are to be used. Our knowledge under this aspect should qualify us to make use of things for the purpose for which they were intended.

No nation has shown so much thirst for knowledge and learning and so much fondness for books as to present a parallel example to that of Mamun, the son and successor of the well-known Khalifa Haroon Rashid of Arabian Nights fame.

One can read in *Culturegeschichte V. II*:—"Mamun opened negotiations with Theophiles, the Emperor of Constantinople, purposely for the exchange of art treasures, books, artists and learned men. After leading a victorious campaign against Byzantines he declared himself ready to give back the conquered countries if the Emperor Michael III would make it possible for him to get prepared translations of scientific works lying in Greece."

(k) *Emancipation of Women.*

The Prophet Muhammad effected over 1356 years ago a series of revolutions. Each one of that series was a marvel for the time it was effected and the way in which it was effected. The Arab mentality at first and then the mentality of the world for generations and generations to come was changed by these revolutions. But no revolution of that long series in all the walks of human life was so strange for the time and so far advanced and far-sighted as one in the conception of religion and the other in the treatment of women.

The first we will deal with later. Here we will very briefly take up the question of women.

The shock which Bolshevist reforms have given to the world is nothing as compared to that bewilderment, and also at first resentment which the reforms of the Prophet produced in Arabian Society over 1356 years ago.

Just as in respect of religion, Arabs engaged themselves in the grossest idolatry, not less abased than that prevailing in India, they treated their womenfolk also not less cruelly and callously than did the Hindus in India. Like the Hindu Rajputs they buried their daughters alive.

History records a very instructive story of the Prophet himself. The Prophet was fondly petting his little daughter when a Beduin passed that way. The Arab was shocked. He could not believe what he saw—a tiny little girl being affectionately caressed. He at once asked who was the object of the affection. When he was told that she was the Prophet's own daughter, he was more shocked and said, "many were such girls whom I buried alive."

How bold and courageous it was for the Prophet to take up social reform among such men first. Probably his religious reform would have been easier if he had not taken up with it so many other reforms. Those reforms prejudiced his people more and more against him and increased their enmity against him.

But he could not possibly leave social and other reforms alone. He did take all up—by words and acts. Daughters in Arabia were treated ignobly but the Prophet used to stand up when his daughter came to him to show respect to her and to her sex and to set an example to his Nation. Women in Arabia were treated with disrespect but when the daughter of his foster-mother came to the Prophet he spread his own covering on the floor for her to sit upon.

He gave legal rights to women which would have staggered the jurisconsults of Rome and Greece and Iran. They would have staggered that very judicious religious law-giver—*Manu*. The Prophet gave rights in property which women got in England only in 1880 and which in Roman Catholic countries like France they do not possess upto this day.

The Author has written a book *Women Under Different Religious and Social Laws* which should be read by those persons who want to make a comparative study of the feminist question. They will know how upto the present moment Islam stands head and shoulders above other religions and institutions in giving rights to women and in establishing their high position in Society with the uplift of their character and rights.

But in this respect also the particular characteristic of Islam is evident—Islam avoids outraging Nature.

The female of all animals, and man after all is also biologically an animal, has a few more burdens to bear (for example of child-birth) than has the male. That is Nature's own design. Neither the Bolshevists nor even Islam could interfere with this social scheme of Nature, nor with the natural position of the two sexes in relation to each other. There are occasions in their life when women do stand in need of some protection or help from their spouse, therefore, the QURAN says, that Nature has granted greater power and mastery to man than to woman and woman has to depend upon man. We know that 84 per cent of a man's weight represents strength

against 54 per cent in a woman and a male's brain weighs 3½ lbs. to a female's 2 lbs. 11 oz.

We will here quote from H. H. the Aga Khan who is in a position to interpret the laws of Islam to hundreds of thousands of persons and who would receive their full obedience by all of them. His word is law among hundreds of thousands. He writes :—

"I have not the least doubt that the whole spirit and teaching of the holy Prophet, whatever their temporary aspects may have been, encouraged the evolution of all legitimate freedom and legitimate equality between men and women.

The responsibility before God for prayers, for action, and for moral decision is the same for men and women, according to the Prophet's Holy Message. Women already 1350 years ago were made economically independent of men, while in England till as late as 1880 woman's property belonged to her husband. The Prophet also broke with that system and made women financially independent and gave them their proper due in succession to their various relatives' estates . . . . . .

The fact that in succession women got only one-half of what a man got does not prove that they have not moral equality. In the same way women in Europe are paid less than men because they are not expected to keep a family, so in Islam in their independent property they are expected to maintain themselves (in Islam a wife has a right of maintenance also from her husband but the husband has no such right) and *not* their families.

The fact that the family name goes through the boys makes it necessary that the wealth of the family should go more to the sons than to the daughters, leaving the daughters with 50 per cent and in a position of real equality.

Even in these days in Roman Catholic countries, the woman's property goes automatically to the husband, who becomes the owner of his wife's belongings. Under this system women have very little real independence and are at the mercy of their husbands.

Seclusion and purdah are purely Oriental (they were European as well, M. H. K.) customs, which came into Islam, but have no relation with the spirit of that teaching though undoubtedly they became part of the social system which Islam carried on from its neighbouring countries such as Persia, Byzantium and Egypt."

His Highness, being the head of all the Ismailies, wherever they may be, and a descendant of the Prophet himself, authoritatively says :—

"I firmly believe that in encouraging education among my religious followers and in trying, as far as possible, to give them

equality, women with men—I have carried out the spirit of the Holy Message of my Ancestor."

That His Highness has done so becomes evident by reading *Women Under Islam* with its parts like (1) Purdah, Haram or Seclusion, (2) Polygamy, (3) Divorce, and (4) Legal rights of women. The complete work *Women Under Different Religious and Social Laws* is waiting for new editions but the parts mentioned above can be had from the Mosque Woking (Surrey), England, by all those who may be interested in those subjects.

To one of those little parts of our Book we would draw the attention of the Bolshevik Reformers who gave a shock to Christian Europe by copying Islam and making both marriage and divorce easy. Although the tendency of the Legislatures in Europe as well as in America now was to remove the Christian rigidity of the law of Divorce in Christian lands, but as Europe used to call Islam names for having made divorce easy (Imam Abu Hanifa made it very easy indeed, almost as easy as the Bolshevists have made it), Europe also calls the Bolsheviks names. All sorts of stories have been spread regarding the Bolshevik's feminist Reforms. It has even been said that Bolshevists have adopted the principles of *Muzdak* who, centuries ago, in Iran, made a law that like air and water women were free to all. This was anti-Bolshevik propaganda. But it is a fact that the Bolsheviks have almost adopted the Islamic law both of Marriage and Divorce. Marriage is a social contract ; Divorce rescinds that contract. Now in many countries of Christian Europe also, religious ceremony is not necessary. Registration of a marriage makes the marriage legal. In many parts of Europe also divorce has been made comparatively easy but not so easy as it is in Bolshevist Russia. Unfortunately, divorce cases in Russia have increased tremendously. While in Muslim lands, in spite of the fact that the divorce has been as easy for over thirteen centuries as it is now in Russia under Bolshevism, divorce cases have been almost unknown. They were not even as common as they were in Christian Europe. In India where the largest number of Muslims is congregated, it is hardly four or five per cent. In Russia it has gone over 44.3 per cent. The fact is that the social system initiated by the inspired Prophet was perfect. But it must be taken as a whole. If a nation copies it, for instance, in divorce alone it cannot profit much by it.

Let the Bolshevist Reformers study thoroughly the *whole* of the social system of Islam—the *real* Islamic system as propounded and practised by the Prophet and as followed by his four immediate successors—Abu Bakr, Omar, Osman and Ali. After the last—*i.e.*, Ali, the real Constitution of Islam was altered and it lost the spirit of the Founder to a large extent. It cannot be denied that as

regards women certain Muslim Rulers and Autocrats departed from the original Islamic spirit. Their natural jealousy led them to adopt the old Roman custom of secluding women which in countries like India became much too rigid. In other respects also the environments had their influence on the social life of Muslims. But as far as Islam is concerned, unlike other religious or social systems, it is very easy to fall back upon the original which has been preserved intact in the *Book of Islam*. The example of the Prophet is also correctly known to all of us. The Bolsheviks would do well to study the *original* Islamic system to make their social reforms successful, lasting, popular and proper.

How well have conjugal relations between men and women been described in these few words. "He created for you helpmates from yourselves that you might find rest in them and He ordained between you love and mercy." (XXX : 21.)

Perfect equality, material, spiritual and moral, of sexes has been definitely established in the following Verses among others :—

"Men shall have the benefit of what they earn and women shall have the benefit of what they earn." (IV : 32.)

"Whoever does good deeds, whether male or female, we shall make live a happy life." (XVI : 97.)

"And the wives have rights similar to their obligations in a just manner." (II : 228.)

"He it is who has created you from a single being and of the same kind did He make his mate that he may find comfort in her." (VII : 187.)

"Whoever does good acts, whether male or female, and is a believer—these shall enter the garden." (IV : 124.)

The last verse clearly indicates that the spiritual salvation of men and women equally depends upon good actions.

The spiritual equality and the responsibility of the sexes has been categorically declared in XXXIII : 35.

Even in their conduct of their daily life a similarity of behaviour or manners has been established to a proper extent in the Verse XXIV : 30, 31.

The farsighted Prophet detected the evils of a polygamous life 1356 years ago but being a Moralist as well as a Socialist and a Universal Teacher for all the people at different stages of their social development and for all ages, he could not make his marriage laws, as also other laws, too rigid. For this reason permission was given on extremely rare occasions, for a limited polygamy and that too after having taken the sting out of it. (Vide Author's Booklet **"Polygamy."**)

Nobody can deny that in certain circumstances polygamy, with Islamic reservations, becomes a boon for Society and is helpful in raising its moral standard. Polygamy in certain respects becomes a blessing for the woman herself and for the children born of her. Excluding such occasions Prophet Muhammad was the very first Reformer or Prophet who ordered one man to have only one (*wahidatun*) wife. (See IV : 2, 3, 129).

At the close of this section we will say that Reforms are undoubtedly needed in Muslim social practices of our days but after twenty years of close personal study and experience of Europe we would say that *Europe to-day does not offer the best model or example for a decent social life.*

Even the Bolsheviks have failed to produce a model social life as relating to men and women. Muslims have to fall back upon their own model and *should in no case carry an inferiority complex.*

A social system which allows, rather encourages, gambling dens and night clubs and public houses for intoxicant drugs at every corner of a street in any town, nurtures street women, produces hundreds of thousands of illegitimate, helpless, dishonoured children, and makes a show of very scantily dressed, almost nude, human beings in public functions and in almost indecent dances, has no right to claim to be a model.

A Muslim with his Islamic social system in his mind which stops all the above-mentioned evils, together with many others, can surely walk with his head erect and with an air of superiority in the streets of London, New York, Paris or even Leningrad and Moscow.

The New Age needs a model *urgently* indeed but if *full* Islamic rights are restored to Muslim women they will undoubtedly set an example for the best Modern Society and the whole of the Muslim system—chaste, sober, healthy and anti-capitalistic, classless and levelling would indeed be the *best* Model.

We say it deliberately, and say it as a challenge, that there is *not* one social law anywhere which can claim superiority to the corresponding Islamic Law and that no social system can claim equality in beneficence with the Islamic Social system taken as a whole.

We have studied deeply social laws, both old and new. At times we have wavered, but ultimately we have come to the conclusion that we can safely throw out the above challenge and we now throw it out to one and all, *not* excluding the Bolshevist Social Reformers.

(l) *Abolition of Personal Ownership of Property.*

We have kept the discussion of the question of the abolition of *Personal Ownership* of any property for the last because it is not only the most contentious of Bolshevist Reforms but also because it is considered to be most novel and revolutionary so much so that all the Muslim writers, though sympathetic otherwise towards Bolshevism, consider the abolition of private ownership to be un-Islamic. Even learned Muslim Alims have done so.

The abolition of private property is not quite new. It is a historic fact, as has been mentioned before, that centuries upon centuries ago a king named Muzdak in Iran abolished all personal property. Because Muzdak was before the time when the Emancipator of Women was born, woman was also considered to be the private property of man—if unmarried that of her father or guardian, when married that of her husband.

Fortunately this kind of degradation of women and exaggeration of the abolition of private property was never repeated. But efforts were made from time to time to bring into practice the extreme form of Socialism in the colony of "New Harmony" and other places by persons who were called "faddists".

Never before, however, was it given a trial so forcefully and extensively as it is being experimented in Russia since 1917.

As a matter of principle, Islam, over thirteen centuries ago, anticipated this advanced social revolution also. *It abolished personal ownership of property in theory as well as in practice.* But it did this in its own way. The sanction behind all its Reforms and Revolutions was *moral not physical*—not of the Red Army, nor of *Cheka*, nor of O.G.P.U.

In his *Roads to Freedom* Mr. Bertrand Russell has said:—"The ultimate goal of any reformer who aims at liberty can only be reached through persuasion." Bolsheviks are finding how difficult this reform can be even by the use of force.

Every man has a natural love for property. The very idea that such and such a thing is one's own gives special satisfaction to the heart. Bolshevists can become callous to this human instinct. They can use force. Muhammad was a Prophet. He was a Moral Teacher. He could not be callous or violent. For this reason his effort was to get rid of the evil and the wrong and the totally selfish use of property even if under certain circumstances it could not be abolished altogether. **But he basically aimed at the total abolition.** In theory the very root of all personal ownership was cut *by vesting the ownership of everything, big or small, in ALLAH.*

The QURAN repeatedly says:—

Lahoo ma fissamavate va ma fill ardhe,

"To Him belongs all what is in heaven and all what is in the earth." (II: 255). So all what a man possessed or could possess was *owned* by ALLAH.

"Owned by ALLAH" in the vocabulary or ideology of Islam means "owned collectively by the whole of mankind". With this definite investment of all possible property in Allah it seems strange that even those learned writers who have expressed their approval of Bolshevism have said that in the matter of property Bolshevism is as disagreeable to Islam as to other religions and systems.

In the early days of Islam also Abuzar Gaffari was almost alone in his views in respect of *kunz* (wealth and property). And this in spite of the fact that even one who knows the A, B, C of Islam knows that it has laid down as its fundamental law that *everything* belongs to God; that He indeed is the *real owner* of each and everything in this Universe. Those Muslims who are very orthodox will not waste even water in their ablutions because they believe that they will have to give an account of that extravagance on the "Day of Judgment" as the water they use is not theirs. It was only in trust with them for its *proper* uses. One's house or land or clothes are *not* really his or hers. They are God's. The person possessing anything is only holding it in *trust* from God. He must not spend it wrongly. If he does he will be held responsible by One Who sees everything, Who knows everything. Man will have to give an account of everything in his charge for the time being. Everybody knows how very great is the responsibility of a trustee in making use of any trust property. The same care should be taken in using anything in possession of anybody. The best use of everything given in trust is to use it for the person giving it in trust. That is, every property possessed by any person for the time being should be spent, as far as possible, in "the way of Allah," *i.e.*, for the good of humanity—for the public good. Thus Islam has gone ahead of even Bolshevism in abolishing personal ownership or in making all people share in the property. And how beautifully this has been done! Private property is a *trust* and can only be used for the good of the people, in social service.

Well has the Sovereign of Hyderabad said that all he possesses is trust for others except his Faith.

The rule has been laid down:—

"O you who believe do not devour your property among you falsely." (IV: 29.)

The most difficult task before the Prophet was to take out from the minds of his Nation the natural love for property so that every person may really be able *of his own free will* to use the

property which he possessed as if it were a trust property from God Himself given in his custody. So Muslims were warned :—

"Wealth and children are an adornment of the life of this world, and ever abiding works are better with thy Lord in reward and better in expectations." (XVIII: 36)

And they were frankly told :—

"The love and desire of wives and sons and hoarded treasures of gold and silver, and well-bred horses and cattle and title is made to seem fair to men, this is the provision of this world, and God is He with Whom is the good goal of life." (LXIII: 9.)

And again :—

"If your father and your sons, and your brothers, and your mates, and your kinsfolk, and the trade, the dullness of which you fear, and the dwellings which please you, are dearer to you than ALLAH and His Apostle and fighting in His way, then wait till ALLAH brings out his Command, and God does not guide the trangressing people" (IX: 24.)

The result of such peaceful preaching and persuasion was the same which Bolshevism has achieved in Russia only after the use of much force and after having caused much unhappiness and misery.

Among the early Muslims all property and wealth lost its charm—their attachment to private property was gone. Wealth gave neither power nor prestige nor even much comfort, as *all* lived a simple strenuous life. In the Prophet's own life-time there was a group of Muslims in Medina which was absolutely propertyless. The members of the group, called *Ashab Suffa*, used to be engaged in teaching or in some other work. They were the highly *honoured* guests of other Muslims turn by turn who fed them and sheltered them as they had really nothing of their own. Yet the richest and proudest men in the land respected and honoured each one of them.

In Muslim Society wealth, even now-a-days, does not count very much. Professor Vambery told the Author himself that for years and years he had lived in Muslim Lands without a penny in his pocket yet he was honoured and respected and his wants were supplied to him as if he was the richest man in the Country.

Among Muslims the possession or hoarding of wealth and property gave no advantage, no honour, no position, no privilege. On the contrary they were told :—

"Those who spend their property, night and day, secretly and openly, they shall have their reward from their Lord, and they shall have no fear, nor shall they grieve." (II: 174.)

All those who possessed any property were commanded :—

"And give away your property forthe love of Him (*i.e.*, for the public

good without any selfish ends) to the near of kin and the orphan, and the needy, and the wayfarer, and those who have to ask for it, and for the emancipation of captives." (II: 179.)

Such teachings of the Prophet were not in vain. They went to the heart of his disciples who tried to live by his injunctions and advices and to follow them both in letter and in spirit.

His disciple, cousin and son-in-law—Ali, gave away all his property for the benefit of the public, and a few others, half of all they possessed, including one shoe of the pair.

Few indeed were men in those days who would not feel ashamed if they possessed much wealth while their fellow citizens needed it for their necessities of life. Wealth and property increased responsibility and burden.

The QURAN vehemently denounced those "who amass wealth and then lock it up." (XX: 18.) It blessed "those of whose properties a due portion is for him who asketh, for him who is propertyless (*mahroom*)." (LXX: 24 and 25.)

The Prophet saw to it always that he himself and all his nearest and dearest relatives were the first to act upto what he preached. Whatever orders he had to promulgate he informed his family members first.

He himself used to give away in the evening anything he possessed in the day to the extent that there was hardly anything left even for the evening meal.

In Islam there was no question of "Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's." *Nothing* belonged to Caesar. *All, all, all* belonged to God.

The most remarkable point in this connection is that Islam did not only theoretically abolish private and personal ownership but did also put almost exactly the same limit to private property which the Bolshevists have put now and which has raised such a hue and cry in all European countries.

Over thirteen centuries ago the unique Reformer laid it down that:—

"The son of man has no right than that he should have a house wherein he may live, and a piece of cloth whereby he may hide his nakedness, and a chip of bread and some water." (Through Osman in *Tirmizi*).

The rule laid down by the Prophet regarding the distribution of property is as follows:—

"He who has with him an excess of carrying animals let him give it to him who has none, and he who has an excess of provision,

let him give to him who has not." "The Prophet made mention of several other things so that we (who were present) realized that none of us had a right to anything we had in excess." (Through Abu-Said in Muslim and Abu Daud.) What was meant by "excess" has been made clear by the Saying quoted before which limits private or personal property to a house to live in, some clothes to wear, and some thing for daily meals. Thus was ownership of property abolished not only in theory but also in practice. In Islam a lesser scope for individual property was put than what the Bolshevists have. Even the Bolsheviks could not refuse that much to individuals.

Besides limiting the possession of property, Islam has by its miraculously just and judicious laws of inheritance not only made large dukedoms or a line of multi-millionaires impossible, but it has also made a very sound distribution of property among the people of the same family. Another quite novel law of inheritance which is peculiar to Islam is *Wakf alal aulad*. By this means a check can be put on inheritance even by one's children. The children may thus be deprived of the full ownership of the property left for public good or charity by their parents, though enough may be left to them so that they may not find themselves in trouble or in destitution. They can hold it only as trustees for the public benefit and must not waste it in personal luxuries if it is given to them under *Wakf alal aulad*.

Thus check upon check has been devised upon the absolute ownership of any property under Islam.

The question was raised when Abuzar Gaffari interpreted certain QURANIC Verses as indicating the abolition of private wealth and property, and it is being raised by the Ulema to-day also, that if Islam meant the abolition of property, why then did it lay down the laws of inheritance and *zakat*—and other anti-Capitalist regulations and rules ?

The question is not difficult to answer for those who know *the mind* and *the methods* of the Unique Reformer.

His object was to remove all the religious, moral and social evils for all times, and for every place, for every Society at whatever stage of development it might be. He was sent as a *Rahmatul lilalamin* (The Mercy for the Worlds). He meant to be so in actual practice. His desire was to take all the possible good out which was put by Nature in every individual to be used for the benefit of Society at large.

We know that Nature in her scheme of this world when she evolved man put the love for bodily comfort, wealth, property and procreation in him. Thus a comfortable life with wealth and

property became a great incentive for men to work and labour. Nature has also designed the procreation of mankind by putting in both men and women a love for their offsprings. Even among animals we see kindness shown to young ones not only by their parents but even by strangers. In this respect also, however, man's sentiments and emotions are distinct from those of other creatures. With other animals, love and affection for even their own young ones ceases to exist when they grow up, in fact they forget the very existence of their young ones and cannot recognise them after a certain period, man cherishes an affection for his progeny all his life—nay, he desires to make all possible arrangement for their comfort, even when he is not there to see it—when he is dead and gone.

Now, while Bolshevists want to outrage human instincts and natural emotions and do not mind if they kill those incentives for voluntary work by force and violence and substitute in the place of those natural incentives the dread of Society and State, of Cheka and O.G.P.U., the Great Humanitarian Prophet adopted such methods as would not violently kill those natural incentives on the one hand and would protect Society and State from the evils of those instincts on the other.

We must not forget that Islam does not believe that man is evilly inclined by nature and is born in sin. The Evolver, the Creator is free from all evil. Nor did He create evil in mankind. It is man who makes evil for himself by making a wrong use of his power, his qualities and his instincts. Because God chose to give free will to man to a certain extent, He did not impose upon him His own will that he should always walk straight. That means that the Evolver did not deprive man of his capacity to misuse the good gifts of God to him.

The QURAN says:—"Of Allah it is to point out the (right) way, but some turn aside (of their free will) from it. *Had He imposed* His own will he would have surely led you all aright." (XVI: 9.)

And again:—

"To every one of you has God given a law and an open way—and if he had pleased (not to give a free will) He would have surely made you one people. But (He designed) that He might try you in what He has given you respectively. *Strive then to excel each other in good work*, to God is your return altogether, then will He inform you of that concerning which ye disagree." (V: 48.)

Thus free will (of course with limitations and with responsibility) has been given to man to engage in competition with his fellow-men in doing good to others and in Social Services.

Man has not been made an automaton.

Even the Prophet was repeatedly warned that he was not "made a keeper" over anybody. He was to use no compulsion. He was only to *preach* in a gentle, persuasive manner. Man has been asked to use his intelligence. The QURAN says:—

"He has enjoined you with that you may use your intelligence." (VI: 162.)

For his actions he must not seek refuge under the wings of anybody—not even of his parents—and surely not of Rousseau or Lenin.

The QURAN says:—

"And when it is said to them follow what God has revealed, they say: Nay, we follow what we found our ancestors following. What! and though their forefathers had no sense at all, nor did they follow the right way." (II: 170.)

Man has got many passions and emotions in him. If used properly they are for the good, otherwise they injure. Society or sometimes the individual himself. Sometimes even his reason misleads him.

Man wants to fulfil his desires. If he loves wealth he will use all his mental powers and all his physical strength to work for that. He will use all his brains to excel others in any profession he takes up. He will be ready to undergo sacrifices, to take risks. Suppose circumstances do not disfavour him and he succeeds in his work and in his profession. Suppose he becomes an expert in his profession—a producer of wealth by his brains. He asks for due remuneration for his expert advice. He wants to live a happy and comfortable life. Islam will allow him to do that *provided* he does not do any harm to Society. The idea of the Bolsheviks is that they would not allow him to do that though at present they do allow some extra wages to foreign experts. But when they stop this they will not only harm the individual, they will also harm the Society by leaving no incentive for a man to become an expert.

Suppose a man loves wealth. He uses his brains for that. He writes a "best-seller" which is useful to Society. Islam will not rebuke him for getting a good price for his book. But Islam will expect from the author that he will not make a wrong use of the money he has earned by his brains and his pen. Islam will tell him that the real owner of the wealth is God; that the author is only a trustee. Every second of his life adverse circumstances might have intervened which might have made it impossible for him to have succeeded in finishing the work. They did not. Therefore he should be thankful for the protection given to him

and in thanksgiving he should give away his wealth to the deserving. He will have to pay ZAKAT also and will not be allowed to become a Capitalist by anti-capitalist Islamic Laws. He can say to every individual and even to the whole Society that his production is his own. He cannot say this to God who controls all the circumstances and who has given him brains.

Or suppose to a man the natural love of his family and children is the incentive for giving his best to the profession or work before him. Islam will not stop the incentive. It has laid down judicious Laws of inheritance which will allow the man's family and children to profit by the earnings he would leave for them to save them from want or penury and to carry on his name after him.

The best effort of the miraculous and God-inspired Prophet has been *to put only as much check on the liberty of a person as was absolutely necessary for the good of Society and his own person* and to give all inducement to a person for doing his best. For this reason he has not been rigid in his laws. He avoided the necessity of using force as far as possible. He tried to make everybody do good works *voluntarily* by the force of habit or by natural impulse. This is why he has not stopped natural incentives for good work. This is why inheritance in a well-regulated form has been allowed. Nor has it been urged to forcibly sequestrate every property left by any person. The Prophet has contented himself by laying down such rules and laws that the wealth or property which anybody has honestly and legitimately collected or left will ultimately be to the advantage of Society. By the *wakf alal-aulad* even his children can be stopped from misspending a man's hard earned money which he would leave behind. They can be bound down to spend it not according to their personal whims, nor for personal luxury, but for the public good, while at the same time due provision could be made for the continuance of the family name and reputation. The main object, however, has been to lay such laws as would be anti-capitalist, would distribute wealth, would offer equal opportunities to all and would help in forming a classless Society and one Brotherhood all over the world. This main object has not been lost sight of even when individual liberty and discretion have been respected.

Everybody knows that all the world is not even to-day governed under Bolshevist principles. Except in Russia nowhere else in the world is private ownership of property abolished. But Islam is for all lands, and for men in all stages of development and progress. If there were no laws of inheritance or for the distribution of property laid down, Islam would have failed in showing the people the right course under such governments as had not compulsorily or violently abolished, for one reason or other, even

if they were Muslim States, personal or private ownership of all property.

But if all the laws of Islam are obeyed in the letter and spirit the evils of possessing property will be removed. In fact if a man treats his wealth as if it was a trust from God, the possession of private property with full powers to spend it in the way of Allah, will prove a blessing to Society instead of being an evil. If a man really uses any property or wealth as he should use a trust given to him by an All-seeing, All-beneficent God then it would prove more good for Society that he had used his hands and brains or both to possess wealth and property than if he had remained a pauper or had collected only enough to support himself.

Thus all the evil in the personal ownership of property has been removed and under true Islamic laws it would not make much difference to Society whether private ownership was completely abolished in practice or man was allowed to possess property and even leave it to his children under the most just, judicious and equitable laws of Islam (far more just, judicious, and equitable than the Swiss Laws or any other laws).

Here we may say in passing that all sensible jurists have admitted the excellence of the Islamic personal laws so it is not the fault of those laws if they are not properly understood and therefore not properly appreciated by a few persons.

The only point of preference which a representative of Turkey in another Country could point out to the Author for the Swiss law was that it had no law of *mahjubul-irs* and that personally he would have suffered if Muslim Law had not been replaced by Swiss Law in Turkey !

We advised our friend to study the latest interpretations of the law of *mahjubul-irs*, and his complaint would disappear. Islam is self-sufficient.

In fact all statesmen should study the Muslim Laws, particularly of inheritance, very carefully and take the advice of great jurists. One of the greatest modern jurists India produced, Justice Syed Mahmud, said that the best proof that the Quranic Laws were from God was the Islamic Law of Inheritance. Even non-Muslim eminent lawyers like McNaughton write as to their naturalness and excellence thus :—

"In these provisions we find ample attention paid to the interest of all those whom nature places in the first rank of our affections ; and it is difficult to conceive any system containing rules more strictly just and equitable." After such impartial statements what justification can there be for introducing Swiss or any other law anywhere in place of the Islamic Law ?

Those statesmen who fail to appreciate such "natural, just and equitable" laws only demonstrate their own lack of wisdom or their senseless spite and prejudice. The "just and equitable" *natural* Islamic Laws of inheritance were promulgated *to meet the demands of Nature* although as a principle all private and personal ownership had been abolished.

The Bolshevists know that *the greatest charge against Bolshevism is that it allows no liberty to man.* It really establishes a dictatorship—it may be the dictatorship of the proletarian class, *i.e.*, a beneficent dictatorship—but sometimes even despotism is beneficent. *It has been said that Bolshevism really makes a man a slave*—it may be the slave of Society. On every occasion under Bolshevism a man has to obey harsh commands of others—do this and not that. This commanding and domineering Society resolves itself into a few officials or Commissars. For all practical purposes it becomes an oligarchy—even a personal rule of an individual—the Dictator.

Islam avoids all this. For Muslims there is no dictatorship of any man or group of men or class of men. No Muslim is a slave of another man, or group of men or class of men. There *is only one* Dictator—but he is not a man—He is not Anthropomorphic —"Vision comprehends Him not." Man, even the most powerful man, even the greatest Prophet, is a slave, but only of Him who has "Nothing as His likeness"—Who is an Infinite and an Eternal Being, "without form or place, without issue or similitude, present to our secret thoughts, existing by the necessity of His own Nature and deriving from Himself all moral and intellectual powers". (Gibbon and Ghazzali.)

In Islam God alone is qualified to command man—He alone is superior to man لاغالب الا الله. He alone is infallible. The majority of men are not *always* in the right. Sometimes it happens that only *one* man is in the right. Such occasions arose even in the life of Lenin. So why should a man take commands from others which may, after all, be in the wrong ? Why should he not prefer to take commands from Him who is *never* in the wrong. Is there any man who would not bow to Allah rather than to a fellow-being or group of fellow-beings or the majority of the fellow-beings or even all the fellow-beings, when there can be no absolute certainty that they are not all in the wrong ? Is there any man who would not like to retain his freedom of conscience, thought and action rather than become a slave at the command of others ?

Some elasticity was left as regards personal ownership to leave man his liberty and discretion and also his natural incentives for work as far as it was desirable or natural.

We would draw the attention of those who say that if Islam had meant the abolition of private ownership it would not have laid down laws of inheritance in the Quran itself, to the fact that one of the names of God is Al-Waris (*The* Inheritor) and the Quran declares :—

انت خيرالوارثين

Thou art the best of Inheritors. And it asks :—"And what reason have you that you should not spend in Allah's way ? And Allah's is the *inheritance* of heaven and earth." (LVII : 10.)

Thus the Law of Inheritance should not be taken to be in the way of the abolition of personal and private ownership of property. It would be best to leave the Law of Inheritance alone and for every true Muslim to leave his property to the *Khairul-Warisin*," the Best of Inheritors."

The Bolsheviks have now behaved more ruthlessly against all property owners, even against Koolaks. This probably Lenin would not have done. Trotsky quotes Lenin thus :—

"We must not ignore the resolution of the lower rank of the people, even though we are not in agreement with them . . . . We must give full freedom to the creative capacity of the popular masses. The essence of the thing is that the peasantry should have full confidence that there are no more landlords in the country, and let the peasants themselves decide all questions and build their own life."

Here Lenin not only gives freedom to the peasants "to build their own lives" but also admits that there can be "ranks." Trotsky after quoting the above paragraph has put in a query—"Opportunism ?" and has himself answered it :—

"No, it was revolutionary realism."

The Bolshevists will do well to keep "realism" or *naturalism* in view in all matters—in the question of personal property as in others.

Alas ! there is no Lenin now to guide the Bolsheviks.

However, it is a mistake to think that the Bolsheviks have abolished *all* personal or private property. Even when Lenin was alive, the New Economic Policy (N.E.P.) was adopted and it was a concession to private property. The N.E.P. gave freedom to the farmer to sell the remainder of his harvest to whomsoever he liked after having paid, in kind, a fixed graduated tax to the State. Later on, the State permitted private trade, as also the establishment of private industries and private ownership of houses. Thus private property and even Capitalism were recognised to a certain extent.

By private property Bolsheviks mean primarily "the means of production." The Communist manifesto says:—"Communism deprives no man of the power to appropriate the product of Society" meaning that certain forms of private property may legitimately be acquired,—clothes, a home, a garden, a little farm, but only for personal use –not for trade, not for profit.

Bolshevism is the enemy of the middle class property owner.

Says the Communist Manifesto:—"The middle class owner of property must indeed be swept out of the way."

We know that even all inheritance has not been stopped in Russia. Limitations have been fixed, as they were under Islamic law, though on a different scale and in a different way. In Russia, and in several other European countries also, State comes in with "Death Duty" or "Inheritance Tax" on the death of a person.

Briefly, the position of a Muslim in respect of property stands thus:—

If he is a true Muslim and wants to follow the *ideal* set by Islam in spirit and letter and the example of the Prophet and other saintly Muslims, he will possess, not even as a trustee, much personal property.

The limit put upon a person's property by the Prophet is given in the Hadith quoted earlier in this chapter, *i.e.*, a house to live in, some clothes to wear, and sufficient quantity of food and water. This is the limit to which Private Property is allowed—no more.

But if a person's natural love of wealth and property gets the better of him, Islam will not take him to task for it, *provided* he does not go against the spirit of Islam, and uses his wealth and property not for his own comfort and contentment alone but also for the benefit of Society.

The State will charge *Zakat* from him and other taxes. He will be expected to spend his wealth and property for certain given social services.

If a person acts upto the injunctions of the QURAN he will not have much to leave as an inheritance, but if he has, then the law of inheritance will come into operation and will have the property distributed very judiciously to make large dukedoms, usurious capitalists and multi-millionaires impossible. If the man was very charitable and philanthropic he would have left property by *Wakf* to be spent on some charitable work. If he would have rather liked to continue his own family's connection with that *Wakf* he would have left it as *Wakf alal aulad*.

Thus without any forceful encroachment upon personal liberty and without depriving men of their natural urge the same object has been gained by Islam regarding the distribution of wealth and the socialisation of property which the Bolshevists have in view.

It must not be forgotten by the Bolshevist that upto the present moment State ownership of wealth, property or of industries has not given much advantage to Russia. The criterion laid down by Trotsky is:—

"Victory belongs to that system which provides Society with the highest economic plan."

But Mr. Hindus asks:—

"What Russia has to match such giants of economic power and efficiency as the Krupp, the Ford Motor Company, etc.?"

He further says:—

"At present the Russians themselves admit that on the economic side their collectivism can boast of no success which private enterprise is achieving, neither in the province of production nor distribution . . . . In America private enterprise has scored its richest triumphs."

However, for the present, the experiment in Russia is being carried on. It has been truly said that the industrial struggle has begun. If the Bolsheviks win, collectivism will sweep the world and private property, as a source of income, will vanish. If they fail the private property in one form or other will flourish even in Russia.

Our reading of the situation is that the Bolsheviks will themselves adopt the compromise—which Islam presents. The ideal will continue to remain to be the abolition of private ownership but means will be adopted to give scope to personal incentive and to the natural urge of children and family, etc.

It must be noted that while Bolshevists are trying to reduce the family urge and the family circle so as to encourage collectivisation, Islam *extended* "family" circle so as to include in it all creatures and to make all people communistic not only racially or nationally or locally, and not only economically or socially but also internationally by its Universal Brotherhood—its world-wide Pan-Islamism.

Contrary to the levelling down process of the Bolshevists we, as Muslims, would adopt the procedure of *levelling up* and raise the standard of life of the proletariat in respect not only of physical comfort but also of mental happiness, to that of the present-day "middle" or even the "upper class."

It was with this object that Islam did not content itself with the abolition of all private ownership of property as a principle

only by vesting it in Allah, *i.e.*, in all His Creatures, but also adopted measures, in case of practical difficulties and in view of the human nature, as the second best course, for distributing and dividing all property as generally, as voluntarily, as justly and as equitably as was possible.

Herein lies the *superiority* of Pan-Islamism over *all* other systems, including the Bolshevist.

IX.—Miscellaneous Agreements Between Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism.

In the above pages we have given a detailed list of similarities between Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism. But it is not quite exhaustive.

Islam even anticipated the ideology of Bolshevists. Officials were called *amilin* (commissars), see IX: 60 and LXXXIV: 156.

The Prophet was called *Sahabukum* (LIII: 2) "your comrade," and so forth:—

There are at least two very remarkable other agreements also.

One is that both Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism have given greater weight to action than to meditation or verbal arguments or polemic discussions or to logical dissertations or even to Parliamentary Debates.

All talk has been finished, actual work is to be put forth.

Action, action, action has been the watchward of both. All theories, all principles are put to test by action. Arguments alone do not suffice. Actual service to mankind is the keynote of both the philosophy of Islam and Bolshevism. In fact science and scientific methods of experiment have been given the place of philosophy and abtruse logic. Work, work, work is the clarion call of Islam. *Jihad* is the strong feature of Islam. As to Russia Mr. Maurice Hindus says:—

"Everybody in Russia is to be a *obstchestwennik*—a Social worker. Social service is to be the great method, the great goal, the great motive and the long reality and the big inspiration in the every-day task of man."

Islam has also declared:—

Laisalil insan illa ma saa. Nothing for man but striving, or working.

Work and action is the breath of life for man. He was created for it. God says in the Quran:—

"Surely we have created man to struggle with difficulties." XX: 4.

It has also been declared that Righteousness is not to turn your face towards the East or the West in worship.

Then is given a whole list of social work to help men in their difficulties and that is called Righteousness.

Jihad in its technical and literal sense is the characteristic of Islam. To act, strive, work, fight at personal sacrifice is *Jihad*. Death or inactivity is unknown to a *Mujahid*.

The QURAN says :—

"And speak not of those who are slain in Allah's way as "Dead." Nay, they are living, only ye perceive not." II : 154.

Nothing appeals to the Author more than the spirit of action now pervading the whole of Russia. As soon as the military revolution in Russia became an accomplished fact and Lenin and Trotsky arrived on the scene, theorisation and arguments ceased and action began. No wonder that Lenin opposed the institution of a debating society in the name of a Parliament or Duma. He had had enough of debates. He wanted action.

Even those Marxian theories against the practicability of which argument after argument had been advanced were brought into practice.

The same was the case with Islam. Such Socialistic and Communistic reforms which are thought even by recent writers, philosophers and statesmen to be impractical, even unnatural, were made practical by the Prophet and his early Successors. The Sword was the emblem of heroic actions. Risking one's life was the greatest sacrifice. Hence Islam preached *Jihad*. Hence the merciful Prophet allowed the use of the Sword.

As said before *Jihad* is quite a unique institution of Islam. No religion has it. Although Moses was also a King and he very freely and rather ruthlessly used the Sword but even Judaism has nothing like the principle of *Jihad* in it.

Jihad represented the most intense, the most selfless and the most unbending activity of the Muslim Nation in the earliest period of its history. *Jihad* then was the highest Moral duty of every Muslim. It aroused the spirit of action. How we wish that the Muslim Nation took once again to action after its long, long, long sleep and laziness ; Islam's call should again be action, action, action ; work, work, work.

Islam has a conspicuous contrast in this respect with Christianity and even more so with Buddhism. Both Christianity and Buddhism taught passivity. Buddha went to the length of giving up his active life for a life of meditation and asceticism. Buddha's most characteristic picture is when he is in his meditation away from the hustle and bustle of the world. And the most characteristic picture of Christ is helplessly hanging from the cross.

On the contrary the Prophet Muhammad's career began when he came out from his cave of Hira, where he used to spend days and nights in meditation, to the life of action, the life of *Jihad*, in response to the call from High :—"O thou covered up in a blanket, *Arise and be a Warner*," The call began with the word **Qum—arise.**

Since the moment that he heard the call up to the last moment of his life the Prophet lived an active life. And soon the whole Muslim Nation became an example for activity. Though the Nation has degenerated now but upto the present moment it is not difficult to revive that dynamic activity in Muslims if proper methods are adopted.

While Buddha was all for self-annihilation, while Christ was for self-immolation—to be "eunuchs" in the cause of God —the Prophet Muhammad was for activity, for fight, for *Jihad* in the right cause.

As has been said, in Nature itself the most prominent sign of life is movement and action. Upto the time that it began to degenerate and became slack in its adherence to Islam, no Nation on earth was so active as the Muslim Nation. Every individual Muslim also lived an active life from early morning to the time of sleeping—from *fajr* to *esha*.

Even on the continent of Europe where the heat is far from being so intense in summer as it is in Arabia or other parts of Asia and Africa, in this age of hard struggle and competition, people take some rest or *Siesta* in the day time. In cold England too, at one or half-past one in the day is the time for luncheon. But at that very time a Muslim hears a call and has to hasten to the nearest Mosque for the public Prayers which not only give a fresh enjoyment to his spirit or soul but also an exercise to his body.

Let Muslims of our days ponder over the wise words of that grand old *Sahabi* (Comrade) of the Prophet, who saved Islam at *the most* critical moment when the Prophet was dead and a disastrous rupture was threatened, when he said that a Nation which gives up *Jihad* dies. Alas ! the Muslim Nation is almost on its death-bed. The spirit of *Jihad* alone can give her a new vigour, a new life. And the Bolshevists should also remember that paralysis is already creeping up their body, and unless they take up the banner of "World Revolution" and leave off the poisonous company of the "Imperialist bandits," as Lenin called the European Powers, they will be as dead as a stone. It is no use deluding with the idea that Bolshevism is not dying.

In fact it deserves death now. It deserved death the day it joined the League of the "Imperialist Bandits." And it again deserved death, when it remained in that League after the brigandage in Abyssinia. And most of all it deserves death now that it does not resign when the mandate under the League over Palestine is brutally killing a small Nation in its own homeland.

That Pan-Islamism has come into play in four Muslim States and stopped cruel butchery for the moment in Palestine

does not reflect any credit upon Bolshevism which has remained indifferent like others. At least we do not delude ourselves that any permanent settlement is in sight or the British will ever do justice unless they are forced to.

Before our Book is out of the press the commission appointed to go into the Palestine Question has published its report.

As far as British Imperial interests are concerned no better proposals could possibly be set out. But as far as the interests of the two chief parties—the Arabs and the Jews—are concerned they can only be satisfied if both the Arabs and the Jews lose all consciousness to judge between what is good and what is bad for them. The Arabs cannot be satisfied by the permanent gift, even if it be for a monetary price, of their most valuable homeland and harbour to an alien community which has not the remotest right to that land left to her since centuries and centuries past. This gift is also directly against the Balfour Declaration which promised to safeguard the interests of the Arabs and give only a home not a State or Kingdom to the Jews.

To the Jews it must not be satisfactory if they have any foresight as this Jewish State or Kingdom may prove eventually to be only a death-trap for the Jewish community. For the present—it may be ten years or twenty or fifty (but no more) the Deep Sea Port of the Jewish Kingdom may serve the purpose to guard the Imperial interests and Eastern dominions of the British and for this purpose the protection may be offered to the Jews encircled by all the fiery Arabs and their States, but the moment the British power is itself weakened as it is already weakening in the Mediterranean Sea and the Red Sea, etc., the Jews and their puny State will be completely at the mercy of the Arabs whose enmity against the Jews, British diplomacy and selfish tactics are increasing day by day.

From the Pan-Islamic point of view this sinister, thin but sharp, wedge drawn into the body politic of Islam and its most sensitive and sacred place should not be tolerated for a moment. So the advice of a Pan-Islamist is that Islamdom should take the matter up at once in right earnest and Turkey for her own safety and strength and prestige should take the lead.

Because the Bolshevists have given up their international aim of world-revolution they may not consider the question of Palestine of imminent interest to themselves but because the scheme is to strengthen the world-wide Imperialism of a great Power with which they may come into clash any day, they must not be indifferent to the question particularly if they mean to remain a member of the League of Nations and exert some salutary influence therein. If they are wise they must not leave

the company of their Muslim neighbouring States, and must continue to show their sympathy to them as they have done so far even at some sacrifice to help them in protecting their vital interests.

The other matter in which there is a similarity between Islam and Bolshevism is the same in which there is the greatest disagreement between the two. This is paradoxical. But it is a fact all the same that *both are anti-god*. The fundamental formula itself of Islam begins with LA-ILAHA, *there is no god*. No Muslim or any self-respecting man will bow before a god who would stoop down to incarnate himself as a man or woman or as an animal or any created thing; who would have sexual passions and who would beget sons or daughters; who would suffer, who would sleep: who would rest—in short, who would have any limitation, any imperfection, any weakness, any impurity. No Muslim or any self-respecting man would bow to "the gods" of science either. He would not bow to the "mighty atom," or mightier "molecules," or "protons," if they lack life and will-power, *i.e.*, are inferior to man in any respect. He would not worship the "all-pervading energy" either if it lacks intelligence and reason which man possesses.

Nor will a Muslim or any self-respecting man worship the sun or the moon or the fire, etc., whom he should try to harness in his service. "*La-ilaha*" every Muslim will proclaim from the top of the tallest house and from the bottom of his very heart. The *Sufis* in Islam lay greatest stress upon the beginning of the Islamic formula—*La-ilaha*. Every Muslim, they say, must first impress upon his mind that there is *no object* of his worship in the whole of the universe, which has any limitations. He must weigh every individual item in the Universe that he can see or his vision can comprehend and *then reject all and each as unworthy of being worshipped by man*. He must be anti-god first. So in this way a Muslim would *not* hesitate to agree with the Bolsheviks in their anti-god notions. Nay, he would be more iconoclastic, more uncompromising than even the Bolsheviks in this respect. *He would pull down all idols, all gods, all fetishes, all shibboleths. La-ilaha illa Allah* and a million times *La-ilaha illa Allah* would be his cry.

In another way also he will go farther in this matter than the Bolsheviks. He will not submit to any *man-god* either. He will rather go a step further again than the Bolshevists do. He will not accept any group of men or any Society as Dictators or gods. He will not enslave his will, his intellect, his discretion to any individual or even to a group of individuals. The Bolsheviks worship the dead body of Lenin as a god though they do not say

so. The Bolsheviks have made Society or State a god. A Muslim, on the contrary, will refuse to surrender himself like an automaton even to Society. After all Society is made up of individuals and individuals are men and men are *not* infallible. Even Society can be in the wrong.

The Author himself has often stood alone in his views in politics or in other matters.

Who says that Society can never be tyrannical and unjust ? While every Muslim would do his best to be a useful and helpful member of Society even at personal sacrifices, he would *not make himself a slave*, to have no discretion or will of his own.

A Muslim realises his personal responsibility, he values his personal liberty and freedom more than a Bolshevist does in relation to the affairs of the world. He has a greater sense of self-respect ; more courage of his convictions ; a stronger character altogether than a Communist Party-man—who is a bondsman, a slave to his Party to whom he has surrendered even his conscience, his soul—in fact he has stopped believing in soul, he has stopped thinking.

Why a Muslim is not a slave to his fellow-man or groups of fellow-men is because he has surrendered himself to an Ideal Being —far superior to every other person or thing in existence—a Being Who is All-pure, All-good - Who is Infallible, Who is All-seeing, All-hearing, Who is scrupulously just ; Who controls everything ; Who created, developed, and evolved the whole universe —Who is the Master of All but Who has given discretion and will-power to man whom He made His own viceregent—that is, superior to every other thing in creation.

After a Muslim's self-conscious soul and intelligence examines everything or being with a desire to bow to it or him and finds it *wanting* and *unworthy of worship* it dawns upon him then that there could be only one Being to whom if he surrendered himself it would be to his own good and to the good of all his fellow-men, the good of Society—the good of Humanity and then he willingly cries out *Illa Allah* (except ALLAH) after declaring *la-ilaha*, there is no god. The merely negative attitude which a Muslim shared with a Bolshevist of denying the existence of god or gods is changed instantaneously into the positive assertion and the Islamic formula becomes

La-ilaha illa Allah. There is no god but Allah.

At once then his passivity goes, disbelief goes, irresponsibility goes, agnosticism goes, pessimism goes, doubt goes and servility goes. It is this assertive and positive belief and conviction that makes him now cry out *illa Allah* ten million times, all is life—

that makes a Muslim unbending and free and self-respecting and self-conscious in this world before *all*, even the mightiest and the strongest.

Nothing on this earth frightens a Muslim, nothing overawes him—he is a slave to none on this earth, he is as free as the air, *he is the freest man living*, the most fearless man living, the most conscientious man living. His Allah says, Fear Me and nobody else. See XXXIII : 39. And again :—"Fear not, Surely I am with you : I do hear and see." XX : 46. And again :—"So whoever follows My guidance shall have no fear, nor shall he grieve." II : 38.

And because it was the man named Muhammad who, as the final Messenger of God, gave to man the best conception of Allah, demanding worship and worthy of worship, and gave the religion of submission to Him and Him alone, thus teaching him how to be free as air, and showed him the way to happiness and greatness and fearlessness, and also to spiritual elevation and grandeur, that the other part of the Islamic formula has become necessary. And the whole formula is, *Ash-shahaduanna la ilaha illa Allah wa ashahaduanna Muhammadan abdaho va rasulaho.*

I bear witness that there is no god but ALLAH and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

A Muslim is a slave to no human being, not even to Muhammad, although he recognises Muhammad to be the greatest man the world has ever seen—although he respects him as a deliverer from every kind of slavery and sycophancy and superstition and sin. In the formula itself as the unity of God is asserted so the deification of Muhammad is indirectly denied by calling him a servant and messenger.

Although the life of a monk or of a recluse is forbidden to a Muslim and he is allowed to enjoy all the good and beautiful things of the world but he would much prefer to live by himself all alone if he can live *in Society only as a slave.* So even if the Bolsheviks make Russia a regular paradise but forcibly deprive men of their liberty of conscience, of thought, of speech, of writing ; deprive them of all their individual rights and discretion and make them slaves to a Dictator or to a group of Dictators or to a party or to Society, a Muslim, in fact every man who deserves to be called a man, would much prefer to live elsewhere than in Russia.

A true Muslim is very sensitive as to his personal honour. He would stoop to none but to ALLAH, the One and Only God —Self-subsisting—*Almighty*, the Evolver and Sustainer, without a peer—without an associate—He "whom vision comprehends not" and "there is naught as whose likeness." The love of a Muslim

for his God is so ultra intense because he has found Him after a good deal of researches, mental cogitations and reasoning, after having weighed every atom and rejecting *each* and *all* as unworthy of worship. A Muslim cannot worship anything else but Allah. For him there is really *no* god *but* Allah. He can accept the supremacy of none but of Allah.

A Muslim surrenders himself willingly to Allah and has then to submit *to no one* else. He rejects the one thousand and one gods of the Hindus—the three gods of the Christians, the anthropomorphic, and limited and defective gods of other religions—even the one God of the Jews because of His limitations. He also finds unsatisfactory to his intelligence the gods of unthinking scientists (either energy or matter) and his self-respect refuses to bow before the gods of Fascists or Bolshevists—Dictators or State and Society, as gods.

It has been said that Bolshevism is Islam *minus* Allah. The above pages confirm, more or less, this idea. Even in the disbelief in a god (with a small "g") there is similarity between Islam and Bolshevism. Upto the beginning part of the Islamic formula *La-ilàha*, there is a similarity. But a Muslim could never rest contented with a negative belief. His very intelligence would revolt against scepticism or agnosticism. He could never remain a doubter—an agnostic. He claims to have been given reason to come to some positive assertion and it was solely and wholly due to the Prophetic genius of the Final and Ever-Living Guide and Teacher that his reasoning power has been fully satisfied and he has come to that positive, unwavering, definite and confident assertion—*La-ilaha-Illa Allah.*

This confidence, this certainty in the existence of Allah, this belief in His attributes which have been described in detail in the other Part of this Book have made him a *superior man* altogether. He is fully satisfied with his convictions. He knows his position in the economy of the world.

The humblest Muslim, if he is a *true* Muslim, is, or at least should be, a superman—and once upon a time **the whole Muslim Nation was indeed composed of all Supermen.**

Mr. S. W. Koelle, a famous Christian missionary who worked for over a quarter of a century in Muslim lands, had to certify the superiority of the character of Muslims thus:—

"Islam has an undoubted tendency to engender in its votaries an excessive sense of religious superiority."

Many other African Christian Missionaries testify to the fact that the new converts to Islam "acquire personal dignity and self-respect."

Rev. Isaac Taylor says:—

"Islam has done more for civilization than Christianity. I confess I am somewhat suspicious of the accounts of missionaries; but take the statements of English officials, or of lay travellers, such as Burton, Pope Hennessy, Galton, Palgrave, Thompson, or Reade, as to the practical results of Islam. When Mohammadanism is embraced by a negro tribe, paganism, devil-worship, fetishism, cannibalism, human-sacrifice, infanticide, witchcraft, at once disappear. The natives begin to dress, filth is replaced by cleanliness, and they acquire personal dignity and self-respect. Hospitality becomes a religious duty, drunkenness becomes rare, gambling is forbidden, immodest dances and the promiscuous intercourse of the sexes cease, female chastity is regarded as a virtue; industry replaces idleness, licence gives place to law, order and sobriety prevail, blood-feuds, cruelty to animals and to slaves are forbidden. A feeling of humanity, benevolence and brotherhood is inculcated. Polygamy and slavery are regulated and their evils are restrained. Islam, above all, is the most powerful total abstinence Association in the world, whereas the extension of European trade means the extension of drunkenness and vice, and the degradation of the people; while Islam introduces a civilization of no low order, including a knowledge of reading and writing, decent clothing, personal cleanliness, veracity and self-respect. Its restraining and civilizing effects are marvellous. How little have we to show for the vast sums of money and all the precious lives lavished upon Africa! Christian converts are reckoned by thousands, Muslim converts by millions. These are the stern facts we have to face. They are extremely unpleasant facts; it is folly to ignore them." . . . .

"There is nothing in the teaching of Muhammad antagonistic to Christianity. It is midway between Judaism and Christianity. This reformed Judaism swept so swiftly over Africa and Asia because the African and Syrian doctors had substituted metaphysical dogmas for the religion of Christ. They tried to combat licentiousness by celibacy and virginity. Seclusion from the world was the road to holiness, and dirt was the characteristic of monkish sanctity. The people were practically polytheists, worshipping a crowd of martyrs, saints and angels. Islam swept away this mass of corruption and superstition. It was a revolt against empty theological polemics; it was a masculine protest against the exaltation of celibacy as a crown of piety. It brought out the fundamental dogma of religion—the unity and greatness of God. It replaced monkliness by manliness. It gave hope to the slave, brotherhood to mankind, and recognition to the fundamental fact of human nature . . . . The virtues which Islam inculcates

are what the lower (as the higher, M. H. K.) races can be brought to understand—temperance, cleanliness, chastity, justice, fortitude, courage, benevolence, hospitality, veracity, and resignation. They can be taught to cultivate the four cardinal virtues and to adjure the seven deadly sins. The Christian *ideal* of the brotherhood of man is the highest ; but Islam preaches a *practical* brotherhood—the social equality of all Muslims. This is the great bribe which Islam offers"....

"A Christian convert is not regarded as a social equal, but the Muslim brotherhood is a reality. We have overmuch "dearly beloved brethren" in the reading desk, but very little in daily life."

The fact is that Islam is not only a "reformed Judaism" but also a much reformed and improved Christianity. After personal experience Major Glynn Leonard writes :—

"In the East I have come in contact with Muslims of all classes and conditions in life ; and I have found that, irrespective of class and condition, they are willing to live upto the liberal principles of Islam. They are pious, simple, open-hearted and believing. Their religion is surrender of self. Whether Afghans, Baluchis, Hindustanis, Somalis, Turks, Berbers or Egyptians, Musalmans are inspired with the same common feeling of idealism, and bound by the same tie of fraternity and good fellowship. In peace or war, at home or in the battle-field, as friends or as enemies, they are ready everywhere to give proof of their moral and spiritual courage. They are brave beyond comparison, fearless of death and unshakable in their belief in God and their devotion to the Holy Prophet. Their learning, piety and loyalty have filled my soul with wonder and admiration. They are fit for Islam and Islam is the fit religion for them. It is undisputable that the power of Islam can raise even ordinary men to lofty heights of idealism."

Islam indeed creates in every Muslim a death-defying, fearless spirit, and an unshakable moral as well as physical strength due to complete trust in Allah.

Not long ago a tragic demonstration of this was made at Jeddah.

A cable from Jeddah, dated May 24, reported that the steamer *Asia* with fifteen hundred pilgrims was lying at anchor in the outer harbour at 8 p.m. in May, 1930, when a fire broke out on board and spread very rapidly.

"The whole vessel this morning," added the cable, "was still a raging furnace. One hundred and twelve pilgrims are missing. It is feared that they have perished."

"Fine bravery was displayed by the officers and crew of the *Asia* and native boatmen in rescuing the pilgrims struggling in the water. They even climbed on board the inferno and took off pilgrims, many of whom were kneeling at prayers amid flames."

Another cable graphically described the dreadful scene thus ;

"Survivors of this disaster, in which it is now feared two hundred have perished, relate that the heat was so terrific that the skulls of many victims lying on the blazing decks burst like pistol-shots and brains seethed out like boiling lead." The cable ended with the information that "many of the pilgrims, even under these terrible conditions, refused to try to escape and remained praying with their faces turned to Mecca."

We venture to ask, would it be impossible under good organisers and leaders to conquer the world, morally, mentally and even territorially with such a death-defying Nation ?

Will the present-day Russian, German, and Japanese Nations please reply after giving a good thought to the question ? *And will* the great *Ghazi* Mustafa Kemal Pasha (*not* the narrow-visioned Ataturk) please reply ?

And how was such a glorious character, full of confidence, fortitude, perseverance, heroism, and an all-conquering spirit formed ? *Only* through the same belief in Allah and unwavering faith in His Attributes as given in the QURAN. The same faith developed also the conscience of individuals from childhood and enabled them to distinguish intuitively between right and wrong.

To lay down the criterion of Faith the Prophet said :—

"When thy good work gives thee pleasure and thy evil work grieves thee, thou art a man of Faith."

And when he was asked "what is sin ?" he replied. "When anything smites thee within thyself, forsake it." (Abu Amamah.)

Thus it was that every Muslim developed a noble as well as a heroic character with a sensitive conscience and a remarkable courage of his convictions due to his abiding trust in Allah.

Now we ask the Bolsheviks, that even if they cannot prove definitely and scientifically the existence of God with all His Attributes (we ourselves are sure that it can be done), will it not even then be good and beneficial, nay, essential in the interests of Society to teach their young men to have faith in a God (Allah) when a belief in Him would help them in this World and would mould and develop their character to such an extent as to make the whole Society, the whole Nation, the whole Community triumphant even unto death as was the case with the Muslim Nation which brought the whole world under its command in early days

and showed its heroism even in these days on board the ship, the *Asia*, when that Faith and Trust in Allah is not as implicit, as strong as it was before.

If the Bolsheviks are real well-wishers of Society, if they genuinely seek to form a grand, noble Community and a grand, virile Nation, then they must teach their youth to have as intense a belief in Allah as the young Muslims had in early days so that each unit of the Community should become worthy of the most highly Communistic World-State and of the most Socialistic Universal Brotherhood imbued both with courage and nobleness.

This means that the one chief difference between Bolshevism and Pan-Islamism must disappear and that it should no more be said that Bolshevism is Islam minus Allah. There should be nothing minus if there cannot be anything plus. This, at least, is our desire.

Even if the Bolshevists are not yet ready to teach their young men at the stage when their characters are being formed, to believe in Allah, they have no excuse whatever *not* to exempt Allah from their anti-god and Islam from their anti-religious movements.

They must realize that if they include Islam in their anti-god and anti-religious war against all Faiths and Beliefs, they may commit a sin or not but they will surely commit a grave and an unpardonable crime against Society, against State, against World harmony and Progress.

And at least we do not understand, even with the best effort, in what way they expect to gain anything by any childish obstinacy in sticking to their anti-god movement.

Suppose for a minute that Allah does not really exist and that it was only the wonderful brain of Muhammad which conceived the idea of Allah, as Euclid conceived the idea of "point," even then what an atheist, if he has any control over any State or Society, must consider is whether it will do any harm if the "theor" of Muhammad—undoubtedly a great man as he was, is put before the young men and if it is taught to them as an axiom—a "self-evident truth," in order to elucidate and solve many philosophic and even scientific points and problems not only relating to this universe as to its how and why and its working but also relating to man himself, as the definition of "point" is taught to all students of Euclid ? If there is no actual harm found, and it is a fact that no harm can come to anybody if a belief in Allah is taught to him, then why should it be considered criminal to teach it,

But if it is found that a belief in Allah *does immense good* to every man and woman mostly at the formative stage of his or her character when the intellect and the conscience are not so developed as to enable him or her to find out the right course to be useful and beneficent to Society and to create in him or her without the fear of Society or of any watchdog of Society, a moral instinct and to put before him or her a standard, to conduct always, in open and in secret, in a way as to be a benevolent and useful citizen of a civilised State and a Communistic Society, then it will indeed be criminal *not* to teach young men and young women of any State, any Society to believe in Allah.

We have no doubt that every Bolshevist who reads those sections in Part II which prove how highly *rational* the Quranic conception of God is, will himself give up at least his scepticism. We agree with the great Scientist Huxley that it may be difficult to give a scientific proof of the existence of God but it is impossible to prove that no God exists, meaning that no educated, reasonable man can be a positive atheist. But if he is so dull-headed that he does not give up his scepticism even then he will have to bow low before the man whose brain had conceived such a God-idea as to be most highly beneficent to Society and to the State and because that man himself refused to take the credit of being the creator of that idea and attributed it to Allah there will be no choice left for the worshipper of Muhammad to become the worshipper of the Creator of Muhammad before Whom Muhammad himself bowed with highest reverence and profound humility.

There are very few books, if any, and certainly there are *no* religious books, not even those which claim to have come from God, in which such cogent reasons and so many effective arguments have been given to prove the existence of God as they are in the Quran. But Muhammad (may he always triumph) did not depend upon verbal arguments alone to prove the existence of God. The number of such men whose intellect has developed so much as to use reasoning and logic is after all not very large. There have been followers of the Prophet who have themselves "seen" God through their spiritual eyes and have even "shown" Him to others. But their number was smaller still. They were called "*khuda numa.*" The miracle of Muhammad in this respect is that he made it possible for every man or woman whether intellectual or not, whether spiritual or not, to get convinced of the existence of God, by himself becoming a visible, material, human sign or manifestation (*mazhar*) of God. A solitary man, with *innama ana basharum mislakum* (I am only a man like you) on his lips but with the most intense belief in God whom every little and big thing in nature—a drop of rain, a growing

blade of grass, the sun and the moon, the thunder and lightning, even a bee making honey and all the different hues and colours confirmed in his belief in God and who was firmly and unshakably convinced of His help—triumphed over all in spite of a world of opposition. He succeeded in establishing the Faith of his God on this earth and continues to be triumphant upto this moment.

To his people ten thousand arguments could not be as convincing of the existence of God as did the one personality of Muhammad himself—living with them and talking to them like any other man.

He miraculously infused in his close Companions—and their number increased from day to day—the same belief in God, the same conviction as to the existence of God, and made them also triumphant. Then he formed a Nation and inspired it with the same conviction of the existence of God and made that also triumphant. To the people of his own times Muhammad's personality became a manifestation of God to such an extent that although he himself had repeatedly warned them that he was only a mortal and would die, when he did die, the sanest of his followers lost the balance of his mind and with sword in hand said that he would cut off the head of him who would say that Muhammad was dead. It was then that another dear Associate and Companion, older in age, read a verse from the QURAN that Muhammad will die and said these memorable words :—

"Ye people ! if ye worshipped Muhammad know that he is dead but if ye worshipped God then know that He lives and will never die."

That sobered Omar and others who were inclined to take the sign for the Original at that moment when the shock of the death of the Prophet whom they loved and revered next only to God had upset them.

But really Muhammad did not die. He lives. No human being on this earth, not even those who are believed to be the incarnations or sons of God born of virgin mothers, had all their works and actions recorded, the minutest details of their lives known or who are loved and respected with half of that sincerity and devotion as is Muhammad or who are followed as devotedly as is Muhammad. Any insulting word to the memory of that immortal man makes Muslims mad, (the Author himself feels highly irritated). There have been cases that such a wretch who insulted the name of the Prophet was killed by a Muslim although he knew that he would himself be executed.

To every Muslim Muhammad's personality even after a lapse of 1356 years is as much a sign or a manifestation of God as it was

to his own contemporaries. So a Muslim does not need upto this day any arguments to convince him of the existence of Allah. Through Muhammad's personality the existence of God has become a self-evident Truth to every Muslim educated or uneducated. He is as sure of His existence as that of his own soul's.

The Author frankly admits that in his own mind he himself has not had often to enter into any metaphysical or philosophical discussions or arguments as to the existence or non-existence of God. It is mostly through Muhammad that the Author has become convinced of the God of Muhammad and cries from the bottom of his heart and his soul—*Allah-o-Akbar*.

If he succeeds in creating the same mentality in the leaders of the Bolshevik movement who also do not care for polemic discussions or dissertations, he will be satisfied because that will remove the one main difference, which is very distasteful to the Author, between Bolshevism and Pan-Islamism.

The Author ardently desires that Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism should be completely united to jointly take up the task of uplifting mankind.

Bolshevists are trying to solve the political, social and economic problems of the day. They grasped the evils of the current system and now they are trying to solve them in their own way which is considered by all to be quite revolutionary in every respect. Similar was the case over thirteen hundred and fifty years ago when Islam took upon itself the task of reforming not only the political, social and economic conditions as Bolshevism has taken up, but together with these also the moral conditions and the spiritual conceptions of the period in a way unparalleled in history upto the present date. The most miraculous fact in the Islamic reforms was that those reforms had a permanent value. Thinkers like Gibbon, Goethe, Carlyle, Rousseau, Renan, Anatole France, Guizot, Haeckel, Draper, Leone Caetani and a host of others have marvelled at the modernity of the reforming genius of the Hero-Prophet. Even in our own age, besides others, one of the greatest thinkers of the time, Mr. Bernard Shaw, before whom Bolsheviks themselves would willingly raise up their hats, has expressed his greatest admiration of the modernity of the Prophet in a written statement which is worth quoting in full. He writes :—

"I have always held the religion of Muhammad in high estimation because of its wonderful vitality. It is the only religion which appears to me to possess that assimilating capability to the changing phase of existence which can make itself appeal to every age. The world must doubtless attach high value to the predictions of great men like me. I have propheried about the faith of Muhammad that it would be acceptable to the Europe of

today. The Mediæval ecclesiastics, either through ignorance or bigotry, painted Muhammadanism in the darkest colours. They were in fact trained both to hate the man Muhammad and his religion. To them Muhammad was Anti-Christ. I have studied him—*the wonderful man*, and in my opinion far from being an Anti-Christ he must be called the *Saviour of Humanity*. I believe *that if a man like him were to assume the dictatorship of the modern world he would succeed in solving its problems in a way that would bring it the much-needed peace and happiness*. But to proceed, it was in the 18th century that honest thinkers like Carlyle, Goethe, and Gibbon perceived intrinsic worth in the religion of Muhammad, and thus there was some change for the better in the European attitude towards Islam. But the Europe of the present century is far advanced. It is beginning to be enamoured of the creed of Muhammad. In the next century it may go still further in recognising the utility of that creed in solving its problems, and it is in this sense that you must understand my prediction. Already even at the present time many of my own people and of Europe as well have gone over to the faith of Muhammad, and the Islamisation of Europe, to use the expression of your own query, may be said to have begun."

Muhammad being the Final Prophet and the Qurán the Last Testament Islam is said to produce *mujaddids* (Renovators) after every century and the *last mujaddid* is expected to be the *Mehdi akhiruzzaman*.

There are people who think that the Muslim Nation needs only a spiritual *Mujaddid* or *Mehdi*. *They are utterly wrong*. Not the Muslim Nation alone but the whole world needs a "*man like Muhammad*" as Mr. Bernard Shaw says. Muhammad was not a spiritual Reformer only. He was a Religious Reformer as well as a Political and Social Reformer. For the world an all-conquering *Mehdi* is wanted who would solve the Political, Social and Economic problems which have upset the World, at the same time that he would save man by his spiritual powers from becoming an animal or a Robot which the present-day Reformers, by their lack of spiritualism and by the progress in science, are making him.

A Mehdi who would be a real *Mujaddid*, that means a man who would spiritualise even wars as Muhammad did, is needed to bring "Peace and happiness to mankind."

It seems that in the case of *tajdid* (renovation) also Providence will, for the time being, keep in view the tendency of the age and what one man used to do before as *Mujaddid* will now be done collectively.

This will probably start in Cairo.

To the religious-minded Muslims, Cairo had for centuries past its own significance with its oldest University—*Al-Azhar*.

On the Author's visit to Cairo in 1934, the late Allama Rashid Radha, who was an old friend of the Author, gave him not only a sumptuous luncheon, but also an intellectual and spiritual treat by bringing him in contact with men of genius like Shaikh Muhammad Mustafa Al-Maraghi, the *ex-Kazi-ul-Kuzzat* of Sudan and now the Rector of *Al-Azhar*.

For some time past *Al-Azhar* has herself been undergoing renovation and now with the Shaikh Al-Maraghi at the head, the work of *tajdid* has begun in right earnest. It is also intended to send Missions to Japan and other countries. To establish a closer link between Egypt and India an Association has been recently formed in Cairo.

The Author has been so convinced that if India and Egypt join hands they can "move mountains," that he, together with his late lamented friend and co-worker Abdullah Suhrawardy, whom the Author had induced to be ready to go to Japan for the cause of Islam, tried to form a link when the youthful Leader Mustafa Kamil arose with his budding spirits, alas ! to be nipped much too prematurely by the cruel hands of death.

Because of its central position, a free, strong and Pan-Islamist Egypt, with a lover of Islam at its head as its present promising young King is said to be, could not only be a tower of strength to Islam as a religion but also a bulwark against the old Imperialists as of the new who dream of reviving the enslaving Imperial Mission of Rome.

But Egypt *must not* delude herself that she can realize that position by her present Anglo-Egyptian Treaty. She needs a good Army, a good Navy and a good Air-fleet to be completely independent. Moreover, she will have to produce a Hero like the world-renowned Salahuddin. And she must know that she cannot be free or safe if her neighbour is the spring-board of a greedy, Imperialist Power.

In this Part of our Book we have shown by giving the similarities between Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism in detail, how far Lenin worked as a Political and Social Renovator. Unfortunately Lenin did not live long enough after the Bolshevist Revolution to have completed the experiment of Social and Political Revolution he had taken up. After him there were quarrels among the Bolshevik Leaders themselves.

Trotsky, the closest companion of Lenin, whom many think to be greater even than Lenin, has been hounded out of Russia and has, upto this day, to hide himself elsewhere for his very life.

Another colleague of Lenin whom Lenin declared in his testament to be one of the six most capable men in the Party, and fifteen hundred "secondary chieftains," besides a number of ex-Commissars and several thousand minor officials and members of the Communist Party have been either exiled or gaoled since the death of Lenin. Many have even been killed under the Russian Government's own orders.

Mr. D. Levine says in his *Stalin* :—"They who had forged the ring of iron called the dictatorship of the proletariat found themselves entrapped, isolated, ill-treated by the officers of the Government they had established and bitterly derided by their cell mates and fellow-exiles."

As to the condition of affairs under the present-day régime an old colleague of Lenin—Dmitrievsky writes :—

"If Stalin's régime of economic and political terror is for the happiness of humanity, I do not want that happiness. I am suffocating in the atmosphere he has created."

The Author of *A Visit to Russia*,—"Leningrad in 1934," confirms by his own personal experience what Paul Marions said as to there being "*Two Russias*." He says that he with his party was taken to Leningrad "in luxurious Lincoln State Cars and at the Palace Hotel their sumptuous dinner was ready for them. At the entrance they were received by gilded door-keepers like those at Claridges in Paris. An orchestra was playing at the balcony and the dining room was decorated with flowers." But Mr. Maurice Constantine, Mayor of the same party, writes :—

"I thought of the crowd lined up in the streets of Leningrad before the houses of the Co-operatives, anxiously awaiting their pound of potatoes and twenty-four grammes of bread, their daily ration—where it could be furnished by the Co-operatives if one had a Worker's permit which every one did not possess."

The party noticed the slow-moving, hungry, melancholy, dissatisfied crowds. This they saw everywhere in Leningrad when they walked through the streets lined with "broken windows" and one of the party remarked, "I am beginning to understand this Communism. Twenty thousand eat as we are doing and one hundred and fifty million stuff bricks." Another traveller who was not favoured by the attendance of the Government officials says :—

"The black bread was rancid and I doubt whether dogs could relish it although it was served in a Palatial Hotel at Leningrad."

The hopes (or are they delusions ?) of Young Bolsheviks are that "the different scales of wages as well as all class distinction

will disappear—no doubt in fifteen, thirty or fifty years—none can say when, but we must have it one day. There will be no cash exchange, none will be paid in cash, every one must work, must give the Community what he can, neither more nor less."

But other more experienced Communists fear, as does Laski in his "Communism," that "the poison of power is notorious, and it is difficult to see why Communists should be held immune from its toxins." "It is indeed," he adds, "so much the most powerful of the factors by which men in politics are moved that there is no theoretical reason why those who make the Communist revolution or their successors, should abdicate from the pleasant task of exercising authority over their fellows."

Herr Joseph Goebbels in his speech at Nurenberg on 10th September, 1936, at the eighth National Socialist Party Congress said :—

"Bolshevism is the dictatorship of the inferior. It seized power by means of falsehood, it maintains power by force."

"The poison of the Bolshevist theory may be alluring and enticing, but Bolshevism in practice is terrible and horror-striking. Its way is marked by mountains of skeletons. An ocean of blood and tears flood that unhappy tract. Human life has lost all value. Terrorism, murder, beastiality—these are the traits that characterise every Bolshevist revolution whether it be successful, as in Russia, or fail and be suppressed, as in Hungary, Bavaria, the Ruhr district and Berlin, or still fighting for power as is the case in Spain to-day."

But such prejudiced and bigoted views as that of Goebbels cannot be taken seriously. The trend of Bolshevism in Russia is that it will soon allow itself to be "Islamised"—that is, it will adopt a spiritual and moral outlook together with its political and economic one. It will soon realise that economic development alone will not solve the problems confronting human Society to-day. It was a great Prophet who said that man cannot live by bread alone. Nor can he live by money alone. While he will not die if he has nothing else but bread with him, he will surely die if he has to live on money alone. Man is so framed that he cannot live in Society, even by his brain powers or reasoning faculty alone. Love and the noble sentiments of fellowship and mutual good-will and also spiritual and moral qualities must be brought into play for the good and prosperity of the human Society.

In Russia the antagonism against religions is getting less in virulence as the following news published on 11th March, 1937, from Muscow indicates :—

"The end of the anti-God movements is statistically foreshadowed in an official statement. The membership of the

Bezbojinks or the militant Godless League has fallen from 5,000,000 in 1933 to below 2,000,000. Many anti-religious organisations are threatened with disintegration. The Commissariat of Education has closed five anti-religious Muslim institutions in the Provinces and the Komsomal has abandoned its anti-religious efforts in many parts.

Encouraged by freedom of worship guaranteed under the New Constitution, the Church is beginning a new drive."

However, Bolshevism being in an experimental revolutionary stage many excesses of the Bolshevists even if not exaggerated, can be excused. Which Government in the world is free from excesses ? The least of all is the Government in India. When there is no fear of a Mightier Power the stronger a government becomes the more irresponsible, autocratic and tyrannical it becomes.

We have tried to show that Lenin worked as a political and Social Renovator on lines laid down by Islam. Because he had a very limited knowledge of Islam he had to use his own genius to guide him. Great credit is due to him that he reached so near to Pan-Islamism. As we have said before if Lenin had lived long enough to know more of Islam he would have worked more closely on the Islamic model and then most probably Bolshevism would not have remained devoid of all moral and spiritual principles and the need of the second Part of this Book would have disappeared. Probably the work of the expected MEHDI (Guide) would also have been accomplished.

Now alas ! as the need of the second Part of this Book remains so does the need of the MEHDI--"a man *like* Muhammad" who will solve all the problems facing the modern world to secure the "*much needed peace and happiness.*"

We do not want to conceal the fact that we do not relish much having had to write Part II. As we have shown categorically in Part I the similarity between Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism is *almost complete*. The only difference, which we think has needlessly been introduced in Bolshevism, is the anti-God and anti-religious policy the Communist Party has adopted in Russia. We call it "needless" because even with the greatest stretch of imagination a negation of the existence of God cannot be said to be essential for Socialistic or Political or Economic Reforms. On the contrary, as we will show in Part II, the QURANIC Conception of God is immensely *helpful* in Political and Social Reforms. But even if it were not so, as it is not so in the case of other religions, it was stupid to make a disbelief in God to be necessary for Bolshevism. It has done no good at all to the Bolshevist cause. It has actually done colossal harm to that cause.

This one disagreement between Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism has made a great difference in the angle of vision of the two

movements which are otherwise similar in almost all their essentials. This one difference with Islam has become very great, because the whole Constitution and Structure of Islam is based upon its God-idea. Take away its God-idea from Islam and its whole fabric will tumble down like a house of cards. It is for this reason that Islam can make no compromise with *shirk*. *Shirk* is anti-Islamic, It is destructive of all that culture and civilization and political and social system which Islam has built up upon the Unity of Allah.

For example if there is more than one Creator and Cherisher how can flourish the communistic organism founded upon the belief that all mankind is the family of One God and for that reason the relations of one man with another of whatever race or country he may be, should be like that of two brothers—sons of *one* father—how can the Universal Brotherhood be established ?

Thus *shirk* will for sure demolish the Grand Socialistic and Communistic Palace which Islam has raised and which is unexampled for its firmness, beauty and elegance.

Is it not the duty of every Muslim, nay of every human being, to protect that marvellous edifice and destroy the would-be destroyer—the great vandal ?

The well-known Scholar Johnson has rightly said :—

"The natural revelations of Muhammad's vast conception of the personality of God is the only explanation of that amazing soberness and self-command with which he entertained his all-absorbing visions." And then he continues, "it could not have been an accident that the one supreme force of the epoch issued from the solitude of that vast peninsula round which the tides of Empires rose and fell. Every exclusive prophetic claim in the name of a Sovereign will have been a cry from the illimitable vastness of the desert. The symbolic meaning given to Arabia by the withdrawal of the Christian apostle to commune with a Power above flesh and blood, became more than a symbol in Muhammad. Arabia was itself the man of the hour, the Prophet of Islam its concentrated world. To the child of her exalted tradition, driven by secret compulsion out into the lonely places of the starry night, his mouth in the dust, the desert spoke without reserve."

We hope that after *a correct* knowledge of the religion of Islam and of the correct Conception of God which Part II will convey, the Communist Party will allow 600,000,000 people spread all over the world to make a common cause with it for the betterment of the world.

If Bolshevism and Pan-Islamism combined together the world indeed would be revolutionised, Islam would supply what is

lacking in European civilization—and Bolshevism is also, after all, based on European materialism.

It is a European—a conservative, patriotic, aristocratic Englishman—who writes:—

"The idealism of Europe never became a living factor in her life and the result is a perverted ego seeking itself through mutually intolerant democracies whose sole function is to exploit the poor in the interest of the rich. Believe me, Europe to-day is the greatest hindrance in the way of man's ethical advancement. It has devastated the peace of the world and deteriorated its ethical mentality for its own interests. It has become, at the present day, the cancer of Human Society. The Muslim, on the other hand, is in possession of those ultimate ideas on the basis of revelation, which, speaking from the inmost depths of life, internalises its own apparent externality. With the Muslim, the spiritual basis of life is a matter of conviction for which even the least enlightened man can readily lay down his life, and in view of the basic idea of Islam there can be no further revelation bearing on Mankind. We ought to be the most emancipated people on earth, and it should be our duty to summon others to join our Holy Religion which was made "perfect" by the Almighty, the Great Allah, the only Creator of all things visible and invisible . . . .

"To a true Muslim, Islam is his all. His very life depends upon its teachings, with him no progress is possible without religion. Islam stands for progress and civilization. Plain living and high thinking is the motto of every Muslim. Islam, as we have seen, wants us to live with Divine morals. It wants us to subjugate everything in the Universe and to use it to our benefit. If this kind of living is not elevating the soul and body to nobler and purer morals, then I have not understood the meaning of the word "Civilization" as found in Islam alone."

What Prof. Gibb says should carry weight with his fellow Europeans therefore we quote these words from him.

"Islamic Society alone can restore the balance of Western Civilization upset by the one-sided nature of European technical peoples and to save it from the exaggerated development of European nationalism . . . . No other Society has such a record of success in uniting in an equality of status, of opportunity and of endeavour so many and so various races of mankind."

Whatever may have been said against Bolshevism the fact remains that Bolshevism has drawn the attention of the world to the poor. It has smashed up the snobbery of Europe. It has exposed its cruel Capitalism and its high-handed and selfish Imperialism. Even Herr Hitler talks of "Constructive Social services"

and of "National Socialism". Thanks to Bolshevism everywhere in this world Socialism is being talked about to ameliorate the conditions of the proletariat. And we have no doubt that if Bolshevism gives a moral and spiritual tone to its Reforms and Schemes of Socialisation it will become a real blessing for mankind and if it obtains the co-operation of a well-organised Pan-Islamism, no power on earth will be able to destroy it. Soon it will become a world force by the support of the mightiest "potent force of the Future" as it was for centuries in the Past—ISLAM.

Bolshevists, as followers of Karl Marx, denounce all religions as harmful to human Society. The news has come recently that the greatest enemies of Bolshevism—the Nazis, do almost the same. A number of Priests headed by Oeynhausen and Pastor Mueller of Dahlem have made a protest against the irreligiousness of Nazi-ism and have called it anti-Christ. They allege that Nazis like Dr. Ley and Alfred Rosenberg hold that Nazi-ism was incompatible with Christianity.

Bolshevists or Nazis may form any opinion they like of other religions excepting Islam and we shall be unable to defend those.

To a large extent History lends its support to their criticism. Who can defend a religious creed which has been responsible for, as Ernst Haeckel says, "more than ten million victims of fanatical religious hatred during the golden age of Papal domination." And who can defend the barbarous "Inquisition," in the name of Christianity, in Spain, or of the general massacre of Muslim monotheists whenever Christians were victorious in the Crusades. Unfortunately this is not the only crime against Humanity with which Christianity can be charged. In justifiable wrath Haeckel cries out:—"It was the despotism of the Papacy that lent its darkest character to the Middle Ages; it meant death to all freedom of mental life, decay to all science, corruption to all morality."

But the records of History itself prove that all the charges put against religion have already been demolished as far as the religion of Islam was concerned.

All will acknowledge that the Prophet Muhammad was the most religious-minded man known to Humanity. In even the most mundane and worldly occupations of life he was religious. The Prophet lived his religion, and it was through his religion that he achieved not only his own spiritual satisfaction and soul-rest but also that of millions upon millions of people all over the world in every age, country and clime for the last 1356 years.

Through that religion he banished within ten years from the whole of the Arab Nation, its hard-heartedness, cruelty, jealousy,

the spirit of revenge, anarchy, lawlessness, female degradation, drunkenness, infanticide, superstitious beliefs and human sacrifices.

Through that religion he endowed the whole Nation with all the saintly virtues on the one hand and all the qualities of a united, religious, healthy, progressive, vigorous body full of the all-conquering energy, on the other.

Through that religion he burnished also the mental powers of his Nation so that in no time it engaged itself in scientific researches and inventions and in the conquest of Nature.

The Prophet has shown it indeed without any shadow of doubt that religion is the most effective and powerful sanction to set a high moral and spiritual standard for the Human Society; to guide it to a very elevated position in the world, to give it even territorial conquests; to guarantee its mental progress, to save it from anarchy and irresponsibility. Spiritual sanctions triumph when the laws of ethics and even the agents of the State miserably fail. Their arms are not long enough to reach the innermost cavities and recesses of man's heart. Economic Reforms may bring riches to the people but cannot guarantee their happiness. The wealthiest men in the world are *not* the happiest.

The Bolshevists will find that if the religion of Islam creates some differences between Islam and Bolshevism as will be shown in Part II, all the similarities which have been enumerated in this Part are also due to the same religion—Islam, the religion of the Universal International Brotherhood.

So the Bolshevists must make an exception in favour of the religion of Islam.

In *Islam and Socialism* we not only foresaw the coming of Bolshevism which we called "the Social world-storm," but also tried to forewarn those who would work Bolshevism of the dangers that would be ahead. We said:—

There can be no improvement in Society except by looking after individual conduct and behaviour.

And we said:—

A combination of selfish individuals only increases the degree and strength of selfishness and extends its scope.

After describing the conditions of Society we said:—

In this age, under these circumstances, it will be impossible to form a Socialistic State of general beneficence and individual good as was that formed by Omar during his time *unless* the entire fabric of Society is refined, and the ideals of civilization and ethics —political, social and moral, industrial and economic, are *all*

improved and, *unless* the finer sentiments of individuals are at least as much developed as their materialistic tendencies.

We made it clear that in this age even a transference of control from a few to many, from the rich to the poor, would not benefit Society or the State as it would only mean "the transfer of power and wealth from one class to another (*i.e.*, from the bourgeoisie to the proletariat)—the oppressors of yesterday becoming the oppressed of to-day."

We clearly warned that the result of trying to introduce reforms and to change the mentality of the world by purely militant revolution, by pulling down the palaces of the one class, by robbing another of its Capital and money, by violently depriving a third of the due reward of talents and genius, has been and will always be discontent, bloodshed and anarchy.

Then we told the Social and Political Reformers:—

"The ideal Socialist State should be an enlarged happy family, in which every individual is not only interested in the welfare of the whole family, but is also ready to enhance the honour and the position of the family at his own personal inconvenience and sacrifices."

"Socialism preceding social reforms," we added, "would be an anachronism of the most dangerous character and those who encourage it must be considered as simpletons not knowing the mischief they advocate or as worst enemies of their Society, State, and Country."

To the credit of the Bolshevists it should be said that they have kept the above-mentioned points in view to a large extent and they did enter into intense social reforms at the same time that they formed a Socialistic State. Through collective farming they have even tried to enlarge the family circle in their own way. Only they have ignored the fact that the family circle could not really and usefully be enlarged at the point of the bayonet. It could only be enlarged through *love*. And at the very best collective farming can after all have a very, very limited scope than what Islam kept in view. As far as the system of collective farming goes there will be nothing to create even inter-kolhoz relationship. One Collective Farm or Kolhoz may remain quite a stranger to the other Kolhoz. So the real communistic spirit cannot pervade even in one Country.

But Islamic Socialism and Communism transgressed the boundaries of kingdoms and countries, empires and continents annihilating all the prejudices of colour and class, race and sentiments, language and customs. Islam aimed to make the whole human race one family and Nation, under one Allah.

Wherever a Musalman happened to be he was yet a unit that formed the Nation. He carried his nationality, which was Islam, with him wherever he went and carried his love of his Nation also with him. In the very early rise of Islam somebody was asked what was his race?—he said Islam, what was his nation? he said Islam, what was his country?—he said Islam, who was his father?—he said Islam. Thus did Islam form the basis of a world-wide Communism.

The New Constitutional Reforms in Russia will bring Bolshevism nearer to our idea of Social Reforms and nearer to Pan-Islamism.

But we have to admit with most excruciating mental pain that now the Muslim Nation has degenerated—degenerated everywhere beyond recognition.

It would require a volume itself to give all the detailed causes of this degeneration but we gave those in *Islam and Socialism* in one paragraph and we will repeat the same here. We said:—

"The one means by which the Prophet raised the Muslim Nation to the highest level was that selfless *Socialism* which he introduced in all the departments of human life and activities. The one cause of the later fall of that Nation, which unfortunately still continues, was selfish individualism. The Nation which breathed as one breath is now so divided that one Muslim does not care for the other."

But if Muslims had not fallen so low and if Bolshevism had not risen with almost all the same objects which Islam had not only had in view but had *accomplished in full*, then there would have been no sense in writing this Book which the Author has written while suffering from shocking artery and nerve pains. He wrote it often while standing at midnight or after it, tortured with pains.

The *raison d'être* of this labour of love is to re-awaken Muslims to their own greatness and virtues and to induce Bolshevists to adopt such methods and measures that the six hundred million Muslims would willingly co-operate with them in achieving the common objects—Universal peace and comfort of body and, as far as Islam is concerned, also the happiness of mind and soul of the whole mankind as one United Community—*one Universal Brotherhood.*

The Prophet had said that knowledge, wherever it may be found, should be taken up by Muslims as if it was their own lost property.

So whatever may such socialistic or communistic objects be as are conducive to the happiness and progress of the peoples Muslims should take from the Bolshevists "as if they were their

own lost property." And because they were lost by the Muslim Nation chiefly through its own fault and the Bolsheviks have not misappropriated those by any violence against the original owners therefore Muslims should re-acquire them in co-operation with the Bolshevists and with amity and good-will for them.

We would request Bolshevists particularly to read this Book without prejudice and understand fully the Pan-Islamic point of view and to so frame their programme as to make it easy for the *Muslims awakened to their own glorious virtues, achievements and triumphs* to co-operate with the Bolshevists. Be it so !

In the end of this Part the Author boldly throws down a decisive challenge in these words applicable to both Pan-Islamism and Socialism when they are at their best :—

Let an educated and thinking Communist come to me and tell me in what respects he thinks he is not a Pan-Islamist and I will tell him, I will convince him, that to that extent his Communism is defective, inferior and liable to cause harm to Society as a whole or to the component units of Society.

And let a learned Muslim come to me and tell me why he does not approve of the Principle or Principles of Communism (not certain accessories which have been attached to it unnecessarily or unwisely in Russia and elsewhere, that are dealt with in Part II of this Book) and I will convince him that to that extent he does not understand Islam itself or his knowledge of Islam and of its spirit is defective.

كنتم خيرامت اخرجت للناس تامرون بالمعروف و تنهون عن المنكر
و تؤمنون بالله

You (Muslims) are the best of the Nations raised up unto mankind. You command what is right and forbid what is wrong; and you believe in Allah. (iii : 109.)

PART II—DISSIMILARITIES.

We have shown in the First Part Similarities between Islam (Pan-Islamism) and Communism (Bolshevism). Now, in Part II, we regret to have to point out a few Dissimilarities between the two.

Unfortunately the main difference between the two is in the fact that while the mainstay and the corner-stone of Islam is its conception of God and Pan-Islamism is also based on that, the Bolsheviks, as the followers of Karl Marx, have unwisely and unnecessarily adopted an anti-God and anti-religious policy because, let us hope, the correct conception of God was not put before their leaders.

As in our opinion this difference should be removed for the benefit of Bolshevism itself and as we trust that the Bolshevik leaders are open to conviction we give in detail the Quranic conception of God in the very beginning of this part. Once this difference is removed Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism together will be the saviours of humanity which is hastening towards a deadly catastrophe.

1.—The Quranic Conception of God.

(a) The Quranic God-idea is superior and unique.

A conception of a god or gods is an old one in human history. Probably it came into the minds of the very first human beings, whether evolved or created, when they began to think and had some experience of life. They soon found out that though they could control animals and grow seeds, yet their command over Nature was very poor. Then they saw the Sun, the Moon and the Stars rise and set. Storms raged furiously to uproot gigantic trees; floods swelled small rivulets, and epidemics came and killed the near and dear ones in large numbers. But on the other hand they also noticed the beneficent activities of Nature—good crops, birth of children (particularly male), recovery from diseases and ailments, and so forth. This induced them to think and to argue in their own minds. Thus they began to believe that there were unseen powers and spirits which had a greater control over

circumstances than they had. They grew superstitious. Whatever was strange and strong inspired awe in them. They bowed to it. Thus they began to worship big rivers, big mountains, even big trees. They attributed gods to storms, to thunder and lightning. Up to this day in India every element has a named goddess. Up to this day small-pox is considered to be a goddess by the Hindus in India, and the mass of people try to appease her to get rid of the small-pox instead of going to a physician. In order to propitiate these gods and goddesses the people offered to them, and they do the same to-day, flowers, fruits and sweets. They chanted music. They burnt incense: they sacrificed even their children. At places Nature worship gave place to Star-worship. The Sun and the Moon and the big stars all were worshipped. Abraham, the father of the Mid-Eastern religions and of all biblical Prophets, was the first to revolt against the star-worship. The scene depicted in the Quran of his self-struggle is very illuminating. It is as follows:—

"And thus did We show Abraham the Kingdom of the heavens and the earth and that he might be of those who are sure. So when the night overshadowed him, he saw a star; and he said: This is my Lord! So when it set, he said: I do not love the setting ones. Then when he saw the moon rising, he said: This is my Lord! So when it set, he said: If my Lord had not guided me I should certainly be of the erring people. Then when he saw the sun rising, he said: This is my Lord! This is the greatest. So when it set, he said: O my people! surely I am clear of what you set up (with Allah). Surely I have turned myself, being upright, wholly to Him Who originated the heavens and the earth and I am not of the polytheists. And his people disputed with him. He said: Do you dispute with me respecting Allah? and He has guided me indeed: and I do not fear any way those that you set up with Him, unless my Lord pleases; my Lord comprehends all things in His knowledge; will you not then mind? And how should I fear what you have set up (with Him), while you do not fear that you have set up with Allah that for which He has not sent down to you any authority; which then of the two parties is surer of security, if you know? Those who believe and do not mix up their faith with inequity, those are they who shall have the security and they are those who go aright."(1)

But it was the final Prophet, the most illustrious progeny of Abraham, who dealt a death-blow to the Star, Sun, Fire and Nature worship, when he was inspired to declare: "Allah is He Who created the heavens (the celestial bodies) and the earth, and sent down water from the clouds, then brought forth with

(1) The Holy Quran, V: 76-83

it fruits as a sustenance for you; and He has made ships subservient for you that they might run their course in the sea of His command, and He has made the rivers subservient for you. And He has made the Sun and the Moon subservient for you pursuing their courses, and He has made subservient for you the night and the day."(1)

It was further declared that not only the Sun and Moon and Rivers and Seas and Air could be utilised by man but :

Alam tarao ann Allaha sakhkhara lakum mafissamavate va ma filardhi va asbaga alaikum neamahu zahiratan va batinatan (XXXI : 20.) Whatever was in heavens and earth, open or concealed, was made subservient to man if he knew how to control it. Only a scientist, and that of the most modern and high standard, can realize the full import and all the implications of such Quranic verses. In fact it was under the impetus of such instructions as to the capabilities and possible achievements of human intelligence that Muslims adopted means to study the laws of Nature and to master the elements—the sea, the wind, the fire, the electricity, in fact all things apparent or hidden (zahiratan va batinatan) in the atmosphere, on the earth or inside the earth. Considering the time when the above announcements were made, every reasonable person will be compelled to admit that such enlightenment could be achieved only by a mind inspired by none but the Author, the Cherisher and the Evolver of the Universe.

Within these last thirteen centuries after the announcement was made, man has progressed very, very greatly; yet if we consider all the possibilities which the above verses reveal we are far, and very far—probably thousands of years far—from accomplishing all that is implied in these verses. What wonder then that, as far as scientific impetus goes, the Muslim claim that the Quran is the final message from God is certain to remain true at least for thousands of years, if not millions. Let man ponder and ponder deeply over such verses as given above with which the Quran is full, and do all he can to bring unto his subservience all that is in the heavens and the earth. That will engage his attention till eternity. How could any sensible man bow down before any being or thing which did not posses any capabilities of bringing even the mighty Sun under his subservience ? Thus was ended for ever among the people with any intelligence, the worship of Nature. On the contrary, serious efforts began to be made to know the laws of Nature set by one God in order to subdue Nature for man's needs and requirements. The Quran has, in fact, stopped for ever the worship of gods or goddesses as it has stopped the worship of Nature. One of the

(1) The Holy Quran, XIV : 32-33.

Quranic arguments is that if there were more than one God "the whole creation would necessarily fall into confusion and be overturned by the competition of such mighty antagonists."

The Quran says :—

"Or have they taken gods from the earth who raise (the dead). If there had been in them any gods except Allah, they would both have certainly been in a disorderly state ; therefore glory be to Allah, the Lord of the dominion, above what they attribute (to Him)." (XX: 21-21).

It is true that long before Muhammad was born there were people whose conscience and reason had rejected the plurality of gods. Even in ancient Egypt, Unitarians were to be found, as also in Greece. The high philosophy of the Vedas also culminated in one Brahma—one "Om." But really the first religious system which based itself upon the doctrine of the unity of God was the Jewish. It was Moses who preached strict Monotheism and conceived a God of high attributes. But alas ! his people could only grasp the idea of a tribal King. They could only think of an exclusive God of the Israelites—a tribal Sovereign. Even then they lapsed into idolatry again and again. They could believe only in an anthropomorphic God—a mighty King of their own Nation. Judaism is the one religion which has no philosophy. It claims to have based itself strictly on Law, and the Jewish people do not go beyond the letters of that Law. Therefore the Law has become too rigid.

Christ came to make this rigidity a little flexible. He also came only to the Israelites and tried to divert their attention to the spirit of the law, but they did not listen to him. Instead, they reviled him and his holy mother. They refused to have him as their Prophet. They jeered at him. They could not appreciate his spirituality. They put him on the cross with a crown of thorn on his head. And his disciples,—almost all of whom had proved untrustworthy, cowardly, untruthful, traitors, made a mess of his principles and preachings after him.

The Christianity as known to-day has very little of the simple teachings of Christ in it. Although its foundation remains that of the old Mosaic religion ; although it recognises the Old Testament as its basis, yet, instead of the spirit which Jesus wanted to introduce into Judaic beliefs, a very poor philosophy has been made the corner-stone of the so-called Christian religion. In fact the old pagan Mithraic cult has been transformed into Christianity. Tertullian admits, as did others, that Mithraism and Christianity were identical in all but name. Not only the same rituals and holidays, like Sunday or December 25th (Christmas Day), were taken from the pagans, but even the puzzle of one-in-three and three-in-one

was introduced from those very sources. And thus the venerable structure of Mosaic Monotheism was wrecked. Other demoralising and degrading tenets were also put in like the redemption or the atonement or the begetting of a son by God or so forth. Christianity based itself on the belief that man was born in sin, for which mother Eve's (woman's) responsibility was the greatest, and that as he was incapable of obeying the Law, the loving God planned the sacrifice of his only son to redeem him! In his *Bible Myths*, Rev. J. W. Doane has given in parallel columns forty-eight similarities between Buddha and Christ, as described by Buddhism and Christianity respectively. While Christ was alleged to have said that he came to the lost tribes of Israel and to fulfil the Law, Paul made an improvement upon Judaic conceptions of God inasmuch as God's sovereignty was no more thought to be confined to His "chosen people"—the Israelites. Another improvement was that the sentiment of love was added to His austere attributes defined by the Jews. But alas! besides the demoralising and degrading tenets which Paul introduced in Christianity, even the universality of God did not reach to its full limits. If it was extended to non-Israelites, it was limited only to those of them who believed in the "Blood of Christ."

It was further limited to those only who were baptised in his name. As to the quality of love in God, even that was degraded almost to a carnal passion so as to beget a son. Thus the Christian god-idea was made much more irrational than was the Judaic idea.

When the god-idea in Judaism and Christianity is so defective it would be no use to dilate much upon the god-idea in other religions. In Buddhism it is alleged to be non-existent, though Buddha himself has come to be worshipped as a god—all perfect, all-wise. God is only a kind of force in Buddhism. Nirvana is the goal of life. In fact, Buddhism was only a cult. It was a revolt against the rigid caste system which the Brahmans had imposed. It was meant to deprive the Brahmans of the power they had obtained even over gods and goddesses who could only be approached through them. Vishnu (400 B.C.) says : "It is only by the favour of Brahmans that gods reside in Heaven." (Vishnu XIX : 27). So Buddha individualised religion, *i.e.*, put it into the hands of every individual, of whatsoever caste, to work up his own salvation by personally shunning this world and the life in it as an evil, in the circumference of course of the transmigration of soul theory. Buddha gave up his own kingdom and his wife and family to achieve Nirvana.

In the Vedas, the god-idea exists only as a very imaginative philosophy which is almost beyond human intelligence to grasp,

and the result has been that the Hindu masses have come down to worship hand-made idols and stones. Even the educated among them bow down before trees, animals and rivers. Their god has to be awakened by ringing bells. He is propitiated by the blood of animals. (Human sacrifices, like the custom of burning the Hindu widows alive, have been stopped only by very rigorous secular laws of foreigners.) It might be that ten Hindus among ten millions are able to grasp, even in these days of enlightenment, the real philosophy of the Vedas. The rest remain in the mire of gross idolatry, in spite of the efforts of their own reformers to preach the unity of God.

The Zoroastrians believed in two gods—one of good and the other of evil—and the poor, helpless man, the whole of the universe, was a plaything between these two rivals of equal power, who were constantly at war.

It was the unique privilege of Muhammad, son of Abdullah (may he continue always to be triumphant) alone, to have given to the world a conception of God which was both rational and spiritual, philosophic as well as scientific, and beneficial to humanity in its progress and development. Muhammad performed many undeniable miracles, but the greatest miracle which he performed and the best proof that he gave of being an inspired Prophet and Messenger, was the God-idea which he instilled in the minds of the Arabs and which did not remain confined to one tribe, or one people, or one country, or one generation, but which was acclaimed by all the world for all times.

What the miraculous Prophet did first of all was to correct all those derogatory notions which represented God only as a tribal King, or one who begot children, sons or daughters, or who could be approached only through priests or Brahmans. He demolished all those notions that attributed to Allah (God), fatigue, suffering, sexual passions, or human sentiments. The Islamic God is not physical or personal, *i.e.*, with human feelings or body. In reality He cannot be referred to as he, she, or it. The Islamic God cannot be symbolized like the Vedic gods by carved idols or animals, or by the elements, fire or water—or by the planets, the Sun or Moon; nor can He be anthropomorphized. Nor can human passions or weaknesses be attributed to Him. So there can be no begotten sons or daughters of His, nor can He be represented by Jesus or Krishna or Rama. The very opening chapter of the Quran sings his praises as *Rabb-ul-Alamin*. The Arabic-word *Rabb* according to the "*Taj-ul-Arus*" and the "Arabic English Lexicon," by W. Lane, conveys the meaning of regulating, accomplishing, completing, fostering and nourishing. According to Imam Raghib Isphahani it means "fostering of a thing in such a

manner as to make it attain one condition after another until it reaches its goal of perfection." *Alamin* means the worlds and all the created things that exist. These two words *Rabb-ul-Alamin* convey the most distinguished conception of God in Islam. *Rabb* conveys a scientific idea. Long before scientists propounded the theory of evolution the Quran proclaimed in the very beginning of the opening verse, that this universe has been evolved by an Evolver under set laws and He is fostering it even now "to make it attain one condition after another" until probably in millions of years "it reaches its goal of perfection." Is the God-idea in any other religion, either ancient or biblical, so rational as that conveyed by *Rabb* ? Is the God-idea in any religion so universal as that conveyed by *Rabb-ul-Alamin*? According to the Quran, God is not the God of Muslims alone, nor of this world alone. He is the Sustainer, the Cherisher, the Fosterer, the Evolver of all things in the Universe. Verse after verse of the Quran gives Unique, Distinguishing and Majestic qualifications of God. In Chapter II, verse 255, runs in the words of Sale:—

"God, there is no god but He, the Living, the Self-Subsisting; *neither slumber nor sleep seizeth Him, to Him belongeth whatsoever* is in heaven and on earth. Who is he that can intercede with Him, but through His good pleasure ? He knoweth that which is past, and that which is to come unto them, and they shall not comprehend anything of His knowledge but so far as He pleaseth. His Throne is extended over heavens and earth, and the preservation of both is no burden unto Him. He is the High, the Mighty. Let there be no violence in religion. Now is the right direction manifestly distinguished from deceit; whoever therefore shall deny Taghut and believe in God shall surely take hold on a strong handle, which shall not be broken ; God is He Who Heareth, Seeth." In his note Sale says, "The Cursi (Throne) allegorically signifies the Divine Providence which sustains and governs the heavens and the earth and is infinitely above human comprehension."

There is not a single page in the Quran which does not refer to Allah with one name, one attribute or other. In Chapter LIX, verses 22, 23 24, eloquently describe Him as follows:—

"He is Allah besides whom there is no god; the Knower of the unseen and seen. He is the Beneficent, the Merciful. He is Allah besides Whom there is no god ; the King ; the Sovereign ; the Holy; the Author of Peace; the Granter of Security; Guardian over all things, the Mighty, the Supreme, the Possessor of every Greatness. Allah is more Sublime than what they (Christians or Hindus) associate with Him. He is Allah the Creator, the Maker, the Fashioner (Artist). His are the most beautiful names. Whatever is in the heavens and the earth declares His Glory and He is he Mighty, the Wise (Scientist)."

A study of the above verses of the Qurán will convince everybody how sublime, chaste, comprehensive and monistic the God-idea is in Islam when compared to that of other religions.

In order to further save the God-idea from being personified or anthropomorphized with human passions or sentiments as other religions had done before, the Qurán has given a philosophic turn to the God-idea and declared:

"*Laisa kamislihi shaian*" (XLII: 11). There is nothing as His likeness. And again:

"*La tudrikohul absar.*" (VI: 103.) Vision comprehendeth Him not. Gibbon's remarks on this aspect of the Islamic God-idea are: "The creed of Muhammad is free from suspicion or ambiguity; and the Qurán is a glorious testimony to the Unity of God. The Prophet of Mecca rejected the worship of idols and men, of stars and planets, on the rational principle that whatever rises must set, that whatever is born must die, that whatever is corruptible must decay and perish. In the Author of the Universe his rational enthusiasm confessed and adored an Infinite and Eternal Being, without form or place, without issue or similitude, present to our most secret thoughts, existing by the necessity of His own Nature, and deriving from Himself moral and intellectual perfection. These sublime truths, thus announced in the language of the Prophet, are primarily held by his disciples and defined by metaphysical precision. A philosophic theist might subscribe to the popular creed of Muhammadans: a creed too sublime perhaps for our present faculties. What object remains for the fancy, or even the understanding when we have abstracted from the unknown substance all idea of time and space, of motion and matter, of sensation and reflection? The first principle of reason and revelation was confirmed by the voice of Muhammad: his proselytes from India to Morocco are distinguished by the name of Unitarians, and the danger of idolatry has been prevented by the interdiction of images."

(*b*) *The Islamic God-idea is helpful in intellectual, political, social, moral and spiritual advancements.*

The Islamic God-idea is, as Gibbon says, "rational." It does not outrage one's reason or intelligence or any scientific truth. There is no mathematical puzzle as three-is-one and one-is-three, involved in it. Gibbon acknowledges: "More pure than the system of Zoroaster, more liberal than the Law of Moses, the religion of Muhammad might seem less inconsistent with reason than the creed of mystery and superstition which, in the seventh century, disgraced the simplicity of the Gospel."

Undoubtedly a "Philosophic theist" would subscribe to the chaste God-idea expressed in the Quranic verses as these:—

"Say, Allah is one. Allah is He on whom all depend. He begets not, nor is He begotten. And He has no peer." (CXII: 1 to 4.)

"And to Him submits whatever is in the heavens and the earth willingly or unwillingly." (iii: 82.)

"Say, have you considered your associates which you call upon besides Allah? Show me what part of the earth they have created, or have they any share in the heavens? (XXXV: 40.)

"And call not with Allah any other god: there is no God but He. His is the judgment, and to Him you will be returned." (XXVII: 88.)

"Allah, there is no God but He, the Ever-living, the Self-subsisting by whom all subsist." (iii: 2.)

"Whatever is in the heavens and whatever is in the earth declares the glory of Allah, the Sovereign, the Holy, the Mighty, the Wise." (LXII: 1.)

"And your God is one God. There is no God but He. He is the Beneficent, the Merciful" (ii: 163), and so forth.

So pure and unalloyed has been the idea of the Unity of God in Islam that while Christianity and almost all other religions have deified their founders the mighty Muhammad was commanded to proclaim under the inspiration of his God:—

"Say, I am only a mortal like you; it is revealed to me that your God is one God, therefore direct your way straight to Him and ask His pardon and woe to the polytheists; who do not give the alms and are unbelievers in the hereafter. Those who believe and act aright shall surely have a reward never to be cut off." (xli: 6, 7, 8.)

The two verses of the Quran that have been given before elevate the God-idea to the utmost philosophical height when they declare that "Nought is as His likeness," and "Vision comprehends Him not."

How can then any created thing, even a highly spiritual or intellectual and powerful human being, represent Him fully in this perishable material body? How can a co-sharer be assigned to Him?

For a belief in God, while other religions are dogmatic, the Quran repeatedly appeals to the intelligence of man. It advises man to draw his inspirations and conclusions from Nature and its laws even as the greatest materialist of the age, Ernst Haeckel, whose Monism needs only a little improvement to become the pure Monotheism of Islam, did in these words: "The school of the twentieth century, flourishing anew on this firm ground (of

Monism) shall have to unfold to the rising youth not only the wonderful truths of the Cosmos, but also the inexhaustible treasures of beauty lying everywhere hidden therein. Whether we marvel at the lofty mountains or the magic world of the sea, whether with the telescope we explore the infinitely great wonders of the starry heavens, or with the microscope the yet more surprising wonders of a life infinitely small, everywhere does divine nature open upto us an inexhausible fountain of aesthetic enjoyment. Blind and insensible have the great majority of mankind hitherto wandered through this wonderland of a world, a sickly and an unnatural theology has made it repulsive as a "vale of tears."

The Quran has more eloquently and more effectively appealed to the intelligence of man for a belief in Allah. Read Chapters xxxi : 29 and xlv : 12, 13 and particularly the following verses 3 to 18 from chapter xvi :—

"He created the heavens and the earth with the truth, highly exalted be He above what they associate (with Him)."

"He created man from a small life-germ, and lo ; he is an open contender."

"And He created the cattle for you ; you have in them warm clothing and (many advantages) and of them do you eat."

"And they are pleasing to you when you drive them back (to home) and when you send them forth (to pasture)."

"And they carry your heavy loads to regions which you could not reach but with distress of the souls, most surely your Lord is Compassionate, Merciful."

"And (He made) horses and mules and asses that you might ride upon them and as an ornament (or means of distinction) and He creates what you do not know."

"And upon Allah it rests to show the right way, and there are some deviating (ways) ; and if He pleases He would certainly guide you all aright."

"He it is who sends down water from the cloud for you ; it gives drink and by it (grow) the plants upon which you pasture."

"He causes to grow for you thereby herbage, and the olives, and palm-trees and the grapes, and all the fruits ; most surely there is a sign in this for a people who reflect."

"And He has made subservient for you the night and the day and the sun and the moon, and the stars are made subservient by His commandment, most surely there are signs in this for a people who ponder."

"And what He has created in the earth of varied hues ; most surely there is a sign in this for a people who are mindful."

"And He it is Who has made the sea subservient that you may eat fresh flesh from it and bring forth from it ornament, which you wear, and you see the ships cleaving through it, and that you might seek of His bounty and that you may give thanks."

"And He has cast great mountains on the earth lest it might be convulsed with you, and rivers and roads that you may go aright."

"And landmarks ; and by the stars they find the right way."

"Is He then Who creates like him who does not create ? Do you not then ponder ?"

"And if you would count Allah's favours, you will not be able to number them ; most surely Allah is Forgiving, Merciful."

The Quranic God-idea sharpens the intelligence of man and helps philosophers and scientists both to solve even those problems which they otherwise find difficult to solve.

Let the scientists take it from us that until they accept the same attributes for the Author of the Universe, the First Cause, which the Quran has attributed to Allah, they will themselves remain dissatisfied with their theories as to the "how and why" of this universe.

How did the molecules come into existence? How was energy engendered ? What caused the coalition of protons and atoms to produce matter? How were the laws of gravity—the laws of attraction and repulsion—fixed ? How were these gigantic and marvellous solar systems set to work ? And above all how was the life-germ which developed into a living, seeing, hearing, feeling and thinking being, produced ? Who was the creator or evolver of the mind and intelligence ? If matter and energy were themselves eternal how was it that every other thing, which they are supposed by certain stupid scientists to have mechanically and accidentally caused to form or develop, was also not eternal ? What caused the formations later ? Was such a complex and such a marvellous mechanism as that of an eye developed without any design ? Was there an object behind all the creation or was it evolved or developed in vain ?

Now, how many of the above questions will it be possible to answer satisfactorily if we do not believe in the *self-evident truth* that there is One Self-existing, Self-sustaining, All-knowing, All-powerful Being as the following verses of the Quran indicate :—

"Wonderful Originator of the heavens and the earth, and when He decreeth a thing He only sayeth to it "Be" and there it is." (XXII : 117.)

"He brings forth the living from the dead and brings forth the dead from the living, and gives life to the earth after its death and then shall ye be brought forth." (XXX : 19.)

"And We did not create the heavens and the earth and what is between them in vain." (XXXVIII: 27.)

"He said : Our Rabb (Evolver and Sustainer) is He Who gave to everything its creation (shape, measure and quantity of materials, etc.) and then guided it (to its goal of perfection)." (XX : 50.)

Take the case of an expert Physicist. His conclusion cannot but be that there must have been a "First Cause." Islam says, Yes, there was certainly a *First Cause*—and calls him *Al-Mubdi* —the Great Originator or Beginner who can create something from nothing. But to a Biologist the existence of a *First Cause* alone will not suffice. He is puzzled to know from where not only this *energy* but *life* itself came. Sometimes he thinks that it came into existence on this earth accidentally somehow. Then he says it must have come from some other planet. But the Quran tells him that it came from *Al-Hayye*, the *Ever-living* and *Al-Qayyum*, the *Self-existent*. It was created by *Al-Mohye*—the *Life-giver*. But a philosopher will not be satisfied by either believing only in a *First Cause* or in a Creator of the life-cell. He would like to know how that life-cell developed into *an intelligent being* like man. He would like to be assured that there was an intelligent MIND behind it all. Islam gives him the assurance that there was One Who possessed the attributes of *Al Hakeem*, *Al- Bari* and *Al-Musawwir*.

In fact, Islam will satisfy not only a Physicist, a Biologist, and a Philosopher, but all thinking men, all men of science.

Over and over again, man has been asked in the Quran to use his intelligence, to think, to ponder and to make deductions.

Let a board of scientists meet to solve the problems of the "HOW" and "WHY" of this universe and let them go to the Quran when they reach insoluble points. If they find the Quranic research difficult, let them study, as carefully and as much without bias as possible, the ninety-nine attributive names of Allah with all the implications, and those alone will help them in coming to a satisfactory understanding of difficult problems.

For instance, let them study the following names :—

Al-Rabb—the Evolver of a thing from stage to stage to its goal of perfection.

Al Rahman—the Beneficent, who anticipates the progressing needs and pre-provides them.

Let the scientists consider only these two attributes of God and they will solve some very intricate problems.

Every scientist arrives at the conclusion that everything and every man has been evolved under set laws. But he is at a loss to know by Whom these laws of evolution were framed so as to enable a plasmic cell, which is called in the Quran "the life-germ", to develop into a full-fledged man whose intelligence is superior to every other creature's in the universe ? From where did this miraculous intelligence come ? How did life itself germinate ? Surely atoms, molecules, protons—unintelligent energy and lifeless matter, even if they could (no intelligent man would say that they could) create, by accident, the life-germ, they could not evolve from it a man—they could not evolve even a "fly" without an Evolver, without a *Rabb*. How could anything lacking life and intelligence itself evolve or create a being superior to itself ? No ! without the Ever-living and Self-existing, Intelligent Evolver—*Al-Rabb*, who not only has given life and soul to "dead" matter and has set laws to evolve, but has also made arrangements of nourishing or cherishing at several stages .when the life-germ could not protect itself or cherish itself, no living thing, much less a human being, could be evolved. The theory of evolution of man reflects even greater credit upon the Creator than that of the creation.

In the same way let a scientist, specially an inventor, put this question to himself that could he invent anything if the *material* had not been provided beforehand for it ? *Who provided this material* ? *How and Why* ? Probably there is nothing which has proved so useful to man as the invention of the steam engine. But could it have been invented or worked so usefully if there was no iron or coal or oil or electricity in store and if man had not been gifted with sufficient intelligence. Instead of being able to use the coal or electricity to his advantage he would have perished from coal-gas and electric currents if he had not been helped by God-given intelligence and reasoning powers to protect himself. If energy could not be produced, if mechanical motion could not be obtained no steam-engine could be invented. Surely man did not *create* iron or coal. He did not create energy or electricity. Nor did he create his own intelligence.

The fact is that man notwithstanding his God-given intelligence has *not* been able to *create anything at all*. What he has done is that he has discovered certain things in nature and brought them for his use and under his subservience, by finding out their properties, created in them to a premeasured quantity of doing good and doing harm. Everything depends upon finding out these premeasured properties, particularly in the case of medicines.

When minutely analysed and examined these medicinal herbs have been found to be very elaborate and very delicately and suitably balanced chemical laboratories, manufacturing properties and juices beneficial as well as harmful, sometimes safeguarding even reactions.

Besides the two names *Al-Rabb* and *Al-Rahman* some other names that would be helpful to intelligent scientists are:—

Al-Muhaimin—He Who guards others in the time of danger; *Al-Khaliq*—The Creator, the Combiner; *Al-Raq'ib*—He Who watches keenly; *Al-Bari*—The Maker; *Al-Hafiz*—The Protector; *Al-Musawwir*—The Fashioner, the Artist, the Designer; *Al-Hakeem*—The Ever Wise, the Scientist; *Al-Khabir*—The One Who is aware of everything, *Al-Mubdi*—The Great Originator or Beginner (the First Cause); *Al-Muhyi*—The Life-giver; *Al-Jabbar*—He Who compels others to work according to His Will; *Al-Hayyo*—The Ever-living; *Al-Mu'id*—The Restorer; *Al-Qayyum*—The Self-subsistent, One Who sustains others; *Al-Muqaddim*—He Who gives others a preference; *Al-Akali*—The Eternal; *Al-Bais*—The Resurrector; *Al-Baqi*—The Survivor; *Al-Mumit*—He Who puts another to death; *Al-Awwal*—The First; *Al A'khir*—The Last.

Let a scientist study our gigantic solar system, nay, he need not go so far—let him study his own person and put the following questions to himself which the Quran has put to guide his intellect:—

"Were they created by nothing? Are they the creators of themselves? Created they the heavens and the earth? Nay, rather they have no faith. Hold they thy Lord's treasure? Bear they the rule supreme?" (lii: 35-36.)

And the Quran challengingly says:—

"Verily, they whom ye call besides God" (whether they be the idols of the pagans or "sons" and "daughters" of God or "man-gods" of other religions, or the "energy" or "matter" of the scientists), "cannot create a fly though they assemble for it and if the fly carry off aught from them they cannot take it away from it. Weak the suppliant and the supplicated. Unworthy the estimate they form of God! For God is Right Powerful and mighty." (xxii: 73-74.)

It would be evident to every man that no individual, no group, no nation on this earth can claim to have mastered all the circumstances, all the incidents in this world. Innumerable are the things which are still beyond the control of man—man who is undoubtedly the most intelligent being on this earth. So the working of the universe on set laws indicates that there must be a Being superior to man who controls the whole universe, all the circumstances, all the incidents.

Islam would accept as the Author and Sustainer and Controller of the universe whomsoever or whatsoever the scientists and philosophers would come to propose after full deliberation *provided the Creator or the Author, the Sustainer, or the Controller, is not less qualified than the creatures and provided He has no defect, no imperfections, no impurities.* Islam accepts only the most perfect God-ideal. That ideal is sublime. It cannot be improved upon. And when sincerely and intelligently believed in as an axiom, *a self-evident Truth*, it solves many an intricate problem relating to the universe and its working. Let every scientist remember that Euclid could not build up his exact science without an axiom. You can measure the two sides of an isosceles triangle to demonstrate that they together are larger than the third, but unless you believe in the axiomatic definition of the "point" you will not be able to prove your proposition. In the same way unless you believe in ALLAH with *all* His Attributes as given in the Quran the mystery of the Universe will remain unsolved. After believing in that *self-evident Truth* we must use our intelligence to understand the "how and why" of the universe.

The QURAN says :—

This He has enjoined you with that you may use your Intelligence. (vi : 152.)

The Poet Sa'adi has said :—

Ki be ilm natwan Khuda ra shinakht.

Without knowledge it is impossible to *understand* God.

Muslims have been urged by the Quran itself to use their intellect for all things—even for a belief in God.

That the Islamic God-idea is helpful politically, socially and morally has been proved in practice by the miraculous advance of the Muslims in the space of a very short time and by the social and moral revolution effected by the Prophet Muhammad in his own life-time when they had implicit faith in Allah. The Prophet created a *model nation* on the same God-idea. And it was a unique model indeed. The world has not seen another nation like it in vitality, cohesion, moral, mental and intellectual genius and in the rapidity of its conquests. The Prophet also laid down the foundations with the same God-idea of a world Empire unique in history in its regard and concern for every individual citizen. The more the Muslims believed in the Quranic God-idea the better men they became in all respects and the more they advanced in their intelligence also. In truth a new world was created—new in the religious conceptions, new in political, social, economic and moral ideals ;—a new culture and a new civilisation were brought into existence in the shortest time.

In his introduction to his work, "The New World of Islam," Dr. Stoddard writes :—

"The rise of Islam is perhaps the most amazing event in human history. Springing from a land and a people like previously negligible, Islam spread within a century over half the earth, shattering great Empires, overthrowing long-established religions, remoulding the souls of races and building up *a whole new world—the world of Islam.*

"The closer we examine this development the more extraordinary does it appear. The other great religions won their way slowly by painful struggle, and finally triumphed with the aid of powerful monarchs converted to the new faith. Christianity had its Constantine. Buddhism its Asoka, and Zoroastrianism its Cyrus; each lending to his chosen cult the mighty force of secular authority. *Not so Islam.* Arising in a desert land sparsely inhabited by a nomad race previously undistinguished in human annals, Islam sallied on its great adventure with the slenderest human backing and against the heaviest material odds. Yet Islam triumphed with seemingly miraculous ease."

While Islam is not beholden to monarchs or kings, many and many and many are persons beholden to Islam for having got through it the courage and power and sagacity to conquer and to rule.

Islam gave even more than these. It gave its own culture and civilisation and a very high standard for Government and administration and an extremely attractive and effective moral code.

The Prophet indeed "remoulded the souls of races." That was his chief miracle. And that he could do only through his God-idea. Rev. W. R. Stephens admits :—

"He (Muhammad) was born in a country where political organisation, rational faith and pure morals were unknown. He introduced all three. By a single stroke of masterly genius he simultaneously reformed the political conditions, the religious creed and the moral practices of his countrymen." "This stroke of genius" was no other than his inspired Conception of God by which he revolutionized, on the highest moral principle, the political and social institutions.

Above have been given some such attributive names of Allah as are helpful to philosophers and scientists. But Islam does not confine its help only to scientists. After all the world is not for the scientists alone. *The crowning success of Islam lies in helping, as no other institution does, a moralist, a social reformer, a statesman and a legislator.* It is a unique characteristic of Islam that it is both a

religion and an institution—marvellous as a religion and no less marvellous as an institution. The God-idea in Islam does not only satisfy our soul, it also satisfies our intellect and our mundane needs. It elevates our character and makes us good not only in ourselves but also for the whole society, for the whole world.

There are very many verses of the Quran like these quoted below, which help in forming a noble character in man. The opening verses of the chapter *Al-Mumineen* say, "Successful indeed are the Believers (*Muminun*) who humble themselves in their prayers and who eschew what is vain and who give alms and who guard their private parts except for their mates or those whom their right hands possess, for as to them they shall be blameless, but whoever seeks to go beyond these they are transgressors ; and who acquit themselves faithfully of their trusts and covenants and those who are mindful of their prayers, these are they who are heirs who shall inherit Paradise, they shall abide therein." (xxiii : 1-11.)

The Quranic God-idea which is helpful in moral and social advancement and in forming human character has been expressed in the following names of God, besides in several verses of the Holy Quran :—

Al-Malik—the Master ; *Al-Malik*—the King ; *Al-Quddus*—the Holy One ; *Al-Salam*— the Author of Peace ; *Al-Jabbar*—One Who compels others to work according to His will; *Al-Ghaffar*—the Great Forgiver ; *Al-Qahhar*—He Who dominates over all ; *Al-Wahhab*—the Great Bestower ; *Al-Razzaq*—the Great Provider ; *Al-Alim*—the All-Knower ; *Al-Sami*—the Ever-Hearer ; *Al-Basir*—the All-Seer; *Al-Hakam*—the Judge ; *Al-Adil*—the Just ; *Al-Khabir*—One Who is aware of everything ; *Al-Hasib*—the Reckoner ; *Al-Muhsi*—the Accountant ; *Al-Rauf*—the Lenient, the Kind, specially in working off difficulties ; *Malik-ul-Mulk*—the King of all Kingdoms ; *Zul Jalal-wal-Ikram*—the Possessor of all Glory and Power, Might and Mercy ; *Al-Muqsim*—the Equitable ; *Al-Mughni*—the One Who makes others rich and contented ; *Al-Hadi*—the Guide ; *Al-Sabur*—the Patient.

While studying the above attributive names of God one must remember the injunction of the Prophet Muhammad :—

'*TAKHALHLIQU BI AKHLAQ-ILLAH.*"

(Imbue yourselves with Divine attributes.)

Can anybody conceive a nobler ideal of manhood than one imbued with the above godly attributes ? Muhammad (may victory always remain with him) and his companions and close followers did imbue themselves with Divine attributes, and it was because of this that in only a few years they changed the centuries-old habits of the Arabs and the Turks and the Moghals,

etc., who were barbarous before, but by their influence became heroic and virtuous. It was because of this that in a wonderfully short period a marvellously democratic Nation and a marvellously internationalistic communist State were formed. It was through this that in that democratic and communist Nation, which within one century spread all over the world, an insatiable thirst for knowledge and progress was inculcated and Muslims were enabled with lightning speed to conquer a great part of the globe territorially as well as intellectually and morally—in culture as well as in civilization. Can it be possible to form a better Society or State than the one consisting of individuals possessing the above attributes ?

But it might be said that there should be more in the God-idea of any religion than that which can satisfy a philosopher, a scientist or even a statesman, a legislator and a moralist. There must be something to satisfy the cravings of the human soul. Islam does not lack this. *No nation has a record of so many saintly and spiritual men of high eminence as has Islam.*

There is no Muslim country, hardly any city or town, inhabited by Muslims, which has not produced a number of saintly men. Only one district, Bara Banki, in India, has produced thousands. The Kidwai clan alone is responsible for about seven hundred. Two of the saintly men of Bara Banki (a number of whose biographies exist) were of so great an eminence that those very miracles which are attributed to Jesus—"casting off ghosts" and bringing the "dead to life"— are said to have been performed by them. Haji Waris Ali Shah of Dewa, Bara Banki, one of whose biographies is written in English with the title "God-in-Man," who died in the early years of this century, was a man of wonderful spiritual powers indeed and is venerated, almost worshipped, up to this day, by men of different creeds and races—Europeans not excluded. Count Galarza is one of his staunchest European disciples as are several others. He was of the type of Christ in his spirituality and even in his habits of life.

Thousands of saintly Muslims (women saints being not unknown in Islam) have their history and work entered in numerous books and biographies. Many of them were themselves authors of classical books on spirituality, ethics, etc. The fact is that high-class literature on spirituality or mysticism in Islam is unparalleled and has not been approached by any religion or nation either in quantity or quality.

Mysticism or spirituality was itself made a science with rules and exercises to develop soul-force and Godliness in man, by thousands of remarkable Muslim spiritualists,

Not long after the rise of Islam, some say that in the very life-time of the Prophet himself and under his own tutelage or that of his beloved disciple Ali, a particular school of thought in Islam was established which took the name of *Sufism* or *Tariqat*. The members of this school devoted themselves exclusively to the cultivation and development of spiritual power and soul-force.

Islam does not believe in incarnations of God in man, as that means a degradation of God, but Islam believes in the rise and elevation of man to as near God as is humanly possible. God saith, "The person I hold dear to Myself I am his hearing by which he heareth, I am his sight by which he seeth, I am his hands by which he holdeth and I am his feet by which he walketh."

Islamic Sufis and mystics achieved even more brilliant successes in their realm than those achieved by their co-religionists in other faculties and walks of life. Thus it was that when Islam produced great generals, great statesmen, great organisers, great jurists, great scientists, great architects, great engineers, great astronomers, great mathematicians, great physicians, and so on, it also produced, at the same time, great spiritualists and great mystics.

The Quran itself calls Muslims the *Intermediate Nation* (*Ummat ul-Vusta*) and expects them to be a connecting link between all nations as long as the ideal of "mankind is one nation" is not achieved. The Islamic culture and civilization have for this reason developed both the aspects—material and spiritual—to the highest standard. Islam has made science the helpmate of religion.

If on the one hand, Muslims became the fathers of the European material civilization and regenerated and remodelled the Greek and Roman sciences, on the other hand, they overshadowed the philosophies and speculations of Buddhists and Vedantists. If their schools and colleges in Spain and Sicily became centres of scientific and vocational training and education, their *Khanqahs and Hujras* in Iran and India attracted *Dervishes* and *Rishis* from all over Asia. They reached every corner of India and established such a high spiritual reputation that even centuries after their death their tombs and mausoleums are the places of pilgrimage to thousands of Indian masses—mostly Hindus. They penetrated even into China, notwithstanding its surrounding high walls, where their materialists or swordsmen (conquerors) never reached.

For the spiritual uplift one should study verses of the Quran as these with all their mystic implications.

"We verily created man and We know what his soul whispereth within him, and We are nearer unto him than his jugular vein." (I: 16.)

"Fear not; surely I am with you; I do hear and see." (xx: 46.)

"Those who deliver the messages of God and fear Him, and do not fear any one but God: and God is sufficient to take account." (xxxiii: 39.)

"And as for him who fears to stand in the presence of his Lord, and forbids the soul from low desires, then surely the garden —that surely is his abode." (lxxix: 40, 41.)

"God does not desire to put on you any difficulty and He wishes to purify you and that He may complete His favour on you, so that you may give thanks." (lv: 6.)

"So they do not become weak-hearted on account of what befalls them in God's way, nor do they weaken, nor do they abase themselves, and God loves the patient." (iii: 145.)

"Continue firm in the right way as thou art commanded." (xi: 112.)

"And your Lord says: "Call upon Me and I will answer you." (1: 60.)

"Who answers the distressed when he calls upon Him and removes the evil, and He makes you successors on the earth." (xxcii: 62.)

"And when My servants ask thee concerning Me, then surely I am very near. I answer the prayer of the supplicant when he calls on Me. So they should respond to Me and believe in Me that they may walk in the right way." (ii: 186.)

"And to thy Lord is the Goal." (liii: 42.)

"And be careful in your duty to God and know that you will meet Him and give good news to the believers. On that day thou wilt see the faithful men and the faithful women —their light running before them and on their right hand. Good news for you to-day." (lxi: 72.)

"Enter it (Paradise) in peace, that is the day of abiding. They have therein what they wish and with *us* is *more* yet." (L: 34, 35.)

"And He breathed into him (man) His Spirit." (xxxii: 9.)

"And wherever you turn is the Face of God." (ii: 115.)

"God is the Light of the heaven and earth." (xxiv: 35.)

"From God we are and to Him we return." (ii: 156.)

"O man, surely thou must strive to attain to thy Lord a hard striving until thou meet Him."

"And who trusts in God, He is sufficient for him. Surely God attains His purpose, and God indeed has appointed a measure for everything." (lxv: 31.)

"With none but God is the direction of my affair to the right issue, on Him do I rely, and to Him do I turn." (xi: 88.)

"God is the friend of those who believe. He takes them out of darkness into the light." (ii: 257.)

"And God is sufficient as the friend and God is sufficient as the helper." (iv: 45.)

"And My mercy encompasses all things." (vii: 156.)

"O my servants who have acted extravagantly against your own souls, do not despair of the mercy of God, for God forgives the sins altogether." (xi: 53.)

"Say, in the grace of God and His mercy, in that they should rejoice." (xl: 58.)

"God loves those who turn much to Him and He loves those who purify themselves." (ii: 222.)

"God loves those who do good to others." (iii: 133.)

"O my people I do not ask of you any reward, my reward is only with Him who created." (xi: 51).

"Say, my prayer and my sacrifice and my life and my death are all for God, the Lord of the world." (vi: 163.)

The culminating point of spiritual elevation is reached by man in this saying of the Prophet from God:—

"O, man: only follow thou My laws and thou shalt become like unto Me and then say "Be" and behold it is."

This is not only a mystic or spiritual Divine Message, given through God's own Messenger, of great significance to man, it is also meant to give an impetus to scientific inventions of great utility and to material progress of great beneficence.

By following God's Laws a man can raise himself spiritually as well as mentally and physically to a great height and possess great powers.

It is very authentically recorded that by his spiritual powers Omar, the second Khalifa, learnt the voice-transmitting law of electricity and sent his message of warning to his military commander far away from him, of a hidden foe. The commander heard the voice of warning and saved his army according to the Khalifa's instructions conveyed by the spiritual power from a very great distance. Marconi, now, by his intelligence, has also learnt the same law and can transmit his voice thousands of miles away. To the present time Omar's spiritual development remains superior inasmuch as he not only learnt the law of transmitting his voice from a distance without a wire, he also learnt the law of vision and could see behind a mountain, miles and miles away

from him, the precarious situation of his army. But who knows that in the future, some other man may be able to discover the same law of vision by his intelligence and he also may come nearer to the "All-seeing" attributes of God. Of course perfection is for God alone and certain attributes of His none can share, but because God has breathed His own Spirit in man, he can imbibe something of God in him as Christ and other prophets had done spiritually or as, at a lower scale, other men of intelligence have done mentally by finding out the laws of Nature.

Those who wish to study the mystic or *Sufic* phase of Islam should go to the writings of Muslim saints and *Sufis, and Dervishes* and others like the world-famous Ghazzali or Mohi-uddin-Jilani, Moulvi Jalal-ud-deen Rumi, or Ib'ne Arabi, or lots of others who have emphasised the esoteric side of Islam.

These authors have elevated the mystic superstitions of other religions to the regions of philosophy and have brought pantheistic ideas under the subservience of monotheistic conceptions. The highest place they have given to Love, as couplets like the following from Moulvi Rumi in his world-famous Masnawi indicate :—

Shad bash ai ishque khush saudai ma
Ai tabibe jumla illathaima.

Blessed be thou O happiness-conferring Love, which is the physician for all our ills and ailments.

Or as Hafiz boldly says :—

Hargiz na mirad anki dilash zindashud ba ishque
Sabt ast ber jaridai alum davame ma.

He never dies whose heart pulsates with Love.
Our eternal life is engraved on the pages of the World.

But it must not be forgotten that the esoteric life was only the first and the preliminary phase of the *Great Teacher's* life, when he used to isolate himself day and night in the cave of *Hira.*

He had to forsake it when the *Call* came and when he girded up his loin at a great self-sacrifice at the risk of his life to make a new world—a better world, and a new humanity—a better humanity, not only spiritually but in all respects.

Islam does not denounce spiritualism or mysticism but it does not forget that the world is material and all men have to live in this world even though that living is not to be permanent, and that when man has to live in this world he must attend to his material needs in the best way possible to ensure health, happiness and progress.

For this reason Islam has not neglected the intellectual, political or social side of a man's life while attending to the moral and spiritual. Islam has taken more care to set rules and laws to enable the generality of mankind in this world to lead human Society on the right path of progress, usefulness and beneficence.

But it must not be thought that those great Souls who live an unworldly life, devoting themselves more to the development of their spiritual powers than to physical, should be ignored or not thoroughly respected.

They serve a very great purpose even in our age. They are a *living protest* against the materialism and scepticism which is making man irresponsible and egoistic. Man indeed cannot live on bread alone. He has something more in him than other animals, other creatures have. He must keep his superior position. He must remain the vice-regent of God Himself, in Power and in Beneficence, on this earth. He must develop his distinguishing spiritual powers. He must not allow materialism to conquer him. Like fire, materialism is good as a slave but terrible when a master. Materialism must not be allowed to have all its own way. It must be checked by spiritual powers. Muslim mystics or Sufis are a necessity to demonstrate that materialism can be conquered by spiritualism. As the worldly civilization is more beneficial to man under Islam so also spiritualism in Islam has a superior tone.

The mode of life of the mystics and *Sufis* is a protest against that formalism and ritualism which is made the essence of religion by the over-orthodox and the fanatics. *Sufis* desire to lay emphasis more on the spirit than on the letter of the Law. They often break down those boundaries which are raised up by the too superstitious and ignorant masses on the one hand and by the too rigid and austere zealots and learned bigots on the other, between religion and religion. They attract to themselves, by their selfless, righteous, saintly life, the *good men* of all creeds and thoughts.

Their example, if it were general, would stop all strife and struggle and restore perfect peace to mankind.

They are indeed a necessity more in this age than ever before and it is only a pity that their number is on the decrease rather than on the increase, among the selfish and self-centred people of the world constantly at loggerheads with each other for worldly objects of life—for power and riches, land and property.

نہ شوق جاہ و دولت ہے نہ فکر سیم و زر تم کو

الگ ان سب بکھیڑوں سے مشیر بے نوا تم ہو

Men are indeed needed who would not bend themselves before the kings and the autocrats and who would humble themselves before the poor and the good.

No one in truth can deny that the world needed Buddhas and Christs but certainly it needed most of all a Muhammad about whom it has been truthfully said :—

آنچه خوبان همه دارند تو تنها داري

"All that the *good men* of the world possess thou possesseth in thy own person in perfection."

The central points of Muslim mysticism are the transcendental and self-attracting Beauty of the One and Only God, and the matchless Belovedness of Muhammad in respect of which the Author has said :—

Ashiq hoa Habibe Khuda per Mushir tu

Taqdir ney raqib bhi kiska bana diya.

Muslim saintly men draw the very soul of humanity towards them. They save man from becoming a beast or a machine by demonstrating in their own person the *reality* of the soul-force.

Of course, Islam does not expect every man to be a mystic or a *Sufi*. By his own example the Prophet discouraged ascetic life but a number of Sufis in the world are necessary to give a tone to human life and to set a high standard of moral eminence.

The Prophet himself valued saints like Abuzer, Avais Qarni and others and even in our age it was one of his own descendants, Syed Waris Ali Shah of Dewa, India, mentioned before, whose life was indeed the best example of an ascetic, Christ-like, spiritual, heavenly life on this globe for men and women of *all* religions—even for men who profess no religion.

He impressed all who came in contact with him that he was a superior man, and this was only due to this extraordinary soul-brilliance, which was reflected even in his face and eyes.

(*c*) *The Islamic God-idea is the basis of culture, civilization, communistic organization of human society and scientific progress.*

This section (*c*) is the natural corollary of the one preceding it. When the Quranic God-idea was helpful to individual man in his advancement it could not but be helpful to him collectively.

The very fact that every book which any Muslim wrote on whatever subject it might have been, religious or scientific, on history or geography or mathematics, began with the name of God the Beneficent, the Merciful, in itself proves that all the Islamic culture was based on the Quranic God-idea. The very first message of God to the Prophet was :—"Read in the name of your *Rabb*

(Evolver and Sustainer) Who created. He created man from a clot. Read and your *Rabb* is Bounteous; Who taught with the pen. Taught man what he knew not." (xcvi: 1-6.)

The untutored Teacher was thus called upon to read in the name of God and his attention was drawn to the use of the pen in the very first revelation. The use of the pen was very little known anywhere in the world, and least of all in Arabia, in those days when the above message came. And it came in the name of God —the *Rabb*—the Evolver, *i.e.*, the scientific conception of God. So it was natural that all knowledge, learning and culture of Muslims was given as its basis the Quranic God-idea and every composition on whatever subject it might be was begun with the name of Allah and with His praise as if it was dedicated to Him.

Professor Lake writes:—

"The Islam of Muhammad also contained a germ which when fully developed has spread its influence in Europe and has been heavier on Western idolatory than its arms were upon the East. It began in the establishment of schools by Muhammad and to assist in these and his educational plans, he released such of his prisoners of war as could read and write. As soon as they had taught, a certain number of boys, to do the same, and if any were willing to remain and take charge of schools they were liberated at once.

The result of this earliest possible schooling of Muslims was that they mastered all subjects and began to write on history, statistics, travels, voyages, chronology, numismatics, pulpit oratory, agriculture, rural economy, irrigation, pure and mixed mathematics and science, topography, geography, medicine, chemistry, zoology botany, natural history, geology, etc. In fact Muslims left no subject unstudied and whichever subject they chose to write upon they wrote in a way that reflected their genius and their mastery. "They were no triflers in those subjects."

There is no Nation and no State upto the present day which can claim to have surpassed, in culture and civilization, the Abbaside period. Baghdad was then the hub of the wheel of the world. It was the capital of Islam. It was a Metropolis when London was a village: All culture and civilization emanated from it. All culture and civilization was centred on it. Communications were established,at the time of the world famous Haroun-al-Rashid, with the West as well as with the Far East. The Great Haroun received embassies from Charlemagne and the Emperor of China at the same time.

Gabriel, the renowned physician; Asmani, the well-known litterateur and grammarian; and Ibrahim (of Mosul), the famous musician, graced his court. Under his rule the clock was invented,

He sent one to the European Emperor Charlemagne which is up-to this day regarded as "a wonderful piece of mechanism."

The period of twenty years of the reign of Haroun-al-Rashid's son, Mamun, was "the most glorious epoch," says a famous historian, in the "Saracenic History." It has left enduring monuments of intellectual and cultural developments of the followers of Islam in *all* directions of thought and in all departments of life—in philosophy, belle-lettres and exact sciences. During that glorious period of Asiatic culture mathematics, medicine and astronomy made as gigantic strides as fine arts and literature, poetry and romance. The *Alif Laila* ("One Thousand Nights") holds up to this day the very first place in imaginative, descriptive, instructive as well as interesting romance.

Abul Hasan invented the telescope and Mansur established the first Observatory at Shamassia.

The Abbaside period produced well-known travellers and voyagers.

Although the Arabs were the sons of the "sandy desert," but because they were taught by the Quran that the seas were made subservient to them for sailing on ships, they learnt to be as much at home on the waves in a boat as in the sandy desert on the back of a camel. They sailed as far as Madagascar in the South and colonized East Africa. The Sultanate of Dar-es-Salaam, alas ! now only a protectorate, is one of the relics of the great Arab Empire in Africa. In Java and Batavia, on the other side, the huge Muslim population of our days is a constant reminder of Arab enterprise. In Europe, Malta and Sicily were under Muslim sway. Sicily became a seat of Arabic learning. In fact the Mediterranean became a Muslim sea.

In the Arab Empire colleges and hospitals were established everywhere. The Nizamiah College built by Nizam-ul-Mulk and the Mustansaryah by Mustansar Billah are well-known to the Arab historian. The University of Al-Azhar in Cairo still lives to tell the story of the Arab's love for disseminating knowledge and patronising learning. So does the Tunisian University.

Improvements in agriculture were made as in manufacture. Refined sugar was supplied to the world from the fields and factories of Fars and Ahwaz; cotton from Tyre, Beirut and Aleppo; dates and other fruits, rice, barley and wheat from other parts of the Arab Empire. Basra had glass and soap factories. So had Samarra and Baghdad itself.

At Samarkand, Khorasan, Bokhara and Damascus looms were busy turning out carpets, brocades, satins and silks. In Tabriz and Ispahan there were State industries of gold and silver embroidery, and paper was made at Baghdad.

On the whole, the Islamic contributions to sciences and arts are really unique. The "Book of Science and Wisdom" (the Holy Quran) itself gave an impetus to learning. It brushed up the brains of all its readers with the result that the Islamic world produced experts in all the branches of science and literature. S. P. A. Scott says in his "Moorish Empire" Vol. IV, "Modern Science unquestionably owes everything to Arab genius."

The latest achievement of the European mechanical skill is the flying machine, but the first two martyrs among the conquerors of the air were Muslims, centuries ago. Muslims compiled encyclopædias, such as "The Historical Dictionary of Sciences" by Muhammad Ibn Abdullah of Granada. Usmah wrote on topography and statistics. He was not only an eminent writer, but also a brave soldier who was killed in the invasion of France (920 A.C.). Ibn Sina (Avicenna), 1037 A.C., the world famous physcian whose "Materia Medica" is still in vogue all over India, was the father of present-day European "Medical Sciences." He wrote on "The Treatment of Leprosy," "Methods of Preparing Diet, and Medicine," and on metaphysics, logic, philosophy, physics, ethics, etc. He anticipated the latest discoveries of the great modern Indian Scientist, Dr. Bose, by attributing a "kind of mind" to plants and vegetables. His writings were versatile as well as profound. Some of his famous works are :

(*i*) Utility and Advantage of Science, (*ii*) Euclid, (*iii*) Astronomical Observations, (*iv*) Health and Treatment, (*v*) Mathematical Theorem, (*vi*) Physics and Metaphysics and (*vii*) An Encyclopædia of Human Knowledge, in twenty volumes.

Ibn Sina alone stands head and shoulders above all his contemporaries in Europe and Asia and can compete favourably with modern physicians in Encyclopædic knowledge. Al-Razi (Rhazas) wrote comprehensively on "Small-pox". He anticipated the use of vaccine also. Up to the sixteenth century his great work was the subject of lectures in European universities.

Al-Kindi wrote two hundred books on such subjects as geometry, arithmetic, meteorology, medicine, optics and philosophy.

Abdul Qassim Zahravi (Abucases) in his work on surgery has left minute details of the instruments and the different types of operations on men and women. Muslim surgeons used "to put their patients to sleep" before undertaking painful operations. The "sleeping draught" called *darue baihoshi* in Persian, was not unknown to Muslims.

Abu Mansur Mowaffik can be called the inventor of Chemical Pharmacy and Ibn Zoar (Avenzoor) was an authority on the same

subject. Al-Bucasis of Cordova was an expert surgeon, more particularly in the obstetrical branch. In operations on females the services of properly trained women were secured.

Chemistry, called *Al Kimiya*, was the particular science of Muslims. Professor Holmyard says :

"Out of the inchoate body of mystical doctrine which represented chemistry in the Alexandrian School, the Muslims had extracted a definite system in which experimental facts and theoretical speculations were for the first time brought into their true relations. The practical applications of chemistry were acknowledged to be an important factor of the whole, so that Europe was able to start its chemical studies with a firm basis of fact, a coherent body of doctrine, and a realization of the value of chemistry to every-day life, ready to hand. For this privilege of our ancestors, let us make haste to pay our homage to the followers of the Prophet."

Abu Musa Jabir, known to Europe as Geber, was the father of Al-Kimya (Chemistry). He discovered nitric acid and *aqua regia* as well as certain peculiarities of metals.

The Muslim contribution to the *Materia Medica* has been very large indeed. They introduced such medicines as alcohol, camphor, ammonia, sanna, amaltas, rhubarb, etc., etc. They created up-to-date pharmacies. The preparation of several drugs and ointments in use in our own days is due to them. Apothecaries of Europe still use Saracenic pharmaceutical terms like elixir, julep, syrup, naphtha, arak, etc., etc.

Archibald Hurd says in his "The *Triumph of the Tramp Ship*" : As in many other ways, however so in that of ship-building the Crusades were to prove of very great educative value, "that is, the Europeans learnt the art of ship-building also from the Arabs.

Draper says : "In whatever direction we may look, we meet, in various pursuits of peace and war, of letters and science, Saracenic vestiges." Muslim chemists, like their fellow professionals to-day, prepared emulsions, syrups, ointments, pomades, etc., and Muslim physicians treated small-pox, typhoid, cholera, plague, cataract and haemorrhage, etc., centuries ago on almost the same lines as modern physicians do. The world-renowned Averroes (Ibne Rushd), on whose philosophy and works the famous Renan has written his "*Averroes and Averroism*" was a great jurist. He was the chief Qazi (Justice) of Seville and later of Cordova. He combined with his knowledge of jurisprudence a knowledge of astronomy. He discovered sunspots. He tried "to unite the doctrines of Aristotle with those of the Quran." Ibn Rushd was a great scholar. Aristotle's philosophy was reshaped and revised by him and he must have found that all that was based on truth in that was covered by the Quran,

Abdul Rahman Sufi improved the photometry of Stars. Al-mamun had determined the obliquity of the ellipse. Abu Junas was a great astronomer. It was the translation of the works of Muhammad Fargani that introduced astronomy as a science in Europe. Abul Hasan speaks of tubes, to the extremities of which ocular and object diopters (sights) were attached, *i.e.*, of telescopes. These were actually used at Maragha. Muslims were the first to build observatories in Europe. The first was established by Gebar at Seville in 1196, but the most famous and complete was that of Maragha at Taurs built in 1259. Abdul Maashir (Abumazar) and Abul Wafa were astronomers of great repute. Ibne Junas (1008) and Nasir-ud-din Tusi, Ibne Nabdi constructed astronomical tables of great merit. The Persian Poet, Omar Khayyam, who is the most popular poet of the day in Europe, was a great astronomer. Many stars such as Fomal-haut (Fum-ul-hut), and signs of Zodiac still carry Arabic names in European languages. Many astronomical words are upto this day Arabic used in their corrupted form in Europe. Al-Batarqius and Sabit bin Qurrah determined the length of the year. Alhazen (Abul Hasan) discovered atmospheric refraction. Abu Osman was an expert zoologist. Al-Razi, Al-Abbas, Al-Baithar wrote on botany. The last mentioned was a practical botanist. He wrote his valuable books after having travelled personally in different parts of the world collecting specimens. The first mentioned discovered sulphuric acid.

Al-Beruni, the geographer, travelled to India. His visit was not like a present-day tourist. He lived among the people of the country (Hindus), studied their language, their literature, their philosophy, their customs and modes of life, their laws, their religion, the geographical and physical conditions of their country and the few sciences they could teach. He has left a monumental record of his travels in which he quotes from Plato and Homer. He lectured on physics, chronology, mathematics, astronomy and gems. He was followed by Nasir Khusro, who, like Ibne Batuta, had travelled over a large part of the then known world and has left a *Safarnamah.*

"In which period" (*i.e.*, in 14th century), writes Archibald Hurd, "another outstanding traveller and explorer was Batuta. A native of Tangiers, he seems to have travelled continually for some thirty years during which he wrote what has since been proved to be extremely interesting and accurate account of Egypt, Arabia, Syria, Persia, Asia Minor, together with the countries lying about the Caspian and the Black Sea. He also voyaged, probably in Arabian trading-ships to India, the Maldive Islands, Ceylon, Sumatra, and China while later he visited Spain and even reached Timbuctoo." The same author further writes,

"With the aid of the Muslim pilots and their Arabian charts De Gama visited the Malabar Coast."

In those days, "geographical science with most other forms of learning, had been eclipsed in Europe."

In history the names of Ibne Khaldun, Tabri, Masudi and Ibne Athir and many others are world-renowned up to this day. The prologue of the first on the Science of History is unparalleled.

Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Yahya (Ibne Bajja) besides being an eminent scientist, philosopher and historian was a remarkable musician and he attempted to introduce a musical scale playable by all nations alike which may be said to be the foundation-stone on which the music of our days is written in Europe. Muslim inventions, now alas! mostly used by Europeans, are innumerable. Muslims introduced the use of gunpowder in Europe. They invented the pendulum, the compass, the asterlobe and the areometer.

They improved agriculture and brought to Europe rice, sugar, cotton, saffron (all adopted from Arabic words) mulberry, spinach, ginger, myrrh, bananas, etc., and nearly all the garden and orchard fruits. They introduced the Egyptian system of irrigation by flood gates, wheels and pumps. They improved the manufacture of textile fabrics, earthenware, iron and steel. Innumerable industries flourished under them, like ship-building, iron and copper utensils, glass, woollen carpets, cotton clothes, paper, silk, etc. Upto the time that the English came to India muslin, cotton-fine-cloth of Dacca and Tanda and the woollen shawls of Kashmir were imported to Europe for the use of the rich and prominent people there. Up to the present day they remain unsurpassed in beauty and refinement. So does the gold and silver embroidered work of Benares, and fine, hand-needle work of Lucknow in the hands of Muslim workers.

Muslims of old mastered every art, every science. They were experts in physics. They introduced Algebra, sines and cosines in trigonometry, and the tangent in astronomical calculations. Abu Raihan "was the first of the race of men" to construct a table of specific gravities. Muslims had invented aerometers to measure the temperature. They had several kinds of clepsydra. They had detected variation in density due to heat.

Abul Hasan (about 1100 A.C.) was the first to trace the curvilinear path of a ray of light through air. He is best known to Europe through his optical works which have been translated into Latin. He was the first to correct the Greek misconception as to the nature of vision showing by anatomical investigations and geometrical calculations that the rays of light come from external

objects to the eye and do not issue forth from the eye. He determined that the retina is the seat of vision and that impressions made by light upon it are conveyed along the optic nerve to the brain. He explains that we see single when we use both eyes because of the formation of the visual images on symmetrical portions of the two retinas. He is perfectly aware that the atmosphere decreases in density with increase of height. He shows the cause of "illusions" and why we actually see the sun and the moon before they have risen and after they have set. He explains the causes of the twinkling of the fixed stars. He explains the nature of the twilight. He determines the height of the atmosphere, deciding that its limit is nearly 58½ miles. In his work "The Book of the Balance of Wisdom" Abul Hasan sets forth the connections between the weight of atmosphere and of gravity. He knows correctly the relation between the velocities, spaces and times of falling bodies. He knows "capillary attraction." The determinations of the density of bodies as given by Abul Hasan are very near to the determinations of the present age. In the case of Mercury they are even more exact than those of the last century.

Draper, after describing some of the discoveries of Abul Hasan, says : "Though more than seven centuries part him from our time, the physiologists of this age may accept him as their compeer since he received and defended the doctrine now forming its way, of the progressive development of animal form." **"Not one of the purely mathematical or mixed or practical sciences," says Draper again, "was omitted by the Arabs."** This was at a time when "the Christian peasant, fever-stricken and overtaken by accident, hied to the nearest saint's shrine and expected a miracle, and when the students of sciences were persecuted and even burnt alive as sorcerers and witches in Europe.

Up to recently the Bolsheviks found the Russian Muzhik very superstitious and it was for this reason that they looked down with contempt on Christianity and with it on all other religions.

We assert once more that we do not think that any Nation in the world can up to this day claim to have been more cultured and civilized than the Islamic Nation.

The author of "The Triumph of the Trade Ship" writes, "The Arabian city of Baghdad is stated indeed at one time to have contained no fewer than two million people, embracing many of the most illustrious scholars of the world . . . . . to their great Caliph (Harun al Rashid), had they ever met, the European Emperor (Charlemagne) would probably have seemed an almost wholly uneducated barbarian."

Islam had chosen the Arabic language, the language of the Arab Quraish, for itself at its start and made that language the

richest at the time. All that was good in any language, whether in Greek, or Latin, or even in Sanskrit or Persian, was introduced either by adaptation or translation into Arabic. There was a time when the Arabic language became the custodian of the best culture in the world. All the sciences, arts and literature known to Europe, Asia or Africa were available in it. The Arab Khalifs possessed the best libraries. The catalogue of one library alone was in forty volumes. Stupendous sums were given to authors. Besides big universities in every important country under Islam, every large Mosque had its own schools and its own libraries. The places for the worship of God thus became the seats of learning, education and culture.

The biggest library of the day was the Muslim Library in Spain founded by Hakam Mustanzar. The description and account of this library, as given by the historian Ibne Khaldun, "baffles one's imagination."

Hakam was a famous Khalifa of the Umayyad dynasty who ruled in Spain. His Empire was extensive and well regulated. He was a Scholar with a wide outlook, and was so very fond of collecting books that even the tribute paid to his kingdom did not suffice for the purposes. Hundreds of his emissaries and merchants were deputed by him to search and collect rare, good books, both old and new, in Spain, Egypt, Syria, Baghdad, Persia and Khorasan.

The Cairo Library equalled and to some extent surpassed the Spanish Library. Maqrizi describes this library graphically. It possessed the globe of the world prepared by Batlimus (Ptolemy). It also possessed another globe of the world prepared by Abul Hasan Sufi for Sultan Adad-ud-Daula.

Nizam-ul-Mulk founded the Nizamiyyah University at Baghdad. It is the same Nizam-ul-Mulk who is said to have been a class fellow of Omar Khayyam and Hasan bin Sabbah. It would ever redound to the memory of Nizam-ul-Mulk that he promulgated a royal edict, that wherever a distinguished savant was available, a Madrassah and a library should be built for him.

Thus thousands of Madrassahs and libraries came into existence. Their existence was the order of the day. Even Mosques were used as libraries, and the traces of this may yet be seen in Istanbul where all big Mosques have large libraries.

The Adad-ud-Daula Library of Shiraz was another renowned library. One of its features was that it contained all books written from the advent of the Holy Prophet of Arabia upto the founder's time. Bashari is responsible for bringing this unique library to the notice of the World. It has been described thus:—This

grand library was located in one of the palatial buildings of Adad-ud-Daula. The building was very long and extensive, and contained several big rooms stocked with hundreds of high *almirahs* kept by the side of the walls. These *almirahs* were three yards broad, and of a man's height. There was fine carving on the *almirahs*. There were separate rooms for books on each religion and for each art and science. There were separate lists of books for each room. Wakil (Agent), Khazanchi (cashier) and accountants were employed to manage and administer this library. No person could enter this library unless accompanied by a member of the Library Establishment.

Saif-ud-Daula's Library was the popular rendezvous of the scholars of the day. Saif-ud-Daula was a highly accomplished man. Hakim Abu Nasr Farabi was a stipendiary of his court. "Books on literature found in his library were not to be found elsewhere."

Love of books and libraries was not the monopoly of the Muslim rulers and sovereigns only. It became the popular hobby of the learned and the rich. Muslims searched for the old and rare Books and secured them wherever they could be had even at fabulous prices. Libraries sprang up not only in Muslim Spain and Egypt, but also in Persia, Iraq, Syria, Khurasan and in India.

It was in the fourth century of the Hijra that public Libraries became the order of the day. Amir Sabur Bin Ardashir was probably the first Muslim who founded a public Library. In 382 Hijra he founded a library called Dar-ul-ulum at Baghdad, which was thrown open to the public. In 395 Hijra, Hakam Bin Amr-il-lah established a grand public library in Egypt. This library had a very large endowment to meet the salaries of the staff employed in the library. It was open to the public throughout the day.

Most of the Khalifas in Europe, as in Asia, were themselves men of letters. "In the midst of all this luxury," says Draper, "which cannot be regarded by the historian with disdain since in the end it produced a most important result in the South of France, the Spanish Khalifas emulating the example of their Asiatic compeers, and in this strongly contrasting with the Popes of Rome, were not only the patrons, but personal cultivators of all the branches of human learning. One of them was himself the author of a work on polite literature in not less than fifty volumes; another wrote a treatise on Algebra." In India, also, certain Moghul monarchs were great litterateurs and have left, like Baber, Humayun, Jehangir and Aurangzeb, classical works of great merit. Their successor in Hyderabad (Deccan) even to-day, is a poet,

in Persian and Urdu both, and has raised as a monument of his literary taste a novel university in India called the Jamia Osmania at the cost of a very large sum of money, which, though quite up-to-date, does all the teaching in the Urdu language—the *lingua franca* of India—which is one of the three sweetest languages of the world. All other modern universities of India have adopted English for their teaching medium.

Because all the Muslim culture was based on the God-idea the Muslims abominated "the lewdness," says Draper, "of our classical mythology, and denounced indignantly any connexion between the licentious, impure Olympian Jove and the Most High God as an insufferable and unpardonable blasphemy. Haroun-al Rashid had gratified his curiosity by causing Homer to be translated into Syrian, but he did not venture on rendering the great epics into Arabic. Notwithstanding the aversion to our graceful but not unobjectionable ancient poetry, among them originated the Tensons, or poetic disputations, carried afterwards to perfection among the Troubadours ; from them, also, the Provencals learned to employ jongleurs.

"The Khalifa of the West carried out the precepts of Ali, the fourth successor of Muhammad, in the patronage of literature. They established libraries in all their chief towns ; it is said that no fewer than seventy were in existence. To every Mosque was attached a public school, in which the children of the poor were taught to read and write, and instructed in the precepts of the Koran.....The Mohammadan liberality was in striking contrast with the intolerance of Europe." And Draper exclaims, "Indeed it may be asked **whether at this time any European Nation is sufficiently advanced to follow such (Muslim) an example!** In the universities some of the professors of polite literature gave lectures on classical Arabic works; others taught rhetoric, or composition, or mathematics, or astronomy. From these institutions many of the practices observed in our colleges were derived. They held Commencements at which poems were read and orations delivered in the presence of the public. They had also, in addition to these schools of general learning, professional ones, particularly for medicine."

Like that of their culture, the basis of the unique Islamic civilization was also the same Quranic God-idea. The present-day European civilization is admittedly the creature of Islamic civilization, only its basis has been changed, and therefore all spirituality has gone from it. Because the foundation has thus been weakened the whole edifice has lost its beauty, stability and soundness. It has degenerated. It has cankered.

Mr. Paul Robson wrote recently in a London daily: "This is supposed to be a Christian civilization and it is run entirely on

non-Christian principles. It is ruled by those who desire power, who desire money, who believe in force. The ideas that are implicit in every action of the great Powers are a continual offence to the Compassionate Face of God." On 6th July, 1935, in another Paper, Mr. John Solosy wrote: "Two thousand years of Christianity seem to have been in vain since it is the Christian nations who have invented all the modern instruments of war (such as poison gas, fluid fire, etc.) to attack or protect themselves from Christian neighbours and have introduced them to non-Christian peoples."

Regarding the diseases of the cankered civilization of Europe, it has been said elsewhere:—

Undoubtedly Europe is ill—dangerously ill. The moral depravity, the class war, the economic upheavals, the greed of money and of exploitation, the jealous and fiery struggle for supremacy, the cruel blood-sucking of the weak, the mutual envy and suspicion, the relentless fight for the dwindling markets on the one hand and excessive industrial development and sweating factories on the other hand are all unhealthy symptoms.

On the other side the Islamic civilization was magnificent although it was established with lightning speed.

Hershfeld says: "Never has a people been led more rapidly to civilization such as it was, than were the Arabs through Islam."

With the Quranic God-idea the people were not only civilized very quickly, the quality also of their civilization was very high because each individual was God-fearing and bore a high moral character.

It should not be forgotten that Muslim civilization grew up to be an advanced materialistic-cum-spiritualistic civilization. Islam does not highly recommend asceticism or celibacy or a monastic life. The prayer it has taught is: "O our Rabb grant us in this world goodly things and good in the *Akherat*." Islam does not forbid the enjoyment of a good, happy and comfortable life with all the goodly provisions.

The QURAN says:—"O children of Adam take your adornment (go decently dressed) to the Mosque and eat and drink (not fermented liquor) but not in excess. Surely He does not love the extravagant. Say: who has forbidden the adornment (good things) of Allah which He has brought forth (provided in Nature) for his servants (all humanity) and the good provisions . . .

Say: My Lord has forbidden indecencies, such of those as are apparent, and such of those as are hidden, and iniquity, and unjust violence." (vii: 31, 32, 33.)

Well has Maulana Rumi said:

Cheest dunia az Khuda ghafil budan

Nai qimasho, nuqrao, ferzando zun.

What is wordliness ? To be forgetful of God, not the possession of wealth, silver, children or wife.

Muslim civilization was different from the Christian, the Buddhist and the Hindu civilizations.

Christ is said to have declared, "It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God."

Calvin said, "Man was unworthy of earth, and polluted this sacred footstool of God."

It was again declared, "The Kingdom of Christ is not of this world."

The more pious a man was in Christianity the more he withdrew himself from society and civilization. Monastic life was supposed to be the best life.

The same was the case with Buddhists. Self-annihilation was the goal of the best of them. They saw nothing but evil and trouble on this earth. And the Brahmans had gone a step further than that. To them the world itself was a delusion. Nothing was real. They urged *Tyag*—separation from all mundane things. The result was that though India was the land of wise and pious men there were very few emblems of civilization in the land. Humayun laments in his autobiography that it is not possible to get any good fruit in India, nor beautiful flowers, nor fine cloth. He says that there is no good breed of horses—only small ponies; called *tanghans*. He cries out that it is not possible to get even cool iced water. Baber said the same.

The Mango, which Muslims developed into the most delicious fruit of varied palatable tastes in the world, was nothing but a tiny, skinny, stony, sour fruit when Ibne Batuta visited India.

All the delicious Persian fruits and flowers were introduced in India by Muslims. The Emperor Jehangir made a collection of rare animals and birds. So did the last King of Oudh.

Because the most distinguished and indestructible monument of the Islamic Culture was the Holy Quran which Muslims carried wherever they went, their culture and their civilization had a uniformity all over the world. When Muslims conquered India and made it their home they found that the old culture of Upanishad and Vedas had become quite obsolete and was almost dead. They had to introduce their own culture and civilisation which was the best and highest in existence

at that time in that divided and degenerated cultureless and civilisationless country. They produced their own Litteratcurs, authors, philosophers,, poets, teachers, engineers, historians, economists, jurists, medical experts, even moralists and spiritualiss), etc., etc. They invented musical instruments, original songs, and new metres in poetry. They taught geography and chemistry which were unknown to the Indians. They gave numerous delicious new palatable dishes to India. In fact, they made cookery an art and a science. They made many cooling beverages and new scents. They gave new schools in arts and paintings, etc., new style in building and architecture. The Revenue system they introduced has not been improved upon up to the present moment. Even the technical terms like the tahsildar, the amin, the girdawar, the qanungo, the talukdar, etc, etc., have been adopted by the British and are current up to the present moment in the Revenue Department. Muslim ladies, like the famous Nur Jehan, invented beautiful new ornaments made of gold and silver and set with jewels.

In fact all the refinement in silk, cotton and woollen manufacturing and weaving of cloth and spinning, in carpet making, in embroidery, in iron work and brass work or wood carving, etc., etc., etc., was due to Muslims whose workmen and tradespeople and artisans monopolised those trades and professions.

Among the natives of the land those who profited most by the Muslim culture and civilisation were the Kayastha or the Kashmiri Pandits, although it was the Brahmans who had pandered more to the superstitions of the people of the lower castes to keep their supremacy intact and had even almost killed the old medical science of Charaka and others and tried to cure all diseases by enchanting hymns and presenting offerings to gods and goddesses or by Ganges water or worse still by prescribing cow's dung or urine. Up to the present day even the educated Hindus if they are orthodox eat from leaves of plants instead of plates spread on dung-wiped floor and stick to their old "civilisation" thus creating a distinction between the mode of life of a Muslim and a Hindu, even in the same village in thought and belief, etc. Even on the Railway platform one hears the cry of "Hindu tea" and even "Hindu water."

It was the Muslim monarchs who introduced in India even the very preliminary marks and needs of civilization. Among the buildings they have left in India there are such as are recognized to be wonders of the world up to the present day. And there are pleasure gardens which remain unsurpassed up to the present time in their beauty of design and in elegance.

Not in India alone have Muslims of old left the monuments of their civilization. The Khalifas, palaces in Baghdad were marvellous. In Damascus, too, they were wonderful. "In one of these palaces," says Ibne Batuta, the great Muslim world-traveller of old, "a very ingenious clock had been constructed." A bird came out of a niche and left balls corresponding to the hour of the time. In another palace coloured glasses rotated to indicate the time.

Wherever Muslims went they introduced a civilization of the highest possible order.

Cordova in Spain, under Muslim rule, possessed more than two hundred thousand houses and a population of over a million. A man could walk through it in a straight line for ten miles by the light, after sunset, of public lamps. This was at a period seven hundred years after which there was not one public lamp in London—the biggest city of the world to-day. The possession of public lamps was not the only feature of Cordova's civilization. Its streets were solidly paved, but in the town of Paris, which is considered to be the most beautiful town of our days, "whoever stepped over his threshold on a rainy day stepped upto his ankles in deep mud."

And who does not admire the famous Alhambra—the almost only architectural monument left intact out of hundreds by the Vandals who succeeded the Muslim Rulers in Spain ?

Professor Draper thus describes the grandeur of Muslim Palaces and civilization. "Other cities, as Granada, Seville, Toledo, considered themselves rivals of Cordova. The palaces of Khalifas were magnificently decorated. These sovereigns might well look down with supercilious contempt on the dwellings of the rulers of Germany, France and England which were scarcely better than stables, chimneyless, windowless and with a hole in the roof for the smoke to escape, like the wigwams of certain Indians. The Spanish Muhammadans had brought with them all the luxuries and prodigalities of Asia. Their residences stood forth against the clear blue sky, or were embosomed in woods. They had polished marble balconies, overhanging orange gardens; courts with cascades of water, shady retreats provocative of slumber in the heat of the day; retiring-rooms vaulted with stained glass, speckled with gold, over which streams of water were made to gush; the floors and walls were of exquisite mosaic. Here a fountain of quicksilver shot up in a glistening spray, the glittering particles falling with a tranquil sound like fairy bells; there, apartments into which cool air was drawn from the flower-gardens, in summer, by means of ventilating towers and in winter through earthen pipes (even metal pipes were not unknown) or caleducts,

imbedded in the walls—the hypocaust, in the vaults below, breathing forth volumes of warmed and perfumed air through these hidden passages. The walls were not covered with wainscot, but adorned with arabesques, and paintings of agricultural scenes and views of Paradise. From the ceilings covered with fretted gold, great chandeliers hung, one of which, it is said, was so large that it contained 1,804 lamps. Clusters of frail marble columns surprised the beholder with the vast weight they bore. In the boudoirs of the sultanas they were sometimes of verde-antique, and incrusted with lapis-lazuli. The furniture was of sandal and citron wood, inlaid with mother-of-pearls, ivory, silver, or relieved with gold and precious malachite. In orderly confusion were arranged vases of rock crystal, Chinese porcelains and tables of exquisite mosaic. The winter apartments were hung with rich tapestry; the floors were covered with embroidered Persian carpets. Pillows and couches of elegant forms were scattered about the rooms, perfumed with frankincense. Since the representation of the human form was religiously forbidden, and that source of decoration denied, the imagination of the Saracen architect ran riot with the complicated arabesques they introduced and sought every opportunity of replacing the prohibited works of art by the trophies and rarities of the garden. For this reason the Arabs never produced artists; religion turned them from the beautiful and made them soldiers, philosophers and men of affairs. Splendid flowers and rare exotics ornamented the courtyards and even the inner chambers. Great care was taken to make due provision for the cleanliness, occupation and amusements of the inmates. Pipes of metal, water, both warm and cold to suit the season of the year, ran into baths of marble. In niches, where the current of the air could be artificially directed hung dropping alcarazzas. There were whispering galleries for the amusement of the women, labyrinths and play-courts for the children; for the master himself grand libraries . . . No nation has ever excelled the Spanish Arabs for the beauty and costliness of their pleasure gardens. To them we owe the introduction of very many of our most valuable cultivated fruits, such as the peach."

This description of the one phase of Islamic civilization by Dr. Draper goes on giving further details of Muslim Spain. Only in one respect has Draper misunderstood the Muslim point. He says: "Religion turned them from the beautiful". It was not so. Religion in fact created in those children of the desert, who had been deprived of almost all natural beauties—the acacia and the palm being probably the only trees in the country, and the horse and the camel the only animals to fondle and admire—a sense of beauty in all things which no other nation, not even the Persians, surpassed. The Arabs in Spain, or the Turks in Asia Minor, were

great admirers of human beauty also. It is not at all right to say that Muslims did not produce artists. What they did not produce was an artist who painted human portraits or made human statues. Otherwise Muslims made fine art the most remarkable part of their civilization. Even in their architecture they have introduced a decorative art of their own. It is quite distinctive. Certain ignorant people have alleged that that miracle in marble, the Taj Mahal of Agra, was built by Italians. An intelligent man need only go and see the front gate of the Taj to detect the contemptible lie of the allegation. Let him only see the calligraphic decoration of a verse from the Holy Quran inserted so beautifully in the decorations: It is distinctly Arabic: It is inimitable: It also indicates that Muslim civilization had its foundation in Islam—on the Quranic God-idea.

However, by giving this detailed description of the material civilization of Muslims it is not meant to say that no other nation developed a material civilization. What is meant is that though Muslim civilization had reached *a very high point materially* it was still under the control of a moral influence. While in Europe the material civilization developed *in spite of Christianity* the camel drivers of Arabia became the pioneers of a grand and glorious civilization *because of Islam*. And it was for this reason, that though it was material, it always remained based upon morality and spirituality.

The moral tone of Muslim Society and Civilization was set by the Quranic verses such as the following:—

"And help one another, in virtue and piety, and do not help one another, in sin and transgression; and be careful of (your duty to) Allah; surely Allah is severe in requiting evil." (v: 2.)

"Lo, Allah enjoins justice, and kindness, and giving to kinsfolk; and forbids lewdness and abomination and wickedness. He admonishes you, that you may be mindful." (xvi: 19.)

"Surely Allah is with those who guard (against evil), and those who do good (to others)." (xci: 121.)

"The believers are but brothers, therefore make peace between your brethren, and be careful of (your duty to) Allah that mercy may be bestowed on you." (xli: 10.)

"O you who believe! Let not a community deride another community; perchance they may be better than themselves: nor let women laugh at (other) women, perchance they may be better than themselves; nor defame one another, nor insult one another by nicknames. Bad is the name of lewdness after faith, and who does not turn (in repentance or apology), such are the unjust." (xlix: 11.)

"O you who believe avoid most of suspicions, for surely suspicion in some cases is a sin, and do not spy, or pry (into others' affairs), nor let some of you backbite others. Does anyone of you like to eat the flesh of his dead brother? But you would abhor that, (so why not abhor the other). And be careful of (your duty to) Allah. Surely Allah is forgiving, Merciful." (xlix: 12.)

"And follow not that, of which you have not the knowledge; surely the hearing and the sight and the heart, all of these shall be questioned about it." (xvii: 36.)

"And not alike are the good deed and the evil deed. Repel the evil deed with one which is better; then lo, he, between whom and those there was enmity (will become) as though he were a warm friend.

But none attain to this save men steadfast in patience, and none attain to this save the possessors of great good fortune." (xli: 34, 35.)

"The requital of an ill-deed is punishment the like thereof: but whoever *forgiveth and reformeth* (the evildoer) thereby he shall have his reward from Allah; surely (Allah) loveth not wrong-doers." (xlii: 40.)

"And there is life for you in (the law of) retaliation,. O men of understanding, that ye may ward off (evil)." (II: 179.)

"And surely we shall try you with something of fear and hunger, and loss of wealth, and lives, and fruits, but bear glad tidings to the patient.

Who when a misfortune befalleth them, they say: We are Allah's and unto Him shall we return.

Such are they on whom are blessings from their Lord, and mercy: and they are the rightly guided." (II: 154, 155.)

Muslim civilization had no room for street women or for men of licentious habits. It had no need for "Barnardo Homes" and "Penitentiaries." "Unmarried mothers" and "war babies," both were unknown to Muslim civilization. Passion-exciting Tango dances or "nudist" dresses were disallowed. Animal-like, free intermixing of sexes was discouraged. Public decency was strongly urged. Gambling was not permitted. Drunkenness was stopped.

While Bolshevism, like Islam, has purged human society and civilization of exploiters, "corner-makers," monopolists, blood-sucking, usurious capitalists and leech-like dukes, drunken lords, slave-drivers and merciless sweating employers; *unlike* Islam it has failed to purge civilization of drunkenness, debauchery

and gambling, which Rev. Taylor calls "the three curses of Christian lands." On the contrary, Bolshevism in this respect has followed Christianity, *not* Islam. Instead of removing these vices from modern civilization Bolshevism has, by its own lack of morality, increased them. Bolshevised Russia is much worse in this respect than any Christian land.

"There are," writes a pro-Bolshevist eye-witness (Marcus Hindus), "nation-wide complaints of drunkenness of proletarians . . . and even of petty larceny . . . Sex life is now nowhere regulated by law in Russia. There is no adultery in the Russian legal code. . . . virginity topples down like a heap of snow by a rock . . . . chastity as a principle and a practice, as a canon and a custom, in and of itself, ceases in Russia to have any meaning, any virtue, any glory . . . . .

"Groups of youth plunged into an orgy or excess. They did not care. They had no God to frighten them. They had no parents to control them. They had no teachers to restrain them. They had no public opinion to bother about. They had only immediate impulse to consider. They did not stop to weigh the consequences—personal or social . . . . .

"The Russians are in danger of sinking into a morass of 'animality.' There are women in Russia who make a practice of inveigling high salaried men into cohabitation so that they can receive fat allowances for the child and when they have snared several such men they are assured of a good income and their worries are over. . . . Indeed the attempt to reforge the sex morality and family relations . . . . . has whirled to the surface of Russian life a host of monstrosities.

"It is unsafe to leave anything unguarded in one's seat even for a brief enough period to buy a newspaper or an apple. Typewriters and suit-cases have to be buckled with chain to the arm . . . . .

"Often there is a Communist who does not hesitate to use his privileged position to settle a personal grudge or extort for himself benefits at the expense of others."

So if they are fair, the Bolsheviks must acknowledge their inferiority to Muslims as Christians like the Revs. Talyor and Stephens have admitted that "Islam has done more for civilization than Christianity."

Stanley Lane-Poole says: "Students flocked from France, Germany and England and drank from the fountain of learning which flowed only in the cities of the Moors. . . . In the practice of war no less than in arts of peace they long stood supreme." He

further says: "Whatsoever makes a kingdom great and prosperous, whatsoever tends to refinement and civilization was found in Muslim Spain."

As to the comparative excellence and superiority of the Islamic civilization and culture, the Writer of these pages made the following remarks on 24th May, 1918, at a public meeting called in London "to protest against the disregard by the Peace Conference of the vital questions affecting Islam."

We are proud of our civilization. It compares favourably with even the most modern civilization. In certain respects it is decidedly superior. Our civilization secured the happiness not only of the rich but also of the poor. Capitalism and dukedoms both were unknown to it. It was based on co-operation, not competition. It eased the natural struggle for existence, not embittered it. It was international, not limited to mere nationalism or patriotism. It preached sympathy and assistance for the weak and the poor and did not prompt the desire to trample them or exploit them. It established universal brotherhood and was not fettered by distinctions of race, colour or country. It brought forward men sober and straight, not drunken or deceitful. And above all it taught men to worship One Loving and Living God and not to worship the goblins of gold or the demons of dollar.

As to arts and sciences, Europe owes the Muslims a deep debt. Chemistry, by the help of which European nations invented asphyxiating gases and tear shells to kill their own brothers, was our science. We taught Europe arithmetic, trigonometry, algebra. We founded libraries and colleges and observatories. We introduced many medicines, instituted hospitals, even with lady-doctors and nurses, in Europe. It was the admirals of these very Turks whom Europe wants to destroy who taught Europe (Venice was then called the Queen of the Sea) how to organise navies on scientific lines. We invented the compass and the clock. Arsenal, magazine, admiral, are our words which Europe has borrowed, and so are many words of science, astronomy and art.

This superiority of the civilization of Islam over that of Christianity as well as of Bolshevism is due to nothing but to the fact that the Islamic civilization is based on the Quranic God-idea. Writes Deutsch: **"By the aid of the Quran** the Arabs conquered a world greater than that of Alexander the Great, greater than that of Rome, and in as many tens of years as the latter had wanted hundreds to accomplish her conquest; by the aid of the Quran they, above all the Shemites, came to Europe as Kings, whither the Phoenicians had come as tradesmen, and the Jews as fugitives or captives. They came to Europe to hold up,

together with these fugitives, the light to humanity ; they alone, while darkness lay around, to raise up the wisdom and knowledge of Hellas from the dead, to teach philosophy, medicine, astronomy, and the golden art of song to the West as to the East, to stand at the cradle of modern sciences, and to cause us late epigoni for ever to weep over the day when Granada fell."

Anatole France writes in his *La Vie en Fleur*:—

"The most tragic event in history is that of the Battle of Tours when the science, the art, and the civilization of Arabia fell back before the barbarism of the Frank."

Upto this day a true Muslim can walk with a superiority complex and an erected head in the streets of Paris or of London as in those of Moscow or Leningrad unpolluted by the evils with which the modern materialistic civilization, Bolshevik or Christian, has impregnated those places. He will look down with contempt on the drinking booths, the gambling dens, the street solicitations and the prostitution hovels in Christian Europe or in Bolshevik Russia. He will be justified in "taking airs" with a high head at both places.

The truth is that Islamic civilization based on the Quranic God-idea reached a standard which was far higher than that of any civilized nation known to the East or the West. Just as honest Westerners have admitted this fact so have Easterners. We quote from Dr. U. N. Muckerji of India, in "A Dying Race" as follows:—

"The superiority of the bulk of Mohammadans is entirely due to the religious revival and the systematic moral training that they impart to every member of the community." The same author writes further on: "The Mohammadans have a future, and they believe in it. We Hindus have no conception of it. Time is with them—time is against us. At the end of the year they count their gains. We calculate our losses. They are growing in strength, growing in wealth, growing in solidarity, we are crumbling to pieces. They look forward to a united Mohammadan world —we are waiting for our extinction."

The fact is that all thinking peoples, whether non-Muslim Asians or Europeans and Americans themselves do not put their own civilization as a model now.

Not long ago a Christian European Governor of a large province in India (recently raised to a peerage) said: "I do not know how far America has arrived at the stage of self-criticism but in Europe, at all events, we are increasingly out of love with our own civilization. . . . It (the European civilization)

certainly has much also which would have to be purged away before we could commend it as a model to be followed by others."

As regards the American view of present civilization the *Signs of the Time* writes :—

"There is a trinity of evil practices abroad in the world to-day and all of these are hell-bent; Salacious literature which has so amazingly increased in volume and daring since the War (probably nowhere more than in Bolshevik Russia); the motion picture with its erotic theme and eternally warring triangles ; and the lowered moral standard of women as revealed in their dress, or lack of it, their increasing use of the cigarette and the promiscuous familiarities with men as "necking" and "petting parties." . . . . . These three are increasingly with us and they mean deterioration and destruction of Christian society and civilization. Unless they are checked, our history will parallel Rome and those other nations of history whose lust and passion sent them with their wine, women and song to the gates of hell and oblivion" . . . . .

That the corruption of the society life of America is in no way lesser than in Europe or in Bolshevik Russia is revealed by the following statistics :—

Five million acts of prostitution are being committed every day in America, ninety-eight per cent. of the prostitutes are venereally affected; 225,000 illegitimate children are born annually in New York alone. A million and a half of unborn babies are murdered every year in America ! 2,800,000 cases of syphilis are treated annually !

No nation in the East has profited so much by the materialistic and scientific advancement on modern lines as has Japan but even the Japanese Nation has got disgusted with the Western civilization.

One of the causes of the dismal tragedy on 25th February, 1936, in which eighty persons, including several ministers, were murdered, was the dissatisfaction of the young Japanese with "the Western fashions, notably dancing, cinema and dress, corrupting Japanese youth."

It would be better for the Bolsheviks to follow Islam in respect of their culture and civilization also, as they have done in several other respects mentioned in Part I of this Book.

Islamic society and civilization had not only a high moral tone, they also had a communistic structure of great beneficence and just as their being based upon the Quranic God-idea was responsible for their culture and civilisation being refined, moral and spiritual, so the same basis was responsible for carrying their communism to the most high level and character.

The best qualification which made Muslims fit for a communistic society was:

"They prefer others before themselves though poverty may afflict them and whoever is preserved from the covetousness of his own soul; those only shall prosper." (lix: 9.)

It was the conquest over egotism and a regard for the whole of humanity that made every individual Muslim voluntarily and instinctively a Communist. No force, no compulsion, was needed as it had been found necessary by the Bolsheviks for bringing Russian Muzhiks (peasants) to Kolhoiz (collective farming) or for removing the covetousness of individuals for property and money. While the Bolsheviks are trying to break up the family system itself and expect thus to induce people to give up their natural affection for their own relations so as to accept strangers as partners, Islam, because the pivot of all its reforms was the Quranic God-idea, *enlarged the family circle to its greatest limit* so that a Muslim included in his family all humanity—in fact, all the creatures of God. Thus no stranger was left—*all became brothers.* The fundamental principle upon which this grand Communism, this universal brotherhood equipoised itself was: *"All God's creatures are his family and he is the most beloved to God who strieth to do most good to God's creatures."* This was the magical formula to make all people black or brown, coloured or discoloured, Europeans or Africans, Asians or Americans, members of one family tied together with the bonds of brotherly affection as the children of the One and the Only Allah—Evolver, Cherisher, Sustainer. *Thus was Islamic communism based upon the God-idea.* The Prophet's own words are:—

الخلق كلهم عيال الله فاحبهم الفعهم لعياله (Anas and Abdullah in Bukhari.)

The Quran declared *"Innamal Mominuna ikhvatan"*—Surely all Believers are brothers. (xlix: 10.)

It was not a verbal declaration alone. The Prophet when he went as an exile to Medina with a few of his followers and when he found helpers (*ansars*) in this town he linked each exile (*muhajir*) with each helper (*ansar*) into an *actual brotherhood.*

In verse 13 of Sura xlix the brotherhood of man has been laid down on the broadest basis. All men are reminded that they have been born of a male and a female as if they were members of one family and their division into families and tribes and nations must not cause estrangement but a desire to know each other better.

No wonder that Muhammad's Communism has proved to be everlasting and perfectly Collective. It is in truth a superior Communism altogether. The whole of humanity

could bind itself under it not only as one community, one nation, but as one family, one brotherhood. Not only the greatest good of the largest number in a country was to be the object of the life of every individual but of all the people in the world.

It must not be considered that the greatest good of the Muslim peoples alone of the world was to be kept in view but *of all the creatures of God*—Muslims or non-Muslims. The God of the Qur-an is *not* the God of Muslims only. He is the *Rabbul-alamin*, the Evolver and the Sustainer *of the people of all the worlds*. A Muslim who does not act rightly should have no expectations at all of being favoured either in this world or in the next. As long as Muslims acted rightly, as long as they followed the Islamic principles, they were helped by God—they prospered and they were always victorious;: They triumphed also mentally and intellectually: They possessed all the comforts: They conquered vast Empires: Their communistic organisation gave them remarkable solidarity. Pivoted on the Islamic Conception of God, the Muslim Nation made not only a miraculous progress in evolving a most refined and intellectual civilization and culture, it also succeeded in democratising the whole basis of man's social and political institutions. The spirit of affection for his fellow-beings, and a tolerance unknown before the Prophet Muhammad, was inculcated in every individual which made him the most advanced Communist, and all barriers of race, country, colour and even creed were demolished. While every other religious, or even Party, system including the Communist Party in Russia, is required to be intolerant to other creeds and parties, Islam gloriously declares that *all* religions were based on truth, that *all* the people of the earth had God-sent prophets and guides, and that to whatever religion, party, school and persuasion we may belong we should have no fear if we believe in the Creator, in our accountability after death and if we *act aright*. *Innal lazina aminu vallazina hadu vassabiuna vannasara man amana billahe valyyaumil akhire vaamila salihan fala khaufun alahim vala hum yahzanun.* (v: 69.)

While up to this day a negro is lynched in "the most advanced and cultured country"—America, a negro slave in the time of the Holy Prophet was given the highest place in the Mosque to call the Muslims to prayers and a slave's son was made the commander-in-chief of an army which had in its ranks men of the bluest blood. It was this purging of all prejudices against one another from the minds of all individuals and the establishment of a brotherhood of all the people under one Omniscient and Omnipresent God—the *Rabbul-alamin*—which gave a communistic tone to all that was Islamic—to the Islamic Faith, the Islamic culture, the Islamic civilization, and the Islamic society, the Islamic administration and the Islamic constitution,

But the most miraculous achievement of the Prophet was making the God-idea the basis of scientific progress.

We have cited Draper as a witness that—"Not one of the purely mathematical, or mixed or practical sciences was omitted by the Arabs."

How was this love of scientific investigation created in the minds of Muslims at a time when the learning of science was considered a sin and ended in the murder and even burning alive of scholars and scientists by Christians and Europeans ?

This was done by laying down the principles, that an all-powerful, all-knowing God was the "Author of the Universe," that this universe was not brought into existence in vain, that laws, unalterable except by His own free-will, were laid down for working it, that a demarcation has been made or a measure has been prefixed by God Himself for the use of man of everything which can be either beneficial or harmful to him as good or evil (*wal qadri kharahi va sharrihi minnal Lahe ta ala*) and that man has been given intelligence and reason to find out the good and evil propensities and a free will, under certain limitations, to use them as he chooses. "The right way," says the Quran, "has been distinguished from the wrong one and he who adopts the wrong way is for his own harm."

Man could profit himself greatly if he could find out the right measure of good in everything. He could even use a deadly poison to his own good if he had learnt how to use it properly and in due measure. The Quran declares:—"Surely we have created everything according to a measure." (54 : 49.)

There is no disease which has not a cure. Life-destroying herbs grow side by side with life-giving ones watered by the same rain, nourished by the same air and the same light. Everything depends upon man's investigations—upon the acquirement of knowledge by him. The deeper and wider the knowledge, the more advantages he will be able to draw for himself from all the things in nature. All that is in the heavens and earth is at his disposal. The Quran says:—"And He has made subservient to you whatsoever is in the heavens and the earth, all from Himself. Most surely are signs in this for people who deliberate (use their intelligence)." (45 : 13.) It is for man to find out what are the good capacities or propensities or properties of a thing or an action and what are the evil ones. He will have to be active, he will have to brush up his intelligence, he will have to make a research so as to be able to use a thing for his own good—for the good of humanity.

The great factory of Nature is constantly at work on fixed laws, with a set purpose. The clouds float in the air. The

burning sun rotates on its axis. (*Vashshams tajri li mustaqarin laha*, was revealed over thirteen centuries ago.) The moon goes round the earth, the earth round the sun. The Solar system, the law of gravity and repulsion have their own objects. A Muslim poet has beautifully and very appropriately said:—

Abro bado maho khurshid hama der kar und
Ta tu nancy ba kaf ari vo ba ghaflat na khuri.

The clouds and the air, the moon and the sun all are at work, so that Thou (O man) should *labour* for thy bread and not eat it in laziness.

A man is expected to be the vice-regent of Almighty God Himself on earth. He is not to sit idle. He should find out the laws and the mysteries and the hidden secrets of the earth and the atmosphere. His Al-Rahman (All-Beneficent God) has anticipated his wants. By natural processes, which worked for thousands of millions of years, coal-fields have been preserved in the bosom of the earth. While the properties of coal could be turned into an industrial boon those of coal-gas were fatal for man. Man had thus to find out the pre-set or prefixed measures of both coal and gas.

Muslims were told by God Himself through His last Prophet that scientific knowledge was the best gift of God. *Yutil hikmata manyasha va manyatal hikmata faqad ootiya khairan kasira.* (ii : 269.)

Thus was an incentive for scientific researches provided by the God-idea of Islam and thus was a scientific temper and sense created. Early Muslims, being true to their faith, engaged themselves in scientific activities to find out the right measure of everything for their use. They were also instructed to travel by land and by sea (*fa seeru fil ardh*, iii : 136). They were told to make subservient to themselves the air, the water, even the sun and the moon.

Alas! after having taught Europe to find out the laws of Nature and to use natural things to their advantage, Muslims plunged into a death-like sleep. They became idle, and, worse of all, unthinking. In the meantime, Europe proved itself to be an industrious but *wicked* pupil so that Sa'adi, the greatest poet-teacher of the world, had to cry out:—

Kas nayamokht ilme tir as man
Ki mara aquibat nishana na kird

"No body learnt the art of archery from me, but he used ultimately myself as a target."

Europeans, after having taken lessons from Muslims for about a thousand years, have been attacking them ruthlessly

for the last three or four centuries. They have taken away from them, by force of arms, almost all their territories, all their riches. And worst of all, they have imposed upon them an inferiority complex. This they could do because the Muslims in their sleep lost all consciousness of their *past*. The Muslims forgot that they were the "torch-bearers," as honest Europeans themselves admit, when Europeans groped in the dismal darkness of bigotry, superstition and ignorance.

In the early days of Islam, the Quranic God-idea had become the actuating motive for all culture and civilization and even for love of territorial conquests.

Mahmud of Ghazni infused his soldiers with the idea that he was invading India to destroy idols and to establish the Unity of God. With this idea the soldiers underwent sufferings which they could not have accepted with any other idea.

Before Mahmud, in the sixty-second year of Hijra (683 A.C.) when the Muslim Commander Okba-bin-Nafai, arrived at the extreme Maghrib on the Atlantic shores, he rode his steed into the waves of the ocean and cried, "O God! if the waters of this ocean did not prevent me I would have gone on to the lands beyond (to America) to claim the Glory of Thy name."

Osman, the father of the Ottoman Turks, the predecessor of the "Ata-Turk," had also the same ambition. He called his son Orchan to his deathbed and said : "Lean not on tyranny . . . . . cultivate justice . . . . promote the learned to honours so the Divine Law shall be established. . . . . Glory not in thy armies, nor pride thyself in thy riches. Keep near thy person the learned in the Shariat (Divine Law) and as justice is the support of kingdoms, turn from everything repugnant . . . . The Divine Law is our sole aim and our progress is only in the path of the Lord . . . . . Embark not on vain undertakings or fruitless contentions. For it is not our ambition to enjoy the empire of the world, but the propagation of the Faith was my particular desire which therefore it becomes thee to accomplish."

How wonderful indeed it is that the Quranic God-idea inspired every Muslim with heroic deeds in every walk of life and brought out the best of every people! These very Turks! What were they before they were imbued with that Quranic God-idea? They worshipped the "White Wolf", and behaved like white wolves. They were a scourge wherever they went. They knew nothing but destruction. They were best known as free-booters. Even sweet Hafiz calls them that. They were not much known then to Europe, but in the East, Turk was a synonym for savagery and barbarism.

But soon after that they became Muslims, they became great empire-builders and the God-idea brought into them very noble qualities. Their barbarism changed into nobleness. From Halaku they became Muhammad the Conqueror, and Sulaiman the Magnificent. In our book "*A Defence of Islam's Standard Bearers*" which was "a close and critical study of the question of the Muslim Ottoman Empire with reference to the memorandum of the Ottoman Delegates and its reply by the '*Council of Ten*' at Paris," a book which was admitted to be one of the causes of the new life in the vanquished Turks, we enumerated the qualities of the Turks which were a gift of Islam to them. We wrote on page 88 : "Who would not be proud of a race that is the most virtuous in the world, that is sober, truthful, brave, gentle, religious, persevering, forbearing, collected and calm, disciplined and devoted, hardy and robust and trustworthy, free from all cunning, low meanness of every kind."

From wild freebooters, Islam changed them into noble empire-builders and "perfect gentlemen."

The present trend of those who hold authority in modern Turkey, who lay so much stress upon secularism and who do not encourage religious teachings for youth is beyond the comprehension of every well-wisher of theirs. Do they want to make the Turks again a curse as they were before they came under the influence of the Quranic idea of God ?

The Turks have very foolishly "torn off much of their living flesh, doing violence to their own traditional culture." Let us pray that this self-inflicted wound, which is an unnecessarily inflicted wound, *because every beneficial reform could have been undertaken under Islam*, will not become incurable or poisoned by the self-destroying materialism of the West, and a nation numbering only six or seven million souls will not cut herself away from a body of six hundred and eighty-five millions spread all over the world who felt a pride in the Turkish nation even when that nation was in a state of decay.

How sincerely the 685 millions would have welcomed that Nation of 6 millions, as their leader and exemplar now that, due to its own great leader, Ghazi Mustafa Kamal, Turkey was on an onward march of progress and power, and how big that Nation of six millions would herself have felt of its world position as the leader of 685 millions of people, can well be imagined !

(d) The Quranic God-idea prompts Social Service.

One other of the *most* unique characteristics of Islam is that unlike all other religions it does not lay much stress upon formalities.

The Quran plainly warns : *Laisal birra an tuvallu vujoohakum qiblal mashriqe val maghribe.* It is not righteousness (or piety) that you turn your faces in Prayers towards the East and West. (ii : 177)

Then, as to belief, the Quran expects a Muslim, if he is righteous, to believe in all that every other monotheistic religion offers for belief, and continues the above verse with the words which mean: "But the righteousness is belief in Allah, and the last day, and the angels and the Book and the Prophets."

However the *mere belief* is *not* enough. It is no use our saying that we believe in one God, and in all the Prophets sent by Him. God is self-sufficient. To Him it does not matter whether one of His creatures, even though he be the one to whom he has given greater intelligence than to any other creature, believes in Him or not. Nor does it help man much whether he accepts the scientific God-idea or not. Whether there is a first cause or not; whether this world was created or evolved; are mere academic questions. They are not of much help to man in his daily life. Nor does our repeating certain *mantras*, hymns or prayers, nor our attending temples, synagogues, churches or mosques in itself make us righteous. The crux, the chief point, the essential of being righteous, and pious, and good is to *act aright* (*Amela Salehan*) and be a benefactor (*Mohsinun*) for others. So the above given verse of the Quran describing the qualities of the righteous runs: '*Va atial mal ala hubbehi zavil qurba val yatama valmasakeena va ibnassabila vas saileena va firreqab. Va aqamas salata va ataz zakat val mufuna be ahdihim iza ahadu vassabireena fil basae vazarrai va heenal base. Olaekal lazina sadaqu va olaika humul muttaqun.* (And give away wealth out of love for Him to the near of kin, orphans and the needy and the wayfarer and the supplicants and for the captives and keep up prayer and pay *zakat*; and the performers of the promise when they make a promise, and the patient in distress and affliction and in time of conflict; these are they who are true and these are they who are righteous. (ii : 177.)

The Quran is replete with such injunctions for Social Service as above. One other verse runs as follows:—"And serve Allah, and associate naught with Him. And be good to parents, and relatives and orphans, and the needy, and the neighbour who is a kin of yours and the alien neighbour and the companion in a journey and the wayfarer, and whom your right hand possess (the employed or workers under you). Surely Allah does not love the proud, vainglorious." (iv : 36.)

What a great and wide field for Social Service has been indicated in the above passages and in many other places in the Quran! In fact the Quran has left out *not one case* which needs sympathy, help and kindness. And what a grand and noble character a man must possess to be called righteous or pious! Mere repetition of certain phrases will not do.

The two words "*ala Hubbihi*," for His love, base the devotion to social service also upon the Quranic God-idea. It elevates our Social Service to the distressed portions of humanity to the highest plane of selflessness. It means that we should do good to others even if we do not expect any return from them, even if we have to undergo some kind of sacrifice on our part. We should be good to others for Allah's sake, not for selfish ends. It is our own Cherisher and Sustainer whose love demands from us goodness to our fellow-creatures. It is a duty assigned by God Himself. If we desire that God may be helpful and merciful to us and accept our worship we *must* be helpful and merciful to our fellow-creatures who need our help.

The Quran has repeatedly put the question, what harm can a belief in Allah do to any person? And we ask all the peoples, particularly our Bolshevik friends, why do you not worship *the* God—Allah—Whose worship makes it *essential* to engage in the most extensive, beneficial and sincere Social Services to all humanity and which gives a remarkable strength and nobility to the human character to make him the best and worthiest citizen of a socialist, a communist Society and State, and the most humanitarian and useful member of a world-wide international Brotherhood? Why? Why? and again Why?

That, without the Quranic God-idea as the basis, any effort for Social Service will often fail to achieve its real object—the happiness and contentment of all the peoples of this earth, has been very recently demonstrated in no other place more than in Russia —the Bolshevist Russia. Who can say that the Bolshevists were not actuated by the best of motives to *Kolhoize* the whole of Russia so as to have collective farms spread all over the land instead of having single peasants or Koolaks? But those persons, mostly young and atheistic who were entrusted with this work of *Dekoolakization* caused such blood curdling misery to hundreds of thousands, rather millions, of people,—Russia's own citizens, that instead of Kolhoization becoming a boon, it has been a real curse to a multitude of people.

In future this Collective Farming plan may prove very beneficial to the Russian people but does the loss and suffering it has caused to millions of Russian citizens, because it was carried out without God, make it worth while? Will any other country try it for itself after what has happened in Russia in enforcing it? The present generation has been sacrificed for the future. But who knows of the future? If during this very generation a war takes place depriving the present-day reformers of their power and the *Dekolohoization* takes place as has *Dekoolakization*, poor Russia, then, will become only a battle-field of blood instead of a land which is an example for all others in Social Services.

The moral of the tragedy of *Kolhoization* in Russia is that, power, even if it be for the Social Service, in the hands of young men whose animal passions are not controlled by the Quranic God-idea, is likely to prove injurious to Society instead of being helpful. Suppose those young men had been taught to believe that they owed it to their Omnipresent and Omnipotent God not to hurt His creatures, then even if they had themselves thought *Kolhoization* to be a blessing for some people or for the State they would have taken all possible care to prevent its doing harm to such a large number of other peoples and to carry out the plan of *Kolhoization* in a way that would have avoided injury. All personal elements would also have been discarded and the work of *Kolhoization* would have been carried out only with one object—the good of the people themselves, for the love of God alone—"*ala Hubbihi*" as the Quran puts it.

Blessed be the soul of Muhammad, who remains undoubtedly the *best* product of the millions of years' revolution of the earth for having given such a beneficent Conception of God as is helpful in our every-day life, and forms our character and makes us helpful members of Society.

Islam is really *the* religion of Social Service. It assigns to every individual person a two-fold duty—(1) *Haqul-Lah*, duty to God, (2)—*Haqulibad*, duty to fellow-men. The two always go together. *Va aqimus salat va atuz zakat* (attend to prayer and be charitable) are the repeated joint instructions in the Quran. The very God-idea in Islam is such that a person is induced to attend to his duty to the creatures of God, his fellow-beings, in no way less than to his duty to his Creator. It is God Himself who has made it incumbent upon man not to be neglectful of his duty to fellow-men. Thus duty to God includes duty to man. If a Muslim does not engage himself in Social Service he will then be wanting in his duty to God and will be accountable for it.

God Himself has said : "My mercy encompasseth all." More than this ; God Himself has said that He has ordained upon himself to be Merciful. The Prophet has assured every Muslim that no mother loves her offspring more than God loves His creatures. So if we neglect our duty to Him, for instance, if we neglect our prayers (and mind, even our fixed prayers are for our own and Society's good—not only spiritual but also mundane) we may expect that God in His all-encompassing mercy will be pleased to forgive us. But if we have neglected any duty towards any man—for example, if we have made some wrong use of any property or money entrusted to us, or if we have neglected our children, or our wife, or our old parents or if we have not done our duty to Society or to the State then the All-Merciful

but just God will *not* forgive us unless and until we have obtained the forgiveness of the person or persons injured. Thus it will be seen that good acts of Social Service are most obligatory for a True Believer—a Muslim, and he must not neglect any of them. And what a wide field of Social Service and charity has been indicated by the Prophet! He has said that our showing the way to a wayfarer is a charity : Our clearing the path of thorns and nails is a charity ; Our gladdening an afflicted heart and smiling to a depressed fellow-being is a charity.

The most wonderful part of beneficence the Quranic God-idea plays in this broadest possible notion of charity, is that, because of that idea, we are induced **voluntarily**, without the help of any secular law or rules, to be charitable and to be engaged in the Social Service.

Let all Social reformers, statesmen and legislators come together and think over the best means of making good citizens of any well-conducted State, and they will find that they have no other course but of creating fear in their minds of a police force and of very strict and rigid secular laws. Even then, the dread of the police and the respect for the law will not serve the purpose of instilling in men all the qualities of a good citizen. What will make one feel that he must try to remove sorrow from the heart of a man who has suffered some recent loss or calamity ?

It is Islam and Islam alone that has invented means to create in man such feelings as to make him best qualified to be a *voluntary* and sincerely sympathetic Social Worker and a helpful citizen of a Socialist State. Islam has done this by making Social Service an inalienable ingredient of the worship of an All-merciful, All-beneficent, All-good, All-seeing, All-knowing God Whose own family the whole of mankind is. When we do our duty to our fellow-beings out of love of such a God, then and then alone that performance of our duty will become a part of our very existence, of our very life, of our very breath—no Police force, no secular laws, no fear of Society, no greed of reward or recompense will be needed to make us good citizens. We will all become then Muslims, and according to the Prophet a Muslim is one from whom everybody is safe.

Then and then alone it will be possible to form a perfect Communistic Society and State as it was in the time of Omar, the Great Distinguisher between right and wrong.

The Prophet himself declared under the Divine inspiration that Islam was a perfected Faith (Din). But the past thirteen centuries and more have proved that Islam is also perfect as a Social and Political Institution.

The Social services enumerated by the Quran itself do not need any additions. Not only Social services have been fully described but ways and means have also been indicated how best to perform those Social services. The *Zakat* Fund has been provided to meet the expenses for the Social services by the State. In the same way a machinery has been provided under Islam itself to carry on the political administration of the country. *Bait-ul-mal*, or National Fund, has been instituted to meet the Political and General needs of the State and the Nation. **Islam is self-sufficient and self-contained.**

We take the liberty to assure the Bolshevists that they will never be able to solve the social problems that agitate men to-day through economics or by the help of science alone. They will not be able to solve even the question of poverty which is so near to their heart and which is undeniably their best and noblest object, by means of science. They will not be able to help even materially the worker or the peasant by means of science.

Surely workers cannot bless science when it produces automatic machinery to do away with thousands of workers at the time when "the demand of Labour tends to exceed supply and thus enable the worker to command better wages" or "what thanks could the agricultural expert, who can double the yield of wheat, get from the farmer who has just gone bankrupt because he has grown too much of it?"

Science has been called the "favourite son of Capitalism." It helps the exploiter, the sweater, and the rich. Dr. Ure in his "The Philosophy of Manufacture" has said, "When Capital enlists science into his service the refractory hand of Labour will always be taught docility."

We must not forget that no less than thirty or even forty millions of persons are unemployed and workless and a "starving burden upon Society in this age of science and materialism. Lenin himself wrote in **Proleterri** in 1909 :—

"Fear of the blind force of Capital—blind because its action cannot be foreseen by the masses—a force which at every step in life threatens the workers and the small business men with sudden, unexpected, accidental destruction and ruin, bringing in their train beggary, pauperism, prostitution and death from starvation —this is the top root of modern religion which, first of all and above all, the materialist must keep in mind, if he does not wish to remain stuck for ever in the infant school of materialism."

Lenin should have said that the only way how not "to remain stuck for ever in the infant school of materialism" was to keep materialism and science under the control of a religion—nay under

the control of **the Islamic Religion**—which is of "unequalled importance for the maintenance of human Society" and its very conception of God prompts social services of the most benevolent nature to Humanity.

It is foolish to expect that a progress in science and materialism will despense with the need of Religion for the Human Society.

Mr. John Strachey has had to exclaim:—"Man's conquest of Nature is far advanced, but where is the millenium? It is almost out of sight." Instead of the millennium we have an armed camp of so-called advanced Nations ready to kill the whole population of cities by death rays and poison gases without a moment's notice—we have starving millions in every country—distraught, decrepit, diseased and destitute—without any spiritual consolation, any sustaining hope or moral stamina of which materialism has deprived them.

Mr. Strachey argues:—

"In practice the technical progress of man, his machine, his science, his general command over Nature, far from having created a universe sufficient for him to dispense with the consolations of religious illusions, have left him almost, if not quite, as miserable and terrified as ever . . . the promises of the scientists and the materialists seem to have been all false. Man has at their bidding eaten the fruits of the tree of knowledge and so conquered his environments, and yet in some mysterious and incomprehensible way Nature remains as cruel, arbitrary and terrifying as ever. Man now knows how to grow food with one-tenth of the labour that he used before, yet, inexplicably he remains as hungry as ever. He can clothe, warm and shelter himself with one hundred times the ease he could, yet he remains almost as naked, cold and ill-housed as before. No wonder that a profound sense of disappointment and discouragement pervades the Western world. No wonder that in spite of the intellectual suicide involved (!) an increasing number of men turn away from science and reason and seek again in desecration to believe in the consoling myths of the childhood of the race."

And he very reluctantly admits:—"Thus the second function of religion which was to give a supernatural sanction to the prohibition of anti-social acts seems to be as much needed as ever." And because there is no religion, no Institution except Islam which, so wisely, effectively, harmoniously, benevolently, intelligibly, and reasonably regulates the "relation between human beings in their practical every-day life as between man and man, and man and nature," therefore the need of Islam is to-day if anything more than it was ever before for the whole of mankind individually and collectively.

Islam is most helpful to Human Society because it conducts the spiritual sentiments and moral emotions which bind man to man with intelligence and reason.

(e) *The Quranic God-idea elevates Humanity to its ultimate height.*

To a scientist a man is only a mammal like other mammals and no better. He is only a highly evolved and well-developed monkey or chimpanzee.

To all religions, excepting Islam, man is not much better, rather worse, than to a scientist. To the Jews every man who is not born of Israel, the chosen people of God, is worthy to be condemned. A poor unfortunate non-Israelite cannot even join the Judaic community however he may desire to do so and however rightly he may act. So by far the largest majority of mankind in every generation is condemned.

To the Christians every human being is tainted with the original sin—every child is born a sinner and if unbaptised dies a sinner. To Buddhists as well as to Hindus, who believe in the transmigration of the soul, the very existence of man on earth is a punishment for him for his past deeds (*Karma*) and he can only rise by shunning this world as an evil, by giving up all social connections with his parents, wife and fellow-beings—in fact, by giving up everything in this world which is a *maya*, delusion.

But the Quranic God-idea gives to man the most elevated position of the *viceregent of God Himself.*

Wa is qala Rubbuka lil malaikate inni jailun fil ardhe khalifatan.

And when thy *Rabb* said to the angels, I am going to place on earth a *Khalifa*—a viceregent—*i.e.*, human being. (ii: 30.)

A plasmic cell, a "life-germ," was created on this earth which under the laws laid down by the All-wise, Almighty *Rabb* (Evolver) developed into a being who by his God-given powers, spiritual and intellectual, can go upto the stars, as Ibne Arabi is said to have done by his spiritual powers or can invent, by his intellectual power, aeroplanes to fly in the air and build submarines and diving machines to go down to the bottom of the deepest seas. Because, by his God-given gift of reason he has been able to study the laws of Nature, he has made electricity subservient to himself. He has also been able to utilize the heat of the sun to give him crops and fruits and vegetables.

He has learnt the laws of Nature to a certain extent, but that extent is yet far from that which God had meant him to study; it is yet far away from befitting him (excepting the Prophet Muhammad) for the position of the *Khalifa* of the Quranic God—Allah. So man with the Islamic Conception of God has still

before him a very large scope of rising higher and higher. Spiritually also the Islamic conception is that *God breathed His own Soul into man* and that he is born sinless, and if he *acts aright* he has a glorious future.

Now it is open to man to choose whether he would like to remain on equal footing with a mammal, who goes about all day to get some grass and when he dies he is just dead and gone, or would he like to feel that he is a born sinner or a convict sentenced to a long and hard or short and soft punishment in this life. If he does, then let him remain an Atheist or a Christian, a Buddhist or a Hindu. But if a man or woman wants to feel that he or she is a being superior to all other creatures both in spiritual powers and intellectual genius, that he or she has been born sinless and that (under God) he or she can acquire the position and power of bringing to his or her subservience "all that is" (as the Quran says) "in heaven or earth" and he or she can rise to the ultimate height, then he or she should learn to live like a true Muslim. A Muslim, whether a male or a female, can reach a great height not in this life alone. In death also he or she can aspire to "the companionship on High" according to the Prophet's last words.

The Quranic God-idea opens out for man (and woman) a progress and a rise, in this life or other, limited only in *one* respect. And that is that he cannot equal *Allah* Himself. He can *not* be Almighty, or All-knowing or All-seeing. If he can make the sun and the moon subservient to himself it would always be according to the will and design of *Allah*, "in their courses" as the Quran says. He shall never be able to change their courses. If he goes on studying the laws of Nature he will undoubtedly know innumerable of these laws but *not* all. The more he knows the more will he realise that he knows very little. And even with the utmost flight of his spiritual powers, his *mairaj*, he can get very close to *Allah* (*quaba qausain au adna*), and gain the companionship of the Being whom no *vision can comprehend* but can never be *the* Being Himself or His peer—His co-sharer.

However, he can rise very high indeed. We see every day what great powers have been vouchsafed to man. But on the other hand, we see too how weak he is. Physically, he is weaker than many animals—many mammals. By his inventive powers he flies in the air but sometimes a strong puff of wind dashes him to the ground. He is more helpless in the air than even a house-fly or a sparrow. He dives to the bottom of the sea but sometimes he never comes up again. He is more unsafe in the sea than any tiny fish or prawn. How weak man really is in matters concerning his own person! How many diseases are there which

he cannot cure in spite of all the progress in medical science. He is so weak that he cannot regulate his heart. He cannot prevent death.

So his power or his intelligence must not make him conceited or arrogant. The Quran warns:—"And do not go about in the land exultingly, for thou canst not cut through the earth nor reach the mountains in height. All this—the evil of it—is hateful in the sight of thy Lord." (xvii: 37-38.)

He must bow himself humbly before the Supreme Power and the Supreme Mind and allow himself to be guided by those who have been inspired by Him to give him guidance. Unless he does that the animality in him, to the existence of which every scientist can bear testimony, will over-power him and he, instead of conducting himself as a benefactor of Society, ready to serve with personal sacrifice, will be tempted to use his power naturally, as that of every animal is used, for personal aggrandizement. His very capacity to rise and to get power will be dangerous for Society. His ingenuity will be used to invent poison gas to kill his brother man and take from him whatever can be taken away for the sake of his own person, or may be, for his own people, his own nation, thus making nationalism a curse for humanity.

Man has been given capacity to rise, under God, to his ultimate height. He should rise to his ultimate height to be in a position to secure the well-being of all his fellow-men irrespective of their country or colour or race. But if the rise of man is to be a boon for Humanity as a whole, even if not for all the creatures on earth, *then it must be with the Quranic God-idea*. And this means that the power a man, a group of men, or a nation may possess should be reserved for the good of the world and all its people.

Well has an English writer said:—"Islam has played the most important part in making the world more desirous of worshipping and adoring the one and only God than in the past, and the Religion of God which was revealed to the great Prophet of Arabia is undoubtedly destined to make still greater contributions to the progress of humanity. The ideal state of Society which is the goal of Islam, has not yet been reached, but as the past shows, it will surely reach through Islam alone.

The Kingdom of Heaven has come to man in the shape of Islam. Now it is for us to realise it in practice. There is no phase of life in which Islam has not given us a lead, there is no situation in the world but with the words of the Holy Quran, "to lead us into Light from Darkness." And it has done so in the promotion of knowledge and science, in the cultivation

of higher morals, in bringing mankind to the very borders of Divinity, into the reformation and uplift of humanity, in inculcating the spirit of true nationalism, and in expounding the creed of a Cosmopolitan Deity, and thus establishing a real Brotherhood of Man."

Islam has done all the above and many other unique services to humanity. It has elevated mankind to a nobler, purer, and holier, more beneficent and less animallike plane of life. It has made men and women better than they had ever been before.

The Conception of God in Islam has elevated Humanity to its ultimate height and grandeur. It has undeniably been the cause of his moral, spiritual, intellectual, political and social advancement, it has no doubt been the basis of culture and civilisation of a very high standard and it has prompted Social Service and has been of very great help in Communistic Organisation and in Scientific Progress.

Atheism may have had some excuse if the God-idea might have been helpful only in some occult, metaphysical, superstitious way, beyond our present life as it is supposed to be in religions other than Islam, but when the Conception of God is such as to be necessary and beneficial for man's individual life and character as well as for the good of Society and Humanity as a whole, as has been definitely proved in the above pages, then atheism should undoubtedly be considered as a crime against individuals and Society, and if the State would intervene against atheism and in favour of the Quranic God-idea it would certainly be justified as it would only mean that the State is performing its duty in adopting measures for the good of the individuals and Society as it does when it lays down other laws for protecting the interests of its citizens and furthering their well-being.

In any case no State will be justified after knowing the Quranic Conception of God in patronising atheism if it has any regard for the good of Society or its individual citizens.

Shirk——*i.e.* a belief in more than one God is as great a sin against Human intelligence as is atheism. It is no less a crime against human Society.

Even sceptic scientists believe in Monism which is only a defective form of Monotheism. And all Social Reformers now believe in Human brotherhood, which implies that all Human beings are creatures or the children or the family, as the Prophet has said, of one God—the *Rabbul-alamin*. This means that the most modern idea supports the Quranic communist principles that mankind forms one Nation—one community. So any State, particularly if it is communistic or socialistic, must not tolerate either atheism or *Shirk*.

II.—Bolshevism Encouraged Anti-God and Anti-Religious Movements.

As said before we think the greatest psychological mistake the Bolsheviks have made is that they have needlessly adopted an anti-religious and anti-God Policy.

To be anti-religious and anti-God was certainly not essential for any Socialistic or Communistic programme and an adoption of an anti-religious policy has without doubt given to the anti-Bolsheviks a chance successfully to frighten away a great mass of people from them and to prejudice the mind of a preponderating number of persons, specially of the East, against them. If it were essential for a Communistic State to be anti-God we would not have blamed the Bolsheviks for having adopted that attitude.

It is not that we do not realize the reasons which prompted the Russian Bolsheviks to adopt that policy. Karl Marx had already prejudiced the mind of all Communists against religion. Nor was the dominant religion in Russia, when Bolshevism arose, such as to command the respect of social reformers or to allow of any partial reformation. Religious fanaticism of the mediaeval type was at its highest. The influence religion wielded at that time in particular was very great but very pernicious. The most popular representative in the Court of Russia of the Christian religion, which was the most general and powerful religious belief in Russia, was that thoroughly corrupt "religious Head"—Rasputin.

The Czar first met him in 1905 and wrote in his diary, "We got acquainted with a "man of God" Gregory, from the Tobolsk province." Gregory Rasputin is said to have had a scar on his head which marked the beating he had received for stealing a horse. This "man of God" was originally a humble peasant but round about him, gradually, a new ruling clique was formed which got a very strong hold on the Czarina and through her on the Czar himself.

In 1913-14 all appointments of any importance and all contracts of consequence depended upon the clique of which Gregory Rasputin was the head. Eventually Rasputin himself turned into a "State Institution." Spies of the Police department kept a diary of his life by hours and did not fail to report how on a visit in September 4, 1915, to his home-village of Poprovsky, he got himself involved in a "drunken and terrible fight with his own father on the street." The other items of the Police report were like these:—

"Rasputin returned to-day at 5 o'clock in the morning completely drunk." "On the night of the 25th-26th the actress V spent the night with Rasputin." "He arrived with Princess D

(the wife of a gentleman of the bedchamber of the Czar's Court), at the Hotel Astoria".....“Rasputin came home with Princess S—very drunk—and together they went out immediately." "He came home at 5 in the morning pretty drunk." Drink seems to have been the chief vice of the "man of God." The reports of the spies are full of such phrases as "completely drunk" and "very drunk." Prince Yussupov, who at times was a companion of Rasputin in the life the latter lived but who, in the end, removed him from the world of the living, wrote:—"His life at Petrograd became a continual revel, the drunken debauch of a galley slave who had come into an unexpected fortune." Rodizianko, the president of the Duma, wrote, "I had at my disposition a whole mass of letters from mothers whose daughters had been dishonoured by the insolent rake."

"Nevertheless," describes Trotsky on the authority of reliable sources, "the Petrograd Metropolitan, Pitirim owed his position to Rasputin, as also the almost illiterate Arch Bishop Varnava. The Procuror of the Holy Synod, Sablor, was long sustained by Rasputin, and Premier Kokovtsov was removed at his wish, having refused to receive the "Elder." Rasputin appointed Stumer, President of the Council of Ministers, Propolopov Minister of Interior, the new Procuror of the Synod, Raev, and many others."

To a question of a spy, why Rasputin was thoughtful, he replied, "Cannot decide whether to convoke the Duma or not."

The Czarina always consulted Rasputin on State Affairs and influenced the Czar to act upto that advice. Once she wrote to the Czar, "Keep by you the little list. Our friend (Rasputin) has asked that you talk all this over with Protopovov." Two days later she wrote "Our friend says that Stumer may remain a few days longer as President of the Council of Ministers."

Even for the official reports of the spies the Czarina has had excuses. She wrote to the Czar, "They accused Rasputin of kissing women, etc. Read the Apostles, they kissed everybody as a form of greeting."

And again:—

"During vespers I thought so much about our friend. How the Scribes and Pharisees are persecuting Christ pretending that they are perfect." Then she adds "yes, in truth no man is a Prophet in his own country."

M. Trotsky mentions the following incident:—"In response to demands for a decent Ministry, the Czarina sent to the Czar at Headquarters an apple from the hands of Rasputin, urging that he eat it in order to strengthen his will." "Remember", she adjured, "that even Monsieur Phillippe (a French Charlatan—

Hypnotist) said that you must not grant a Constitution, as that would mean ruin to you and Russia . . . . . "Be Peter the Great, Ivan the Terrible, Emperor Paul, crush them all." M. Trotsky after writing this forgets that Lenin—or he himself would have "also crushed them all under feet" if they were in the same position, and angrily exclaims:—

"What a disgusting mixture of fright, superstition and malicious alienation from the country."

The fact is that all "Courts" were corrupt. Nor was Gregory the only Rasputin in the world. There were many pious (?) "drunken debauch" in the world. But neither one Rasputin nor two thousand of them could justify a generalisation that every religion should be abolished because of one Rasputin or more. So, if the Bolsheviks became anti-religious because of Rasputin or Rasputins, they were not justified. But unfortunately there were other reasons why the Bolsheviks encouraged an anti-religious movement although it cannot be denied that in Russia the very existence of Rasputin must have alienated many people from Christianity or religion itself. But those reasons which prejudiced the Russian Reformers against religion were not confined to Russia alone. Irreligiousness was a common epidemic in Europe and even in that part of the East which copies Europe blindly. The young people were inclined to become irreligious, although science was supporting day by day the idea of a God or an Intelligent, Artistic, Mind. Monism was the faith of an extreme Materialist to whom even thought was materialistic.

Professor J. S. Haldane also wrote that "the analysis of our experiences led finally to the conclusion that the Universe was a manifestation of God and that God was the personality of personalities. There is growing dissatisfaction of physicists and mathematicians with many material conceptions of the World and man. Biologists and the leading authorities in physical sciences and mathematics now supported neither panthesim nor materialism."

The great living British scientist, Sir Oliver Lodge, believes in spiritualism. In all Mid-Eastern religions a belief in angels was supposed to be the most irrational. Yet Sir Oliver Lodge says:

"The idea of angels is usually treated as fanciful. Imaginative it is, but not altogether fanciful, and though the physical appearance and attributes of such imaginary beings may have been even emphasised or misconceived, yet facts, known to me, indicate that we are not really lonely in our struggle, that our destiny is not left to haphazard, that there is no such thing as *laissez faire* in a highly organised universe. Help may be rejected but help

is available, ministry of benevolence surrounds us—a cloud of witnesses—not witnesses but helpers, agents like ourselves of the immanent God."

Even Mr. J. Strachey admits:—"And to-day a large part of official academic philosophy is in full retreat from the attempt to use the intellect in order to comprehend the Universe and is engaged in no other task than the reintroduction of theological methods."

But young men of these days do not care for science or philosophy. They are blindly guided by whims and fashions. It is a fashion to-day to consider religion as something archaic. It is a fashion to-day to be a "hero worshipper." Those who worship Lenin would follow him quite blindly. They would not use their own intelligence at all. They have developed a slavish mentality. They would not take into consideration any of his weaknesses. They have only set up new idols and are blind and irrational believers as the idol worshippers of old. The same is the case with the worshippers of Mussolinis and even Hitlers. These unthinking young imitators lower the position of their heroes instead of elevating it when they exaggerate their virtues and become blind to their weaknesses and vices just as those who call themselves devoted Christians lower the respect due to Jesus as a Prophet, Reformer and an un-common spiritual-man, when they make him out to be a God or part of a God or the only begotten son of God. As a man, Christ was undeniably a superior person, as a God he can only be a very, very low kind of god before whom no self-respecting person would bend his head.

In fact the greatest factor in making people generally and the Bolshevists particularly anti-religious and anti-God has been the tendency of the followers of all other religions except Islam, to worship a God of very low attributes—sometimes a God even with vices and weaknesses. How can one blame an educated and experienced Bolshevik—much less an unthinking, raw, zealous, youth, if he is anti-religious and if he supports the anti-God movements when he does not know the real QURANIC Conception of God which is the only conception that can satisfy a materialist, a sceptic or even an atheist.

An atheist is unblamable if he refuses to bend himself before the family, or racial God of the Jews even though He is One God, or if he refuses to believe in the mathematical complex of One-in-Three and Three-in-One, or if he wants to have nothing to do with one thousand and one man-gods or gods-incarnate, who had degraded themselves by having adopted the material body and the animal habits of man. And when an atheist does not care much to attend to the needs of his "after-life" or the "next

world" he thinks he can well ignore the worship of such a God as would secure his salvation only in the next world and can give him no assistance in this life of flesh and blood, of work and labour and service, as of beauty and love, sympathy and honour. It is the Conception of God in Islam alone which is helpful to man in his spiritual aspirations as in his material progress, which enables him to develop his angelic qualities, and also makes him a good citizen for a Socialistic State and a good individual for the best Society and for every race and in every country.

We think that Bolsheviks have been anti-religious and anti-God only because they had not in their mind the right conception of religion and of God. We have discussed before that they were wrong in believing with their Master, Karl Marx, that every religion was opium for man.

In "Emotion as the Basis of Civilization" the three chief objections to religion from the Bolshevist point of view are given as follows:—

(1) That religion helps in the maintenance of the present Social System which has borne the fruit of Capitalism, with a consequent crushing of the poor.

(2) That it keeps the people subject to superstition and thus hinders the advance of science.

(3) That it teaches them to pray for their needs instead of working for them and thus it makes them indolent.

Who can deny that those defects in religion are not all imaginary excepting in the case of the Islamic religion ?

We have dealt with the Islamic Conception of God in another chapter which answers the above objections and many others. Here we can only put forth, for the Bolsheviks, the excuse of ignorance (which we know to be unacceptable under law) of Islam for their attitude against all religions. A Muslim's reply to the above objections against religion can very, very briefly be given thus :—

(1) Islam made Social Service the necessary ingredient of faith and of righteousness. Islam is anti-capitalist. It has adopted measures as no other religion or institution, including Bolshevism, has adopted to relieve all the suffering humanity—the poor, the indebted, the wayfarer, the captive, the helpless orphan, the worker, the labourer and others who have been categorically mentioned as deserving of help and service. Laws and rules have been laid down to obtain and even to regulate that help.

Islam raised the status of the poor and the Prophet himself lived the life of the poor, on dried dates, with patched up clothes,

in a humble house which he equally shared with his emancipated slave. The Prophet slept on a mattress that left marks and scratches on his body. He proclaimed "poverty is my pride," and he declared, "I wish to live with the poor and die with the poor and be raised with the poor."

(2) By its very Conception of God Islam gave an incentive to reasoning and thinking. It polished analytical and deducting powers of man; it encouraged researches and enquiries and even travels. The Quran declared that he who has been gifted with *hikmat* (science) has been gifted with the greatest blessing. Islam urged upon man to discover the laws of Nature so as to bring to his service and use "all that is in heaven and earth."

كُل مافي السموات والارض

As a consequence the scientific progress under the aegis of Islam was exemplary, and that in all the branches of science.

(3) Prayer in Islam is only to receive guidance, strength, and help, *after* man has done his best, to overcome obstacles and difficulties which are beyond human control, from an All-Powerful, All-Merciful, Just and Pure and Sublime and Loving God and to master and over-power temptations and disappointments or carnal pleasures and animal passions that may come in the way of achieving noble or pious objects or in living a benevolent and righteous life for Society and for ones own self.

The Quran warns, *Laisa lilinsan illa ma saa*, there is nothing for man but to work hard. This means that man has been created to work, regardless of success or failure. Prayer is meant to sustain him on failures and to urge him on and on to further efforts with his trust in God. Islam wants man to work with the spirit "*Assai minni vo itmamo alal Lah ta ala*" (It is for me, man or woman, to work and the accomplishment is with the High God.) One must brave all troubles and difficulties with an unwavering trust in God and should never, never, never get despondent howsoever averse the circumstances may be. لاتقنطوامن رحمت اللاہ is the most encouraging and heartening message of the Quran, inspiring man to continue his exertions in the darkest hour. Thus Prayers in Islam, instead of encouraging indolence or weak-heartedness, are meant to strengthen the will and spirit of man to conquer all, even when physical power and energy may be getting weak. Prayer is further meant to reveal man those laws which the God of nature has kept secreted in nature itself, and to help man in his researches and experiments. A Muslim's prayer in thevery first chapter of the Quran is إهدنا الصراط المستقيم Show us the *right way* (to work or act, both spiritually or physically and materially

and to find out the laws of nature or to solve the mysteries of the world, etc., etc.). To stop indolence or inaction and not to keep trust only in spiritual means, or in Prayers in order to gain one's object, it has been laid down in the Quran itself that God does not alter His own *sunnah* (tradition), which means that the system laid down for this material world of cause and effect is not usually altered and that no man should expect to achieve any object "unnaturally"—without struggling or striving for it. In the general natural struggle for existence in this world a man should take his own part because the laws of nature are the same for all creatures and God does not usually change His laws, His traditions, His *sunnah*, without any very cogent reason. Where Prayer helps is in getting guidance for the *right way* to accomplish the desired object or the strength and courage to persist in case of failures or disappointments or spiritual assistance and will power when circumstances are beyond human control.

It is a pity that the present-day Bolsheviks are only following Marx and Lenin blindly and unthinkingly. We do not deny that Marx and Lenin did not, or rather could not, believe in Christianity. Lenin deliberately demonstrated this during the Revolution.

When Lenin visited the Cathedral of St. Peter and St. Paul the Archdeacon with the Bible in one hand and the cross in another began to pray. Lenin then told him:—

"Stop this buffoonery. The power of the working classes comes from no gods, but from workshops, ploughs, from sweat of blood. Enough of your fables about gods. We want no more of the opium which binds the will of the people. There are no gods on earth or in heaven." And he bitingly said:—

"Even if your God did exist, he would abandon you now, you flunkeys of the Czar, you gluttons, drunkards, whoremongers and oppressors of the working class."

While Lenin's first remarks show that Lenin was a blind follower of Marx, his second remarks suggest that he had Rasputin in his mind.

But although Lenin personally did not believe in religion he encouraged the religious emotions of Muslims. Nor did he abolish religion. The October Revolution only reiterated the promises given by the Provisional Government of freedom, of worship. In 1918 the grants made to various sects in the Czarist régime were stopped. Lenin only separated the State from Religion. And which State could really go hand in hand with Christianity?

It was some five years after the death of Lenin (Lenin died on 21st January, 1924) that a decree was issued (in May, 1929) giving

atheism the status of a State dogma and granting to atheists the monopoly of the right to teach their belief. The Soviet Government soon after instructed the Commissar of Education to organise a special new "Inspectorate of anti-religious propaganda", with branches in all district centres, to superintend the enforcement of the new Law, restricting the liberties of the Church and forbidding all religious propaganda. But for colonising the Jews the Government had allotted an area of 2,000 square Kilometres in the District of Beera Beazhan in 1928. So the actual association of Bolshevism with atheism and anti-religious movements began *not* under Lenin or Trotsky but under lesser men who lacked the tact of those great Leaders and who had not much sense of proportion. Not to believe personally, or even as a group, in a God or in religion is much different from organising, on behalf of the State, which was supposed to be a Republic, a propaganda on the authority of the Government, against the most cherished beliefs of the citizens of that Republic thus creating an ill will against the Republic of the vast majority of the people of the Country and alienating the sympathy of millions of peoples with the chief objectives of Bolshevism. We feel confident that Lenin would have found a much better way to get the population of Russia free from its superstitions and to remove the obstacles which Paulic Christianity put on the socialisation of Russia, than the propaganda against all religions. Lenin probably thought that with the dissemination and success of the Communistic principles, which are in harmony with Islam and are devoid of fetishes and superstitions, Islam would itself triumph. But he died and those who came in his place unwisely applied the policy of making (though not in so many words) atheism the State religion in Russia. Naturally young men were glad at the removal of the check to their free indulgence and thus the anti-religious and anti-God movements made young men extremely irresponsible, immoral and unmannerly. It has made them reckless and regardless of others. It has made them dissolute and licentious. They are degenerating into an animal life, giving no thought to consequences. If the state of the mind of young people continues to be what it is to-day in Russia, Nature will undoubtedly punish them with the severity which only Nature knows how to do. The attribute of QAH-HAR and Jabbar will surely come into play according to the established law of Nature. Diseases will follow, and health will deteriorate. Individuals will lose their character. Social evils will crop up and ultimately Society will suffer. Of diseased, raked, conscienceless and characterless parents only weaklings can be born. The present generation or the one after may not suffer much with the consequences but the generations following will

certainly reap what the present generation is sowing. All evil is man's own creation. Godlessness is sure to cause good many evils. Irresponsible young men, with their passions and egotism uncontrolled, cannot be expected to make good, wise and tactful statesmen or citizens, particularly of a Communist State which really needs all its citizens to be of very high characters. They will hardly carry much prestige with others. Therefore the whole edifice which Lenin and Trotsky built with great labour will crumble down owing to inherent weaknesses and external pressure. In politics it is the long view that often pays, not a short one. If a long view is taken it will be found that the present policy of anti-religion and anti-freedom are colossal mistakes. And mistakes in politics are crimes. Let all those Bolshevist Leaders, who wish well of Russia in the future and who desire to present a captivating example, give up their harmful and unnecessary anti-God policy. At least, let them study all religions and *particularly* Islam very carefully and with an unprejudiced mind and include their anti-religious movement in the changes they have recently effected in their constitution. All the restrictions put on religious propaganda should be withdrawn and all people should be allowed freedom of their conscience and worship. There must be a high moral standard for the individuals who form Society in a Communistic State.

III.—Bolshevism Claimed No Moral And Spiritual Basis.

While the greatest authority on modern Communism is generally considered to be Karl Marx, that phase of it which commonly goes by the name of Bolshevism recognises Vladimir Ilyitch Ulyanov, better known as Lenin, to be its expert Teacher, Guide and Philosopher. Therefore we quote Lenin himself to show whether he claimed to follow any moral Principles or not. Lenin replied to his friend Gorky who questioned him if he has no moral principles:—"Who ever told you, Comrade, that I had principles or believed in morality?" When Lenin's own friends and colleagues opposed his taking tainted money and considered it a "crime" he said:—"I will take the money. Are you not rather full of bourgeois notions about propriety? But why did you praise me when I organised a raid on the Post Office at Tela and gained a few thousand roubles? You knew as well as anybody that the money belonged not only to the bourgeoisie but also to poor peasants and destitute workers and yet you shouted Bravo! Get rid of your prejudices, Comrades. Do not worry about rights and wrongs." Lenin did not hesitate to write to another friend "neither morality, nor a code of honour exists for us." F. Y. Ossendowski mentions in his "*Lenin*" that Lenin asked Walcis to forge Russian notes. Walcis did this and gave 500 forged notes of 10 roubles each. Lenin thanked him heartily, and exchanged those Russian notes in pounds sterling. He then went to London and assumed the false German name of Richtor. Later, when Trotsky protested "we are no more than a gang of mutinous beggars" Lenin consoled him in these words:—

"We have the jewels of the Romanovs. We have the treasures of the Hermitage and other museums. They can all be sold. Besides, the State Printing Press can print any number of foreign bank notes." The father of Bolshevism whose tomb to-day is worshipped by thousands of people was so callous and heartless as to say once to his friend Gorky:—"We live in an iron age and our work is not to pat people on the head. Our hands must fall heavily, smashing men's skulls and pulping their bones without mercy." It is true that even some great moral Teachers did not show much regard for human life as is evidenced from such sayings:—"And slay every man his brother and every man his neighbour. Ex. xxxii: 27; and:—"I came not to send peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. (Matt. x: 34-35.) It cannot be denied that violent persecution for convictions unpopular to the

ruling authorities is not the monopoly of the present-day Dictators or Rulers. Even the "mild Hindus" did it. Shankaranjaya mentions that King Sadhanavan issued the following edict:—

"From the bridge of Rama in Ceylon to the Himalaya, he who does not slay the Buddhists both old and young, shall be slain."

The author of the *Early History of India* writes:—

"It is recorded by contemporary testimony that in the seventh century King Harsha, who obviously aimed at closely copying the institutions of Asoka, did not shrink from inflicting capital punishment, without hope of pardon, on any person who dared to infringe his command by slaying any living thing or using flesh in any part of his dominion." Actual examples have been cited when the special courts at Anhilwara of Kumar Pal, King of Gujrat, after his conversion to Jainism in 1159, ordered the killing of a man who brought raw meat in the capital. But what the Brahmans and Jainists did was only as a revenge against Buddhistic Censor and persecution. It was a "revolt against the inquisitorial tyranny of Asoka's system."

Mr. Vincent Smith says:—

"Asoka, from this time forth, made it a business of his life to employ his unlimited autocratic power over a vast Empire in the teaching, propagation and *enforcement* of the ethical system which he called the law of Piety or Dharma."

In Kashmir even "modern parallels to Asoka's Censors are not lacking," nor even Kumar Pal's actions.

But this persecution of conscience and lack of freedom of thought and life are not commendable whether the persecutions are political or religious.

The Prophet Muhammad, however, did not allow any violence or compulsion for the propagation of his "Aim", his "Mission." "There is no compulsion in religion" (*La ikrah fiddeen*) is the teaching of the QURAN. Islam attaches a value to every life and it has stopped torture or mutilation of every living thing, even of a beast of prey. Some of the sayings of the Prophet on the subject are as follows:—(1) Maim not the brute beasts. (Abdullah Jaffer.) (2) Take not things which have life to shoot at (in practice), etc. (Ibn Abbas.) (3) The Prophet forbade all living things to be killed, tied up or bound. (Jabir.) (4) The Prophet forbade setting brutes against one another. (Ibn Abbas.) (5) The Prophet forbade branding or striking animals on the face. (Jabir.) (6) There is no man who kills a sparrow for nothing or anything else

without its deserving it, but God will take an account of it. (Ibn Umar.) And so forth.

The QURAN says:—

"There is no moving thing in the earth, nor a bird that flies with its wings, but is a being like unto you." (ii: 38.)

And a Muslim poet has said:—

میازار موریکه دانه‌کش است—که‌جان دارد و جان شیرین خوش است

Do not hurt the ant which is carrying a grain of seed,

Because it has life—and sweet life is pleasing.

The value of human life could not possibly be enhanced more than what the following Verse of the QURAN has done:—

"Whoever slays a nafs (life) without having slain a person or committed mischief on the Earth, it is as though he slew all mankind. But he who saveth a life it is as though he saved all men." (V. 32.)

Once when the Prophet was asked to curse his blood-thirsty enemies he said that he had not come to curse people but to bless them. In contrast to this the reply of Lenin, when his friend Gorky drew his attention "to the tears now flowing in our villages and of the despair in every cottage of our land," was:—

"Let it be so. There are too many crowded together in their cottages. There are enough for a hundred wars. What now if famine comes to wipe them out. The blood of our Workers and Peasants flows to-day but we will shed a sea of blood from the veins of our enemies and murderers." Lenin himself issued instructions to Dzhershwisky to be ready to destroy Nicholas II and his family. He further said that "it would be a dangerous tragi-comedy to try the Czar in public . . . We could not let him live." His philosophy was a ruthless violence. He declared:—A Dictatorship implies power based immediately upon violence and nothing else . . . . only traitors or fools can desire tolerance for those who oppose the Dictatorship of the proletariat."

The Grand Duke of Russia told the Author a few years ago when both were staying at the Ritz Hotel, London, that during the days of Revolution in Russia when one day the Chief of Police went to President Kerensky after having searched in vain for Lenin to arrest him, he found him at Kerensky's, but Kerensky told him not to bother about Lenin as he was "quite all right." If this is a true story the obvious conclusion is that Lenin must have deceived poor Kerensky very thoroughly. The other equally great leader of Bolshevism, Leon Trotsky, had the same philosophy of

unmitigated violence. He declared as the then head of the Government :—"We must make a clean sweep of bourgeoisie and gentry until not a trace of that stock remains." When the founders of Bolshevism disregarded all moral and legal code, and all scruples it was natural of Bolshevism to be devoid of a moral basis. It was only because the circumstances favoured it and because it could bribe soldiers and peasants that it succeeded in Russia. Even now the Red Army is said to be its main support. The coming generation of Bolshevik Russia is brought up without a moral or ethical or religious code. Forceful expropriation of property, compulsion to work at the bidding of the Executive, no freedom of speech or avocation is the current policy of the Russian Government which does not allow any opposition. A general massacre followed when the Bolsheviks captured the Winter Palace. Neither age nor sex were respected. Lenin actually saw a Bolshevik soldier getting hold of a bourgeois girl for sexual enjoyment and said "Let the faithful defender of the proletariat enjoy himself. From to-day onwards, Comrades, everything is yours: take what has been taken from you." At another time he said, "There will be no laws to bind the freedom of workers, soldiers and peasants."

What a contrast the above quotations make with the orders of the first Khalifa of Islam to his General not to molest people who were devoting themselves to the worship of God, nor to hurt any woman, child or old person, nor to cut down fruit trees, nor to burn palm groves, nor to destroy populated places, nor to kill any cattle except for food, nor to embezzle public money and never to behave like cowards.

And the first act of the great Omar, on becoming the Khalifa, was to degrade the greatest military genius of the age, Khalid bin Walid, from the position of the ever victorious Commander-in-Chief or Field-Marshal of the Muslim Armies to that of an ordinary soldier because he had been harsh to a conquered foe once and because he was rash. Abu Obaida was appointed the Field-Marshal in Khalid's place because he was more gentle and kind-hearted.

The result of the lack of moral control was that Bolshevist soldiers "plunged into sexual orgies" when they were victorious. On the contrary when the reviled, the persecuted, the exiled, the all but murdered Prophet Muhammad entered Mecca with an army of victorious volunteers from Medina where they had taken refuge from the deadly persecution of the Meccans, he proclaimed that he would treat the enemies with fraternal forgiveness and announced the good news that they were all free and no excesses of any kind were committed.

Even if we judge Bolshevist morality or ethics by the standards laid down by Lenin himself, that is, "morality is wholly subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat," we will find that it has not always kept to its own standard. Peasants, who were ex-soldiers of Trotsky's army of which Lenin himself was proud and who helped, as nobody else did, in "the class struggle of the proletariat", and who established with their blood the United States of Soviet Russia with all its power and might, were themselves ill-treated. For example, orders were issued to make good the deficiency by wholesale seizure of grain from the peasants who still retained their small holdings in Ukraine. "When the harvest had been gathered, a Red armed force entered the villages, took away all grain from every home and left the inhabitants to their fate. Soon after winter set in. Snow-bound as the land becomes, nothing could be produced. All egress from the villages was prohibited. Frontiers were sternly guarded. The inhabitants—men, women and children—were abandoned just to die." ("*The Social Order.*")

Unfortunately Lenin himself based his system on violence and deprecated even legal morality. Mr. Raymond T. Feely quotes Lenin's own words from Joseph Stalin's most recent Booklet, *The Problem of Leninism*, thus:—

"The scientific concept, dictatorship, means nothing more nor less than power which directly rests on violence, which is not limited by any law or any absolute rules. Dictatorship means unlimited power resting on violence and not on law."

Mr. Feely indignantly cries out:-

Boldly, brazenly the man of whom even Lenin said "he was too brutal to rule," boasts that the government we are asked to imitate "directly rests on violence and is not limited by any laws or restricted by any absolute rules."

That Islam brought a moral code of its own of a very high order proved an invaluable social asset and a great check upon the animal passions in man. The whole population behaved in a disciplined manner and obeyed the wishes of the Prophet.

The laxity of morals is evident even in popular writers in Russia. Modern Russian writers encourage immorality and indecency. However, while running down Russian laxity of morals we do not shut our eyes to what is happening in other Western countries under the materialistic civilization of the age. As in Russia so in Germany, France and even England popular writers pander sex-immorality now. The result is that because moral check has been weakened crime has increased. In America,

which is considered to be the most advanced modern country, the following are the statistics of crime :—

One inhabitant of America is murdered every 45 minutes. 14,000 New Yorkers are in prison and about 400,000 are engaged in criminal activities. America's crime bill is estimated at 13,000,000,000 dollars.

Even in Turkey itself since Turkey has been Westernised the morals of the Westernised ones have grown lax and efforts have to be made to check them by prohibiting nude dances, etc. In Russia the laxity of morals has, as Mr. Hindus says, "whirled to the surface of Russian life a host of monstrosities."

The people of England are mostly conservative and supposed to have a good moral sense but year after year they have to attend to thousand upon thousand illegitimate infants. In some respects the English are outdoing the sentimental French, so much so that it has been related that the Prefect of one of the French sea-side places on the Channel where English men and women flock for "holidaying," had had to issue orders that more clothes should be put on by the English womenfolk there.

The lack of morality does not affect Society only sociologically. It also affects it politically as well as administratively.

Bribery, embezzlement, nepotism, injustice, etc., all creep into the administration of the country. In Russian Central Asia "a combination of embezzlement and mismanagement brought the Co-operative system," as reported in the Russian Soviet Press in the middle of 1934, "to a state of chaos." Corruption found its way in almost all big concerns like the Kiev Banking Trust, or the gigantic organisation, "Metrostroi" or in building the Briansk to Vysayma branch Railway line.

The report further relates large-scale theft of goods from Government organisations, misappropriation of public funds, and unlawful speculation in goods and funds by responsible and trusted officials. The incidents occur in all sections of the country and in a wide variety of organisations. The chinovenik (petty official) is as corrupt as ever. To stop corruption the Soviet Government has to take recourse to the strongest penal measures and there is an increase even in death sentences.

The American writer Mr. Hindus says in "The Great Offensive": "The Soviets are creating a strange and formidable human being to whom all the old familiar words, Religion and Freedom, Wealth, Home and Family are losing their *significance*."

IV.—Islam gave New Connotation to Religion.

If any proof of the Prophethood of the untutored orphan child of Bibi Amina were needed by the sceptics of to-day or by the Bolsheviks it will be found in the Principles of Islam, promulgated some 1356 years ago, which meet the objections raised in our age against religions. The Prophet anticipated centuries before that a time will come when men will not be satisfied by any of those religions which he found in vogue in his days, as they had not kept in view the future development of the intellect of human beings and their future political, social and economic needs with the moral and spiritual ones. He gave, therefore, quite a new connotation to religion. He broad-based religion and gave a new character to it.

Every religion, except Buddhism, and Buddhism is only a cult or a form of meditation and self-annihilation, was based upon a belief in supernatural unseen power or powers that controlled the destiny of man after his death. It was at the sweet will of that Power to bestow salvation on whom he liked. Religion was meant to teach some dogmas and formulas or *mantras* by a repetition of which communion, in an occult way, could be held with that Power, or to show how to worship and to please that Power and to appease and mollify the wrath of the relentless and ruthless god who had passions like man's.

That teaching and that form of worship did not take into consideration whether it was in consonance with our intelligence or reason. It did not give the least guidance to us in political and social walks of our human life. In fact, it led men most often to an exclusive, self-centred, unsocial life as was the case in the most "unworldly" religion or cult—Buddhism.

All religions, and most of all Buddhism, desired to concentrate all human beings attentions upon the life to come—the *Nirvana* or *Baikunth*, after death. Meditate in such and such a manner with such and such a posture, get away and keep aloof by this and that means from this miserable wretched world, kill all your passions, affection for parents and family-members or other fellow-beings, live the life of celibacy, so as not to know the love of a wife and the happiness of having children, torture as much as you can this dirty and sinful body (Christianity even taught that all human beings were born in sin), repeat such and such a *mantra* with such and such rituals, offer flowers and sweets and scents and rice and flesh and blood of such and such animal (one's own children not excluded) to please the Unseen, not only to grant you salvation in the next world but also to cure you of ailments and sufferings in this world without the use of any medicines, only by miracles, and to rescue from the epidemics and diseases with which he has inflicted

you because you have somehow angered him or her and which your medicines and hygienic measures can never dispel, on the contrary they may make the jealous, unseen, power more angry with you if you put any confidence in medicines rather than in that Power, were the injunctions of every religion. The religious priests were supposed to teach and describe the ways how to carry out these injunctions. Thus religion became only a matter of certain rituals, ceremonies, and forms and priests became the rulers of the destiny of mankind in this world as in the other. Even now when a Hindu villager is ill in India he goes to the priest who recites a few words of a *mantra*, the meaning of which no human being can understand, to please the goddess of that particular disease to remove it. A person is supposed to be cured of the deadly poison of a snake-bite by the repetition of these meaningless *mantras*.

These *mantras* are supposed to be effective not because they are the cry of an afflicted person in his own language to an unseen Power but because the sound of these meaningless *mantras* is somehow considered to be pleasing to that Power. In the same way because the river Ganges is supposed to have a heavenly origin if the cremated ashes of any dead person are thrown into the Ganges it is believed that all the sins that he had committed while alive are washed away.

To such religions all those objections and many more certainly apply which have been mentioned above.

The world indeed was full of superstitious beliefs.

Then came Moses with his grand Monotheism and his laws. His religious ideal was not low. His laws were not mean. But his religion was almost soulless and his laws were much too rigid. His God was only a tribal, powerful, austere King—a very hard task-master. Judaism is an extremely exclusive religion. No socialist structure can be built upon it. Probably no religion has produced such a large number of individual Capitalists as has the Jewish religion. Most of the objections against religion can as well apply to the Jewish faith specially the charge of continuing the Capitalist system.

As far as Jesus was concerned his only thought was for the "Kingdom of Heaven." Like Buddha he preferred the life of celibacy and monasticism. Buddha did not like human society. Nor did Jesus. His teachings, as preached by Paul, did not improve either the conceptions of religion or the social conditions of man, nor did they give any help in the intellectual development of human beings. In fact, his orthodox followers stopped all intellectual or scientific progress. They also reintroduced the pagan belief not only of the Trinity but also of atonement through the sacrifice of the "only begotten son of God."

Paul said that man had fallen because of his cravings of knowledge and therefore what was wanted was a blind faith in atonement by Christ through his own blood, to uplift mankind. The Pope and the Priest were therefore entrusted with the duty of making all people believers in the blood of Christ for their rise from the fall which their first parents brought about for them. Blind belief was wanted not the use of intelligence or reason.

The Prophet Muhammad, on the contrary, put the new purpose and the new aim before religion to carry humanity to that goal which the Evolver (Rabb) had meant it to reach when he created it in this world and breathed in him His Own Soul or Spirit to be His worthy viceregent on the earth. So religion according to the Prophet was meant not only to teach mankind how to worship the One and Only God of all the best conceivably good attributes in their perfection, but also to evolve all those latent qualities in all human beings which the *Evolver* had kept concealed in the life-germ or the minute plasmic cell, and to develop into a being fit to take the Government of this Globe under God and to make subservient to himself, by the development of his mental, physical and spiritual powers, all that is in Heaven and Earth—the Sun and Moon, the air, the water and all.

Muhammad, therefore, placed before men not only a rational, scientific and philosophic God-idea but also gave them a religion which, as we said in "*The Miracle of Muhammad*," "though treating in the first place of their relation to God (the *Rabbul Alamin*) anything holier, nobler, purer, more sublime, more perfect, more supreme, more worthy of worship, it was impossible to conceive, taught them all that was essential to the life of a peaceful citizen, a brave soldier, a loving husband, a devoted wife, a dutiful son, an affectionate parent, a righteous man, a judicious administrator, a scholar, and a man of business and a statesman. Even the mode of communion with prayer to the Unseen is such in Islam that it does not elevate man or woman only spiritually but also does him or her good individually and collectively.

Thus religion's scope was widened so as to cover all the departments of a man's or woman's life and quite a new connotation was given to religion which even to-day men of other religions fail to grasp fully. So novel is that connotation, when compared with other religions which deal only with man's relation to God and his "salvation" or well-being only in the "next world," that people fail to understand fully such Islamic principles and institutions as *Jihad* and *Khilafat*, etc. It is not denied that Islam connotes a faith as other religions do but the central point—the Conception of God, has been so improved and perfected and the co-relationship of spirit and matter, the "after-life" and the present

life has been so very intellectually and prophetically indicated in Islam that Islam has come to connote not only a faith —a religion in the ordinary sense concerned only with the spirit of man but it also connotes a new angle of vision for this whole universe—*new* outlook altogether of life, a *new* position for mankind in the economy of this world and a *new* responsibility for man's actions and his duties to God and to his fellow men.

Thus while Islam connotes a *new faith* it connotes at the same time a *new institution*, a *new social system*, a *new culture*, and a *new civilization*. The Prophet created a *new world* altogether inhabited by men and women of superior calibre with unprecedented high ideals regarding both the present life and the after-life.

Thus it is that not one of those objections can apply to the religion of Islam which have been raised by the modern critics, specially by the Bolsheviks against religion. The Prophet foresaw all those and miraculously met those in advance—may he and his always triumph!

V.—The Islamic Moral Code is Perfect.

Contrary to Bolshevism which has no spiritual or moral ideals at all Islam has established a perfect moral code. It is universal in its application to every department of human life—religious, social, economic, commercial, legal, industrial and even political.

The authors of the Chamber's Encyclopaedia say:—

"That part of Islam which distinctly reveals the mind of its Author is also its most complete and its most shining part—we mean the ethics of the QURAN. They are not found, any more than the other laws, brought together in one or two or three SURATS, but like golden threads are woven into the very fabric of the religious constitution of Muhammad. Injustice, falsehood, pride, revengefulness, calumny, mockery, avarice, prodigality, debauchery, mistrust, and suspicions are inveighed against as ungodly and wicked, while benevolence, liberality, modesty, forbearance, patience, endurance, frugality, sincerity, straightforwardness, decency, love of peace and truth, and above all trust in one God and *submitting to His will* are considered as the pillars of true piety and the principal signs of a true believer."

In the words of the QURAN :—

"God loves the doers of good" (II: 195); "Those who purify themselves" (II: 220); "The righteous" (III: 75); "The patient" (II: 146); "Those who do good to others" (III: 147); "Those who judge equitably" (V: 42); "Those who are careful of their duty" (XX: 7).

God does not love those:—

"Who exceed the limits" (II: 130); "The unjust" (III: 56); "The mischief-mongers" (V: 64); "The extravagant" (VI: 142); "The treacherous" (VIII: 68); "The Proud" (XVI: 22); "Any arrogant boaster" (LVII: 23).

The QURAN enjoins:—

"Turn aside evil with what is better." (XXIII: 96). And again it urges:—"Good and evil are not alike: turn aside (evil) with what is better, and lo, he between whom and thyself was enmity shall become as it were warmest friend." (XII: 33, 34.)

Moral aspects in legal dealings have also not been left unguided. The QURAN directs:—

"And do not conceal testimony, and whoever conceals it is surely sinful, and God knows what you do." (II: 283.) "You who believe, be maintainers of justice, bearers of witness for God's sake, though it may be against your own selves, or your parents or near relatives: if he be rich or poor." (IV: 135.) "You who believe! fulfil all engagements." (V: I.)

Everybody who has read the life of Lenin knows that Lenin was not by any means a moralist. But if he had found in Christianity any such morality as would have helped the people in their social or political advancement, we do not think that in that case Bolshevism would have been so unconcerned with ethics and so indifferent to religion as it is now. While Rousseau, the father of the French Revolution; Haeckel, the Materialist; Gibbon, the Rationalist; Ingersol, the Agnostic; Goethe, the Philosopher-poet; Carlyle, the Critic, and many others in Europe knew something of Islam and therefore each of them has put in a good word for it; probably Lenin's knowledge of religion was mostly confined to that of Christianity which is the product of the Church and which was represented in its most orthodox and conservative form in Russia. Because of this "church morality" the Bolshevists tried to invent their own morality and have called it the "new morality." We will deal with that in another chapter to show how far even that was anticipated by the Prophet.

If Lenin had known even a little of the Islamic moral code he would not have been so unscrupulous as he was.

Islam is not the name of any particular set of rituals. Any man who lives a moral life is a Muslim. That is, every good man is a Muslim. After describing the naturalness and simplicity of Islam, Goethe asked, "If this be Islam, do we not all live in Islam?" And Carlyle answered, "Yes, all of us who live a moral life, we all live so." Carlyle never spoke a greater truth than when he said that.

It can be truly urged that every religion teaches ethics and delineates moral obligations. It is for this reason that any religion is better than no religion. But where Islam excels in its ethical ideals is that it puts responsibility for all one's acts on the shoulders of each individual.

Islam teaches that a merciful God has taken steps *to show the right way* and that free will has been given to man. The QURAN says:—"Of Allah it is to point out the way, but some turn aside from it. Had He imposed His Own will He would surely have led you all aright." (XVI: 4.)

"Guard yourself against the Day when not in aught shall one soul avail another, nor shall compensation be accepted from it, nor shall intercession be of use to it, nor shall they be helped."

"Say: O men! now hath the truth come to you from your Lord, so whoever is guided is guided for his own soul; whosoever erreth erreth only to its hurt. And I am not a guardian over you."

And again:—

"Say: ye will not be questioned as to our faults; nor shall we be questioned to what you do. Every man is responsible for

what he shall have wrought." (XXXI: 33; II: 123; X: 109; XXXIV: 25; LII: 21; LIII: 36-41.)

Islam does not hold that everybody is born a sinner. On the contrary it lays down that everybody is born with a righteous instinct. That means, if everybody were given opportunity to walk straight and if he were not forced by adverse circumstances, nobody could then act crookedly. If a man steals it is not because he is born a thief but because he is in want of the needed thing. If a man speaks a falsehood it is because circumstances force him to do so. Surely Rousseau would have not committed larceny, nor Lenin prompted forgery if circumstances had not forced them to do so. And if they had been brought up under an effective moral code then even circumstances, however adverse they might have been, could not have made such great men act wrongly.

All what the Moralists, Spiritualists and Lawgivers had laid down in the world for ethical guidance of man, all what Rama, Krishna, Epictetus, Buddha, Moses, Christ and others had preached for the moral and spiritual elevation of Man, was preached by Islam as well. But the uniqueness of Islam lies in the fact that the Prophet of Islam, the final Seal of Prophets, or his immediate successors, demonstrated **all virtues** known to man by practising those, so that morality was brought down from the copy books to the actual daily life of the Nation which followed the Prophet's example. The Islamic moral code, as the life of the Prophet, is before the Islamic Nation upto this day, the reason being that the Prophet has acquired almost a physical immortality. He lives, as it were, in flesh and blood to restrain the wrong-doer.

A Hindu Scholar writes:—

"I speak the truth. Islam is the only religion that still retaineth the spirit of its originator in full identity. The spirit of Muhammad and the spirit that is retained by every individual Muslim to-day, are almost the same.

"Amidst hundreds of sects and beliefs of the Hindus and amidst the various shades of Philosophy, I do not know what should be accepted as the real Hinduism or the spirit of Hinduism.

"Many Asiatic countries such as Tibet, China, Japan, Siam, Burma and Ceylon are known as Buddhist countries. But I am sure if Buddha himself would come to find out his own spirit to-day he would feel himself quite a foreigner in these lands.

"And about Christianity, it is doubtful whether the spirit of Jesus Christ was ever cherished in Christian Church except by some solitary individuals like St. Francis of Assissi and Huss, who could only pursue the spirit of Jesus Christ at the point of severe persecution in the hands of Christian Churches."

Sir Mark Sykes confirms the practicability of Muslim Socio-moral Laws in these words:—

"It is not Muhammadan Law that one should admire but the observance by Muslims of their own free will of those social duties which Christians will not perform save at the end of a policeman's truncheon."

Goethe said to Eckermann of the moral force and teachings of Islam, "You see this teaching never fails and with all our systems, we cannot go and, generally speaking, no man can go further than this."

It is said that the Bolshevists rejected Christianity because they found it to be anti-social. But as Sir Mark Sykes has said, Muslims voluntarily perform their "social duties." Thus the Bolshevists have nothing to teach them in this respect and should have no objection against Islam.

Carlyle writes thus of the Islamic morality:—

"It has ever been held the highest wisdom for a man not merely to submit to Necessity,—Necessity will make him submit, but to know and believe well that the stern thing which necessity has ordered was the wisest, the best, the thing wanted there. To cease his frantic pretension of scanning this great God's World in his small fraction of a brain: to know that it had verily, though deep beyond his soundings, a just Law, that the soul of it was good: that his part in it was to conform to the Law of the Whole, and in devout silence follow that; not questioning it, obeying it as unquestionable.

"I say, this is yet the only true morality known. A man is right and invincible, virtuous and on the road towards sure conquest, precisely while he joins himself to the great deep Law of the world in spite of all superficial laws, temporary appearances, profit-and-loss calculations; he is victorious, while he co-operates with that great central Law, not victorious otherwise: and surely his first chance of co-operating with it, or getting into the course of it, is to know with his whole soul that it is: that it is good, and alone good. *This is the soul of Islam.*"

If the Islamic moral code had allowed the least equivocation, prevarication or mental reservation (*taqayya*) in any form or circumstance, the grandson of the Prophet—the great martyr Hosain, would not have sacrified his own life and that of his near and dear ones.

One of the greatest moral achievements of Islam is that it has stopped despondency and it has stopped suicides while in England and Wales more than five thousand commit suicide every year. In Japan *Harakiri* (suicide) is considered to be a virtue.

It was because the Islamic moral code was perfect in all its essentials and because it was socialistic and practical that in the short period of ten years a high moral standard was raised for the whole of Humanity for all times. Not only the Arabs but the Turks also as a nation have demonstrated in their person the practical effects of the Islamic moral code.

Says Lord Eversley :—

"The Turks of Anatolia had very valuable qualities as soldiers. They were, and are to this day, brave, hardy, sober, frugal and cleanly in their habits, as *inculcated by their religion*, a strong point in their favour when sanitary arrangements were completely ignored by armies" .....

Finlay says and Gibbon confirms it that the secret of Turkish successes when the Turkish soldiers followed Islam more closely lay in "the superiority of the Ottoman tribe over all contemporary nations in *religious convictions* and in *moral and military conduct.*

VI.—Differences in Outlook and Methods.

Bolshevism has not only a very limited scope as compared to that of Islam, it has also adopted a different angle of vision for the social, political and economic outlook of man. Bolshevism is too materialistic. It ignores human emotions and sentiments. It sometimes even ignores human nature. While such religions as Buddhism, Hinduism, Christianity ignore human nature in one way, Bolshevism has gone to the other extreme in ignoring human nature. It refuses to acknowledge the inherent difference in the capacities of a man and man as there is in every animal and animal. In its principles it ignores personalities although in actual practice it recognises the greatness of certain persons. It treats Lenin as a superman. It should not shut its eyes to the fact that even if two brothers, who might have been brought up in the same environments and might have received the same education, even if they adopted the very same profession they would differ in their prospects and achievements, often one will earn more than the other. But Bolshevism refuses to recognise natural limitations and capabilities of man and would feel contented if it puts man into a position to satisfy his animal cravings. Bolshevism would be perfectly satisfied if bread and property are equally divided among all men. It is not concerned, as is Islam, with mental happiness or satisfaction of the soul. Its object is to make the whole world proletarian. Hence its aim, for the present any way, is to establish the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. It has, at least for the time being, a still more limited object. It wants to establish the Dictatorship of only one class of the Proletariat. It wants to establish the Dictatorship of the Workers. But Islam works for a higher aim. It wants to establish a *World Brotherhood.* It wants to do away altogether with the division of Society into proletarian, plebeian—worker or labourer. It sets up a new scale—of merits, of nobleness, of character. Islam hates every human Dictatorship—either individual, or of a class and it avoids using compulsion. It recognises both human natural limitations and capacities and its aim is to allow full play to all the human capacities for good and only to restrain those that are for evil. It bends the cane to its full limit but avoids reaching the breaking point. Its basic principle is *la ukallifullaho nafsan illa vusaha.* God does not put any task upon any soul but according to its capacity. The prayer Islam has taught man is *va la tuhammilna ma la taquata lana beh.* (II: 28.) Isalm holds that the right path has been made distinctly distinguishable from the wrong. That Prophets had been sent to every nation for spiritual guidance and moral uplift. That everything has a measure, and that man has been given discretional powers to adopt the right or wrong course

and he has been given capacity to adopt the right measure that is good and beneficial or the wrong one which would do him harm. Islam wants man to get out of Nature all that is beneficial for him and to avoid or regulate all that is harmful. Therefore it instructs him to learn all the laws of Nature—so as to bring even the Sun and Moon under his service and to use even poison or electricity for his good. Islam wants to make science its help-mate instead of its antagonist. While the latest Socialistic and even Bolshevistic view is that mechanical or scientific production is causing greater unemployment and is helpful to Capitalism, Islam has encouraged scientific researches and it handles science in a way that its mischief is checked. Islam has such a correct angle of vision and such a just outlook that it succeeds when all other systems, including Bolshevism, fail in the social or political realm.

As has been shown in the first part of the Book there is a close agreement between the objective of both Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism. Islam anticipated centuries ago most of those reforms which have been initiated by Bolshevism only now. But there is a good deal of difference not only in the angle of vision but also in the methods employed by each even though the object is identical. To a large extent this is natural and should not be made a reason of any mutual dislike. Bolshevism specially should be more respectful towards Islam because Islam has adopted, to say the least of it, peaceful, effective and steady methods in achieving those objects which Bolshevism has only introduced by force and by shedding the blood of Russia's own citizens. This difference in methods makes a good deal of difference between Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism.

While Islam has never advocated compulsion to advance its principles, the Bolsheviks had to take constant recourse to the *Cheka* and to depend upon the Red Army to achieve their objectives. The news comes that just recently—August, 1936, sixteen of the former Bolshevik leaders have been killed. So it is not only Hitler who enjoys occasional blood baths.

The Quran has taken special care to impress upon Muslims not to use any violence in the preaching of Islam. It has directed them to be very courteous and pleasant in preaching Islamic principles. It says:—

"There is no compulsion in religion, the right way is clearly distinct from the wrong way". (II: 256.)

It has stopped reviling even idols:—

"Abuse them not upon whom they call besides God for then they may abuse God in spite without knowledge." (vi: 108.)

The Quran says that even during war time:—

"If one of the idolators seek protection from thee give him protection till he hears the words of Allah, then make him attain his place of safety, this is because they are a people who do not know." (ix: 6.)

It has forbidden violence against all living things which should be treated as kindly as a man himself.

The Quran says:—

"There is no moving thing on the earth, nor a bird that flies with its wings, but is a being like to you." (vi: 38.)

A definition of Momin (Believer) given by the Prophet is as follows:—

"A Momin is one from whom people are secure concerning their lives and properties."

And again:—

"A Muslim is he from whose tongue and hands the Muslims are safe and a Momin is he in whom mankind has an asylum for its blood and wealth." (Abu Hurairah.)

And again:—

"Faith is a restraint against all violence. Let no Momin commit violence." (Abu Hurairah.)

Of course Islam was too practical and natural a system and a religion to allow itself, its adherents and its Prophet himself to be brutally destroyed. It was too moral to encourage evil by not resisting it.

For this reason the Quran lays down the philosophy of combating evil thus:—

"And were it not for restraining some men by others, the earthwould certainly be in a state of disorder." (ii: 251.)

Also read verses 190, 193 of Chapter II and XXII: 39-40.

The moral justification for fighting and wars is given as follows:—"And why should ye not fight for the cause of Allah (that means for the freedom of conscience and all other good causes and not for selfish ends of getting territories or opportunities for exploitation or other base motives and objects), and for the feeble among men and for the women and children who are crying "Oh Lord! Bring us forth from out of this town (place or country) where people are oppressors! Oh give us a champion from Thy presence and give us from Thy presence a defender." (iv: 75.)

Would any person deserving to be called a man desist from risking his life in response to such a cry as mentioned above to

relieve the oppressed, suffering and downtrodden people and would not rush, sword in hand, to stop the evil doers, the cruel barbarians ?

But the Prophet was inspired to say to the unbelievers :

"To you your religion, to us ours." (cix.)

Not only the Prophet did not use force for his objective but his whole outlook was essentially spiritual. On the other hand the outlook of Bolsheviks and their angle of vision is exclusively materialistic. It is altogether devoid of spirituality.

For this reason we notice a great contrast in the methods of the Islamisation of Arabia at first, then of a large part of the world and eventually of 685 millions of human souls of our days with the Bolshevisation of Russia. While the first has been achieved by means of persuasion and preaching and by setting up a model, the latter is being even now carried on at the point of bayonet, at the cost of the life and property of millions of people, not foreign enemies but the citizens of Russia herself.

Maurice Hindus, who is by no means an unfavourable writer on the present conditions of Russia and is far from being an anti-Bolshevist, gives in the "Red Bread" story after story, all emphasing the mercilessness of the Russian revolutionaries. At one place he writes :—"What a nightmare ! People were put out into the street with no place to go for shelter—and their children too—no pity, no human feeling. And the "dekoolakyzations" in the villages, what a horror that was ! The whole thing was like a nation-wide pogram, that is what it was." He further describes a controversy from the mouth of a Koolak thus :—

"Yes it is true you did not dash babies' heads against brick walls like the old Black Hundreds. You did not rip peoples bellies with butchers' knives. No, you did not do those things but think of the men, women and children whom your confiscation and banishment have left without bread at the mercy of weather and hunger."

It has been related not by enemies but friends that those "liquidated" Koolaks were at places allowed to bring their foodstuff and other belongings with them but when they were entrained for exile those things were put in other carriages which were all left behind and poor exiled men, women and children had to settle down in new and unhospitable places without any belongings at all of their own.

Even Communists, who are Stalin's staunchest friends, admit that in the winter of 1929-1930 forcible methods in the villages pushed Russia "to the brink of holocaust."

Maurice Hindus says:—"Koolak is one of the hardest toiling people in Russia and so are his wife and children."

He then describes in the following words how these "hardest toiling people" of the Proletariat, were treated by their own Government which is supposed to have given the Dictatorship of the world into the hands of *Workers*. He says:—"The Politbureau under Stalin's influence drafted its famous declaration of January 5, 1930. The declaration embodied two vital decisions:—To liquidate the *Koolaks* and to achieve complete collectivization of the land within specified time.

"The *Koolaks* were to be economically exterminated, their properties were to be confiscated and they exiled to Siberia—to the far North in Europe, or to a remote strip of poor land away from their former homes, where, with limited animal power, few implements and with no aid from the State or Co-operatives, they were to make their way in the world as best as they could. Since *Koolaks* constituted between 4 or 5 per cent of the population this decision doomed more than one million families to the loss of their properties and to banishment."

Then Mr. Hindus is forced to make such remarks:—"When one sees in Moscow's streets the multitude waiting in queues for food, the spell cast by Revolutionary rhetoric fades and one faces the sinister force behind, *i.e.*, the brutal intolerance of differing opinion that has banished hundreds of honest doubters and non-Conformists to far away parts of the land or to a fate even worse."

These are a friend's lamentations!

Besides this barbarous treatment meted out to *Koolaks* there have been stories of forced labour when hundreds of thousands of men have been compelled by the State to cut wood to be sent abroad for sale.

In contrast to all these barbarous and inhuman methods of Bolshevisation of Russia the world was Islamised with a new and superior civilisation which gave men all the material advantages and comforts, besides elevating them spiritually, *by altogether different methods*.

Up to this day the propagation of Islam is going on. Through peaceful proselytization the number increases annually and that even in such countries as had not much Muslim population before and where "the sword of Islam" had not reached. The methods of Islamisation remain different from those of Bolshevization.

Herein lay the greatest miracle of the Prophet that he could enter the very hearts of all the people.

There is no man on this earth even upto this day who is cherished, loved, obeyed, and reverenced so ardently, sincerely and devotedly as is Muhammad (may he and his always triumph !).

It was thus that the Prophet removed the need of using force in bringing people to act upon his principles.

It was thus that his own personality became a connecting link between people belonging to different races, countries and colour.

His God helped him in another miracle. The mutually fighting tribes in Arabia coalesced into one Body, one Nation.

The Quran reminds :— "And hold fast to the cord of Allah together and be not disunited and remember the favour of Allah on you when you were enemies (of one another), then He created love in your hearts so by His favour you became brothers (to each other). (III: 102.)

Thus by creating brotherly unity on the one hand and by raising the moral character of each individual Muslim on the other, the Prophet set his Nation on the path of progress and of an irresistible advance—moral, mental, spiritual as well as territorial.

Though that Nation has degenerated but even up to this day the character of the Muslim peoples wins praises even from the enemies as has been quoted elsewhere.

It was because of this wonderful success in forming high individual characters that the Prophet accomplished so peacefully all what Bolshevists have been trying to accomplish with force and compulsion.

The beauty of Islamic communism was that it did not forcefully interfere with private enterprise, nor with individual initiative or liberty yet it made it almost impossible for an individual to rob, sweat or exploit others or to get rich at the expense of others or to misuse even that wealth which he might have acquired through his own brains or hand or even by inheritance. It was thus that the Prophet and his successor Omar formed a Communistic State and a Socialistic Nation (Omar's Empire was very extensive) without the necessity of waging a "Class War," and without the need of forcible expropriation of property or wealth or income and above all without the deprivation of individuals of their liberty or discretion and incentive for action and labour.

VII.—The Everlasting Triumph of the Prophet and Its Secrets.

How well has Renan said:—*Religion cannot be said to have made a bad choice in pitching on this man (Muhammad) as the ideal representative and guide to humanity.*"

For the last 1356 years this Man who lived on dried meat and dates, who patched up his own garments and shoes, who slept on a coarse mattress of palm-leaves, who used to be the first to salute all and who was last to withdraw his hand from the clasp of a brother man, who loved innocent children and was instinctively loved by them and who respected his own daughter so as to stand up if sitting when she came to see him and who eloquently declared, "Paradise lieth at the feet of mother," this superman, who anticipated Rousseau and Marx and before whom Lenin should have bended his knees, has been the loving and the well-beloved, the well-respected Teacher, Guide, Friend and Philosopher, the Minister of life, the source under God, of the hopes of millions upon millions of peoples of different races and countries, moulding their character, generation after generation, in all walks of life, on all emergencies, at every stage of development of human Society in every clime.

The great Critic, Philosopher and Historian Carlyle says of him:—

"Withal I like Muhammad for his total freedom from cant. He is a rough (we would say honest, frank and sincere) self-helping son of the wilderness; does not pretend to be what he is not. There is no ostentatious pride in him but neither does he go much upon assumed humility: he is there as he can be in a cloak and shoes of his own clouting; speaks plainly to all manner of Persian Kings and Greek Emperors what it is they are bound to do, knows well enough about himself "the respect due unto thee."

Another European writer, Mr. Bosworth Smith, has described the Prophet thus:—

"Head of the State as well as of the Church, he was Caesar and Pope in one, but he was the Pope without the Popes' pretensions, Caesar without the legions of Caesar, without a standing army, without a bodyguard, without a police, without a fixed revenue. If ever any man had the right to say that he ruled by a right Divine, it was Muhammad, for he had all the power without its instruments and without its supports."

The same author further says:—

"By a fortune absolutely unique in history Muhammad is a three-fold founder of a nation, of an empire, and of a religion. Illiterate himself, scarcely able to read or write, he was yet the author of a Book (under God's own inspiration and in His own words, M. H. K.) which is a poem, a code of laws, a Book of Common Prayer, and a Bible in one, and is reverenced to this day by a sixth of the whole human race, as a miracle of purity of style, of wisdom and of truth. It was the one miracle claimed by Muhammad—his standing miracle he called it, and a miracle indeed it is. But looking at the circumstances of the times, at the unbounded reverence of his followers and comparing him with the Fathers of the Church or with mediaeval saints, to my mind, the most miraculous thing about Muhammad is, that he never claimed the power of working miracles. Whatever he had said, he could do, his disciples would straightway have seen him do. They could not help attributing to him miraculous acts which he never did and which he always denied he could do. What more crowning proof of his sincerity is needed? Muhammad to the end of his life claimed for himself that title only with which he had began and which the highest philosophy and the truest Christianity will one day, I venture to believe, agree in yielding to him, that is, a Prophet, a very Prophet of God."

And what a greater proof of his Prophethood could there be than that he remains a Guide and a Teacher upto this day. He was not only the most successful Prophet in his own time but remains the same to-day.

Samuel Johnson says:—

"His thoroughly democratic conception of the Divine Government, the universality of his religious ideal, his simple humanity—all affiliated him with the modern world."

History does not present any other man who so successfully accomplished his mission in his life-time as did Muhammad. And what a glorious but how difficult of achievement, how arduous and how versatile that Mission was! Nobody on this earth in all its history had taken upon himself such an impossible and superhuman Mission. But Muhammad performed the miracle. He made possible what was impossible and within ten years he accomplished his Mission.

The Prophet saw with his own eyes the glorious result of his preachings and the accomplishment to the full of his Mission. A contemporary record of the Quran is:—(O! Ye who Believe!) This day have I brought to perfection your religion for you and

have filled up the measure of my favours upon you and have chosen for you—Islam (the religion of Peace), as your religion. (V : 3.)

These verses indicated to the Prophet himself and to his loving followers (tears came into whose eyes when they heard those), that the Prophet's career was to close on the earth and he was to depart from it.

Such a complete success of one's very high Mission by his own hands, in his own life-time, remains unique upto our days.

It was Muhammad who, by his own towering Personality and his God-inspired teachings, saved Humanity and Human Civilization 1356 years ago at the *darkest* period in History.

Writes Mr. J. H. Denison in his *"Emotions as the Basis of Civilization"* :—

"In the fifth and sixth centuries, the civilized world stood on the verge of chaos. The old emotional cultures that had made civilization possible, since they had given to Men a sense of unity and of reverence for their rulers, has broken down, and nothing has been found adequate to take their place . . . . .

"It seems then that the great civilization which it had taken four thousand years to construct was on the verge of disintegration, and that mankind was likely to return to that condition of barbarism where every tribe and sect was against the next and law and order were unknown . . . . The old tribal sanctions had lost their power. . . . . The new sanctions created by Christianity were working division and destruction instead of unity and order . . . . Civilization like a gigantic tree whose foliage had overreached the world . . . stood tottering . . . rotted to the core . . . . Was there any emotional culture that could be brought in to gather mankind once more into unity and to save civilization ?"

The same author replies to his own question thus :—

"It was among these people (the Arabs) that the man was born who was to unite the whole known world of the East and West." The Prophet undoubtedly made a golden chain, by his miraculous powers, which heart to heart and mind to mind in faith and duty, in culture and civilisation binds together an hourly increasing mass of humanity, upto this day over all the world known to Man.

But the political and social unification and uplift was not the only achievement of the Prophet. He also succeeded in changing, by his personality, the most depressed condition of the world in all respects,

Muir says :—

Death—mental, moral and spiritual—had overtaken the human race, and darkness prevailed everywhere clouding the belief and preventing the actions of the people."

He further says :—"The Christianity of the century was itself decrepit and corrupt."

The most authentic and uncontroverted contemporary record is as follows :—

"Corruption has appeared in the land and sea of what the hands of men have wrought." (xxx : 40.)

Regarding this miraculous personality of the Prophet which insured his success and brought about the desired Revolution, Lane-Poole wrote :—

"On the graces and intellectual gifts of Nature to the son of Abdullah, the Arabian writers dwell with the proudest and fondest satisfaction. His politeness to the great, his affability to the humble, and his dignified bearing to the presumptuous, procured him respect, admiration and applause. His talents were equally fitted for persuasion or command. Deeply read in the volume of Nature, though perhaps not much learned in letters, his mind could expand into controversy with the acutest of his enemies, or contract itself to the apprehension of the meanest of his disciples. His simple eloquence, rendered impressive by the expression of a countenance wherein awfulness of majesty was tempered by an amiable sweetness, excited emotions of veneration and love ; and he was gifted with that authoritative air of genius which alike influences the learned and commands the illiterate. As a friend and a parent, he exhibited the softest feelings of our nature ; but while in possession of the kind and generous emotions of the heart, and engaged in the discharge of most of the social and domestic duties, he disgraced not his title of an apostle of God. With all that simplicity which is so natural to a great mind, he performed the humbler offices whose homeliness it would be idle to conceal with pompous diction. "God", say the Moslem writers, "offered him the keys of the treasures of the earth, but he would not accept them."

The Prophet's personality was really the chief secret of his success.

By the same powers of his personality and his God-inspired teachings through which he saved before, he and he alone can save to-day Humanity which in its greatest agony is piteously calling for deliverence.

A learned scholar, Mr. W. B. Pickard, B.A. (Cantab.), wrote in 1934:—

"Call to mind the life of Muhammad the Messenger of God, and consider it carefully. Can you find in any other recorded life so clear an example to follow? Can you find in any other of humanity so great a source of comfort, of inspiration, of courage, of guidance towards the right living of your own life?"

Another well-known scholar and author, while asserting that Islam is still the greatest spiritual and the uniting power in the world offering the best solution of the great world problems of to-day, says:—

"Islam has a claim upon the attention of every thinker, not only because it is the most civilizing and the greatest spiritual force of the world but also because it offers a solution of the most baffling problems which confront mankind to-day. Materialism, which has become humanity's ideal in modern times, can never bring about peace and mutual trust among the nations of the world. Christianity has already failed to do away with race and colour prejudices. Islam is the only force which has already succeeded in blotting out those distinctions and it is through Islam only that this great problem of the modern world can be solved. Islam is, first and foremost, an international religion and it is only before the grand international ideal of Islam, this ideal of the equality of all races and of the unity of the human race, that the cause of nationalism which has been and is responsible for the troubles of the ancient and the modern world can be swept away. But even within the boundaries of a nation or a country there can be no peace so long as a just solution of the two great problems of wealth and sex be not found. Europe has gone to two extremes on the wealth question, Capitalism and Bolshevism. There is either the tendency to concentrate wealth among the great capitalists or by community of wealth to bring the indolent and the industrious to one level. Islam offers the true solution by ensuring to the worker the rewards of his work, great or small, in accordance with the merit of the work, and also by allotting to the poor a share in the wealth of the rich. Thus while the rights of property are maintained in their fullest sense an arrangement is made for equalizing conditions by taking a part of the wealth of the rich and distributing it among the poor according to the principles of ZAKAT, and also by a more or less equal division of property among heirs on the death of an owner. The problem of race, which is probably the greatest stumbling block in world harmony, also can only be solved through the Prophet to secure universal peace and prosperity."

A friend of the Author, Dr. Neville Whymant, has made the following line the theme of one of his poems:—

"At the feet of Muhammed East and West meet."

They indeed meet at his feet. It is he who has produced a model *ummatul vasta*, "an intermediate nation", to be a link between different religions and philosophies, as well as political and social systems.

One of the secrets of the Prophet's success was his sincerity which, as Carlyle admits, "had in very truth something of the Divine" and that "the words of such a man being a voice direct from Nature's own heart *men do and must listen to that as to nothing else*, all else is wind in comparison."

Another secret of the Prophet's success was his enthusiasm for his Mission, of which Mr. Lane-Poole writes:—

"He was an enthusiast in that noblest sense when enthusiasm becomes the salt of the earth, the one thing that keeps men from rotting whilst they live. Enthusiasm is often used despitefully, because it is joined to an unworthy cause, or falls upon barren ground and bears no fruit. So was it not with Muhammad. He was an enthusiast *when enthusiasm was the one thing needed to set the world aflame, and his enthusiasm was noble for a noble cause.* He was one of those happy few who have attained the supreme joy of making one great truth their very life-spring. He was the messenger of the one God; and never to his life's end did he forget who he was, or the message which was the marrow of his being. He brought his tidings to his people with a grand dignity sprung from the consciousness of his high office, together with a most sweet humanity, whose roots lay in the knowledge of his own weakness."

The Prophet's only weakness was that he was a man, a perfect man yet not the Quranic God. It can be said without any fear of contradiction that all those gods who are worshipped by non-Muslims fade before the majesty of Muhammad. If Muhammad fades it is only before his own inspired Conception of God. Before nothing else in heaven or earth does Muhammad fade—he is far, far and far more brilliant than the Greatest Luminary.

Carlyle says:—

"There was something in this Truth he has got which was of Nature herself; equal in rank to Sun, or Moon, or whatsoever thing Nature had made. It would speak itself there, so long as the Almighty allowed it, in spite of the Sun and Moon, and all Quraish and all men and things". . . . .

"The universal empire of Allah, presence everywhere of an unspeakable Power, a Splendour, and a Terror not to be named,

as the true force, essence and reality, in all things whatsoever, was continually clear to this man. What a modern talks of by the name Forces of Nature, Laws of Nature ; and does not figure as a Divine thing ; not even as one thing at all, but as a set of things, undivine enough—saleable, curious, good for propelling steamships. With our sciences and Cyclopaedias we are apt to forget the *Divineness* in those laboratories of ours. We ought not to forget it. That once well forgotten, I know not what else were worth remembering . . . The best science, without this, is but as the dead timber ; it is not the growing tree and forest, which gives over new timber, among other things. Man cannot know either unless he can worship in some way. His knowledge is a pedantry, and dead thistle, otherwise."

For the grand Mission of the Prophet the All-wise God could not chose any other man except one of the calibre and personality of Muhammad.

The Quran says :—Verily a noble pattern have ye in Allah's apostle. (xxxiii : 21.)

If Muhammad had had any weakness, such a high and ever continuing work would not have been entrusted to him, nor would this Mission have been given in his charge if he had not something superhuman in him spiritually and mentally both.

Carlyle has well said :—

"It is from the heart of the world that he comes ; he is a portion of the primal *reality* of things."

These few words of Carlyle are but a meagre commentary of the following verses of the Quran when taken in their esoteric *Sufic* sense showing Muhammad to be certainly a portion of the *Reality* and his closest humanly possible proximity to God in soul and body.

As it is impossible to give any satisfactory and impressive translation of those and as no other characters but the Arabic can do full justice to the words used, we give those verses in the original 1356-years-old Arabic language and in Arabic characters :—

والنجم اذا هوى — ما ضلّ صاحبكم وما غوى — وما ينطق عن الهوى

ان هو الا وحى يوحى — علمه شديد القوى — ذو مرة فاستوى —

وهو بالافق الاعلى — ثم دنى فتدلى — فكان قاب قوسين او ادنى

فأوحي الي عبده ما اوحى—ما كذب الفؤاد ما راي—
أفتمرونه على ما يرى—ولقد رآه نزلة أخرى—عند سدرة المنتهى
عندها جنة المأوى—اذ يغشى سدرة ما يغشى—ما زاغ البصر وما طغى
لقد راى من آيات ربه الكبرى

(Liii: 1—18)

These verses are said to refer to the Ascension (*Mairaj*) of the Prophet. Rationalist Muslim writers think that they have an esoteric and spiritualist meaning. But those who believe in the physical Ascension of Jesus have no reason to disbelieve in the physical Ascension of Muhammad. The first believers, in the Ascension of Jesus, were a few very superstitious, ignorant, insignificant fishermen but the first believers in the Ascension of Muhammad were talented, cultured, well-known, well-respected persons, many of whom have themselves made History—a glorious and monumental History, particularly his first two successors, one of whom was given the very title of the Truthful—*Al Siddique*, because of his expressing without a moment's hesitation his firm belief in the Ascension of the Great Superman.

A miraculously far-sighted Prophet as Muhammad was he refused to make wonder-working a proof of the truth of his message. But there have been prejudiced polemical Christian writers who, instead of appreciating it, have deliberately misrepresented the facts and have said that the Quran itself has not assigned to the Prophet any high spiritual elevation. To give a lie to such critics we have quoted the above given verses from the Quran otherwise we would not have given prominence to those verses, as the object of this Work is not to deal with the spiritual side of Islam or of the Prophet.

The interest of the readers of this Book would be probably mostly confined to learn the political and social reforms made by the Prophet and the constitution he gave to the Islamic State for the Islamic Nation which he created. His triumph in those respects was indeed grand. We have said before that the Pan-Islamic Constitution was deliberately kept flexible. It could be adapted according to the needs of the people and to all the current needs and circumstances of the place and time. But there was

nothing more foreign to the Constitution of Islam than autocracy, personal domination or an alien rule. If any Muslim is unfortunate enough to have to endure these he can do so only as he endures a disease or pain, making every effort to relieve himself of it as quickly and as completely as possible. A Muslim who is cringing to any human being cannot be a true believer in "Allah". Nature itself should not be able to bend him as he should give himself under the protection of the *Lord of Nature* and should be clever enough to have a command over the laws of Nature to give it a good fight.

The Islamic law (*Shariat*) does not contemplate a permanently subordinate position for the Muslim Nation. It must acquire for itself a position to be able to **command** what is good and to **forbid** what is wrong. It was raised for the set object of being the *Very Best Nation* for mankind. And if it worked truly under the Constitution and laws of Islam nothing could keep it down—not even the hot hurricanes of the Arabian sandy desert where the great, all-conquering Nation was born. The miraculous Architect of that all-conquering Nation demonstrated by his own life and work how even one man could conquer both men and Nature. And although his spirit left its physical coil centuries ago his conquest continues all over the world to this day. The man—Muhammad the mighty Pan-Islamist, thus conquered Death itself. He is the only ever-living Man—the ever-living Teacher of all men. When he could overcome Nature and conquer Death what wonder that he could bisect the Moon or command the Sun into subservience.

No need of any fresh Prophet or *autars* remains after Muhammad, because he is ready to teach, as he was about fourteen centuries ago—teach not only by his sayings, but also by his works and examples, a record of which exists uncorrupted.

Those who glibly talk of the continuance of the Prophetic Revelation after the final Prophet—Muhammad, have no sense to understand the design of the great Evolver of this Universe. As far as Religious Revelation went the finality was reached the very day when it was announced by God himself, *"alyaom akmalto lakum dinakam, va atmamtu alaikum naimati va razitalakum Islam dina.* Anybody who believes in the Divine origin of the Quran cannot doubt at all that Islam is the final religion from God and Muhammad the final Prophet. For all of them the above verses are decisive. But for those who do not believe in the Quran there are also cogent arguments to make them believe in the finality of the Prophet Muhammad. From a religious and spiritual point of view the finality was reached through Muhammad in the God-ideal. No man can say that that ideal can ever, ever be improved upon.

It is perfect. Nothing holier, purer and more sublime could ever be conceived. The Quran says that even if the deep seas were used as ink to write the words of God's glory (*li kalimate Rabbihi*) they will not suffice even if others may be used as such when the first were exhausted. There is no exaggeration in this. There is no respectable religion now on earth which does not feel ashamed of any belief in the multiplicity of God and which does not try to make out that it also teaches the belief in one and only God. Nature itself proclaims the unity of God.

A poet has well said:—

Her geyahai ki as zamin ruyad
Wahdaho la sharikal ah goyad.

Every blade of grass that grows from the earth shouts out:—He is one, there is no Associate of Him.

Truly the cry raised by Muhammad of *La illah illallah* echoes and re-echoes and will continue to echo and re-echo uptil the time that the universe will exist. It will echo and re-echo even more loudly, more demonstratively when nothing in the Universe will exist and He and He alone who is Eternal will remain. Undoubtedly the Messenger of this Truth, this unity of God, is *final*—and shall remain final till the finish.

It was so designed by the All-knowing Himself that there would be no need of any fresh Messenger, as human intelligence itself would develop to an extent after Muhammad as to give the Message a perpetuity. The Quran lived on the tablets of the heart of millions of people until the invention of the Press. It can never die now. It cannot be corrupted. Innumerable copies of it are available everywhere. Where is there the necessity of any new Revelation ?

This has been said of the revelation in its *technical* sense, *i.e.*, of the Prophetic Revelation. Otherwise revelations have continued and shall continue all the time. God reveals Himself in a new glory every day.

Va kulli yaumin hooa fishshan. (Yasin.)

It has been well put by Saadi:—

Berge darakhtane sabz der nazare hoshiar
Her veraque deftaraist maarifate Kirdigar.

Numerous Laws of Nature have been revealed to man and are likely to be revealed oftener in the future. The law of gravity was revealed to Newton or that of the transmission of voice to Marconi. The African savage who used quinine for the first time for malaria or the old priests who experimented upon digitalis for the heart *must* have received

their inspiration and revelation from Above. The Law of hybridisation which has enabled Rosarians to produce soul-delighting roses like the "*Kidwai*" must have been revealed to the first Rose-grower. In truth, Revelation has not been confined to man alone. The Quran itself says that the wonderful process of making honey, which even the cleverest chemist cannot produce, was *revealed* to the Bee. Such revelations do continue and must continue, although in this respect also in one way finality has been reached in certain matters. For instance, it has not been found possible to improve honey. It should be noted that the last thirteen hundred years' history has proved that the Prophet Muhammad was indeed the last Prophet and no man has been able to make any improvement upon the Quranic Conception of God or in the universality of religion as preached and practised by the final Prophet. History has proved something more. It has been shown that although no finality was claimed for the political, social, juristic and economic reforms initiated by the Prophet, the last thirteen centuries have not been able to produce any man who could improve upon those principles which were laid down by the Prophet in these respects also. In such matters full discretion was left to meet the situation as it arose and the Prophet himself had given his approval to the declaration made by Muad bin Jabala, when he was being sent to Yemen to preach Islam and to organise the Provincial administration, that he will conduct the administration according to the human reasoning faculties if any such matters cropped up for which there was no direction in the Quran or no precedent from the life of the Prophet. Thus room was left for Rousseau, Marx and Lenin, etc., but no room for pretenders to the prophethood. In our personal opinion, as we have said before, finality, in the organisation of a vast State or Empire on International and Communistic lines, was reached by the second Khalifa of the Great Prophet on the very foundation laid by the Prophet. But not even an Omar, upon whom the mantle of the Prophethood would have fitted most, as the Prophet himself had said, could reopen the door of the Prophethood. No other human being, or angel or anybody could reach in the thirteen centuries or can ever reach in the coming years the spiritual Prophetic grandeur of the last Prophet with his incorruptible message to mankind for all time.

However it is not only by miraculous, spiritual powers that Muhammad rules to-day over the hearts of more than one-third of the human race as he ruled over the hearts of the hundreds of thousands of people who saw him in flesh and blood, eating with him and talking to him. They love him also for his personal qualities and because of his unequalled services to the cause of

humanity. They know the most secret acts of his life and work after over thirteen centuries after his death. They know him as intimately as did his own contemporaries. The more they know him the more they love him, respect him and all but worship him.

There is no man in history who is so well known. There is no living man on this earth even to-day whose life-history is so exhaustively and minutely known as is that of Muhammad thirteen centuries after his death. Hundreds of thousands of his life-histories exist in different languages. Thousands of his sayings have been recorded and preserved for all these years. *He is really the only ever-living man on this earth.* We say this again and again and again. Almost all his actions, his sentiments and his aspirations have become an example for millions upon millions of people of the world. And when Nature could produce only one Muhammad in millions of years how can it be expected that another Muhammad could be born again. It would be against the economy of Nature to give birth to another Muhammad, because Nature itself did adopt means to make the first Muhammad immortal. His teachings have been kept intact through the pure and uncorrupted words of the *Qurán* as they came out of his mouth and every item, even the most private part of his history, is known to us as well as it was both to his own close companions, and to his contemporary enemies. Hence he is the final Seal of the Prophets and spiritual Teachers. Hence he remains not only the most successful Teacher whose disciples are increasing day by day on this earth but the most beloved and the most respected of all human beings, living or dead, ever born, upto the present day.

His followers by his own command call him only a man. He is *not* the pivot of the religion of Islam (Allah is the Pivot) as is Jesus of Christianity or Buddha of Buddhism. No Muslim worships Muhammad, and when he does not worship Muhammad there cannot possibly exist anybody before whom a Muslim would bow his head. But to every Muslim, educated or uneducated, a peasant, a philosopher, a statesman or a scientist, Muhammad, even upto this day, is what no man, no idol, no god is to any other man. The enlightened and the cultured are as fondly attached to him as are the unlettered and unpolished. To give only one example of what the most polished and educated Muslims think of and feel about Muhammad we will quote the opening address of His Excellency Mirza Husain Khan Ala, C.M.G., the Iranian Minister at the Court of St. James, who is a very esteemed friend of very long standing of the Author, delivered in London on the festive occasion of the birthday celebration of the Holy Prophet in 1936.

His Excellency said :—"It is my pleasure and privilege to preside at the meeting and to greet you on a most joyful occasion—the anniversary of the birth of the Holy Prophet Muhammad—(may peace and the blessing of Allah be upon him).

"It is over 1,366 years ago that the great Reformer saw the light of day and during a life consecrated from the first to the last to the service of God and humanity shed new lustre upon the world.

"His Message :—The Unity of God and the equality and Brotherhood of men is, after fourteen centuries, still the strongest appeal to reason, and holds good under modern conditions.

"Muhammad rose in the midst of a nation sunk in superstition, vice and cruelty. He surprised his fellow-countrymen with the belief in One sole God of Truth and Love, Purity and Justice. Those who were disunited in perpetual jealousy and warfare he united by the ties of brotherhood and charity. How much does the world of to-day, distracted, alas ! and torn with dissensions and aggressions, need the beneficent and soothing presence of Muhammad—so sincere in his purpose, so cleanest in his nature !

"He who only fought in self-defence or for the sake of religious freedom, would bring peace and understanding among the Nations ; he could break down, as he did in Arabia, the baseness of lust, greed, caste and exclusive privilege.

"Indeed, his democratic conception of Divine government, his simple humanity, his progressive ideals affiliate him with the modern world.

"That remarkable Teacher enjoined eternal striving and constant effort for man. Contrary to the Western conception that Islam means fatalism, and therefore stagnation, the Prophet said, "The effort is from us, the fulfilment comes from God." What better examples of the activity and progress under Islam than Renaissance, in recent times, of the countries of the Near and Middle East !

"The passing of years has made no difference in the love and the devotion that Muhammad inspired. To-day, as in his lifetime, during which he was given to see the accomplishment of his high Mission, the Faithful have in their hearts and on their minds the words,—*ruhi fidaka ya Rasulallah.*"

One of the greatest and best demonstrations of the commanding powers of the Prophet and the continuous and lasting hold he has had for centuries and centuries past and has upto this day over the hearts of millions and millions of people in every country and clime is the fact that upto this day the soberest people in this world are his people who cherish the Message :—O ! you who believe ! intoxicants and games of chance and stones set up and

arrows are unclean, the devil's work ; SHUN those therefore that *you may be successful.* (*v: 90.*)

After the sad experience of the dismal failure in America of the prevention of the use of alcoholic drink, in spite of all forces and resources of a united nation and a powerful Government, who would deny the miraculous powers and influence of the Prophet and the place he and his words had in the hearts of his followers generation after generation and which and which alone keep them away upto the present date from even touching the "attractive poison."

Can any example of any other person be pointed out who can claim such a command over the hearts and the minds and actions of such a multitude of people ? No.

If a few men, like Mr. H. G. Wells, are blind to the virtues of such a man they cannot do better than consult a physician.

Technically perhaps Mr. Wells could claim to be right when he wrote to the Author that he was "A Muslim Minus Muhammad," probably meaning thereby that a belief in Muhammad was not essential for being a Muslim. The Prophet himself has said:—

"*Mun quala la illaha illa Allah fa dakhala jannah.*"

(He who says there is no God but Allah enters Paradise.)

And again:—The Key of Paradise is the bearing witness that there is no God but God. (Muadh b. Jabal.)

And again:—Who so dies while he knows that there is no God but God, will enter Paradise. (Osman bin Affan.)

Muslims worship God *not* even the unequalled, grand, superman Muhammad. But they believe as does an eminent lawyer of the British Bar, a. K.C. and a justice of a High Court, in no sense less learned or intelligent than the novelist, when he writes:

"*Our Holy Prophet is not only a necessary element but* **the** *principal element in the scheme of all creation.*" If a true conception of God and high spiritual and moral principles were to be promulgated on this earth according to a set design or purpose of the Evolver of the Universe, if a scientific sense was to be created even among the religious minded, and if man was designed to get to his right place in the world, and taught to possess capacities to bring the sun, and moon, etc., into subservience, then Muhammad and only Muhammad could be the instrument and the Messenger and Teacher. Every other man would have proved too weak to carry out the mission or bring the Message which if delivered to a mountain the mountain would have been indeed crushed by its weight.

If Muhammad were not the necessary element in the design of the creation as the Exemplar for the world for all time, the Quran would have been revealed on a stone tablet or in some other miraculous way so as to be even more impressive for credulous minds of the age of the Prophet. But the world was to progress on rational basis and the age of wonder-working was to end. The Prophet, the final Prophet, foresaw this. The Quran itself has been claimed as a miracle, but as an intellectual, rational and ever-working miracle, with a challenge for all reasoning, intelligent people of all races to test it as an inimitable Book of Wisdom and Guidance by their intelligence and by actively following its preachings to achieve eminence and happiness for humanity. Muhammad was necessary to show that the Quranic teachings were not meant to remain on its pages alone (although a miraculous, uncorrupted permanency was guaranteed to that also) but to be workable and practicable. It was not that Muhammad could not work miracles which hundreds of thousands of his humble followers have claimed to have performed but as a proof of the Truth of his preachings or of his being the Messenger of Allah he refused the demand of his people to show miracle and boldly announced :—

"Say (O Apostle) : I say not unto you (that) I possess the treasures of Allah, nor that I have knowledge of the Unseen ; neither do I say unto you : 'Lo I am an angel.' I follow only that which is inspired in me. Say : Are the blind and the seeing alike ? Will ye not then reflect ?" (vi : 50.)

"Say : I am not the first of the apostles ; nor know I what will be done with me or with you. I do but follow that which is revealed unto me, and I am nothing but a plain warner." (xlvi : 9.)

"Say : I am only a mortal like you. My Lord revealeth unto me that your God is only one God. And whoever hopeth to meet his Lord, let him do righteous work, and let him make none a sharer with his Lord in the worship due unto Him." (xviii : 111.)

The foremost reason or secret of the everlasting success of the Prophet was that his vision and foresight were supreme. Thus he succeeded in keeping an eye not only on the current human needs and psychology of his own people or time but of all time and the last 1356 years have given a definite and undeniable proof of this.

Here is a challenge to those self-contented or self-deluded people who sincerely think that they have made discoveries in religious ideals or even in political and social thought to make a thorough and intelligent research in the Quran or the life-history and Traditions of the Prophet and they will find that the very

same idea in its best and most beneficial and practical form had been anticipated by the Prophet 1356 years ago.

Our Bolshevik friends will be astonished to know that even their "New Morality" was anticipated by Muhammad (may he always triumph) at its very best.

Of course, he was too great a Reformer and a Moralist to discard, as the Bolsheviks have foolishly done, those moral and ethical principles and virtues which had had the sanction of the ages and generations past and which had been found of a very great help to the progress and betterment of individuals as of Society.

But together with the old ones the Prophet did give to the world *new* moral ideals which could cover those that go to-day by the name of "New Morality".

When the Webbs (husband and wife) asked, during their visit to Russia, "what was the criterion of good and bad in the conduct of a member of the Communist Party?" an important leader "reputed to be the embodiment of the conscience of the Communist Party" said to the effect that whatever conduced to the building up of the classless Society was good and whatever impeded it was bad.

After knowing this criterion of the "New Morality" let us study the following sayings among others of the Prophet Muhammad with *all their implications*:—

He said:—

1. *Khairannas mun yanfaunnas.* The best man is he from whom mankind receives greatest benefit.

2. *Afzalal ashghal khidmatannas.* The best occupation is the service of mankind.

3. All creation is the family of God, the most beloved of all creation to God is he who does most good to His family. (Anas and Abdullah.)

4. God has revealed to me say, show humility, so that no one may rise above another, or pride himself above another. (Iyad b. Himar.)

5. Shall I tell you about the best among you and the worst among you? The best among you is he from whom good is expected and from whose side (all) are secure and the worst of you is he from whom good is not expected and from whose side (all) are not secure. (Abuhurairah.)

6. This your descent is no cause of reviling any one; all of you are the children of man, alike each other as *sa* to *sa* (*i.e.*, there is not the slightest distinction). (Uqbah b. Amir.)

7. The best of you is he who is best to his people.

8. Verily, God has now taken away from you the vainglory of the days of ignorance and its boasting of forefathers. Man is only a pious *Momin* or a wicked sinner. Mankind are all the children of Adam (*i.e.*, there should be no class, colour or any distinction) and Adam was from dust (*i.e.*, no man should be conceited). (Abu Hurairah.)

Even at his own expenses the Prophet encouraged equality and classlessness. He said:—

9. Do not eulogise me as the Christians do the son of Mary (Jesus), for verily I am a servant of God. Call me then a servant of God and his apostle. (Ibne Abbas.)

I am only a man; when I bid you anything relating to affairs of your religion, receive it, and when I bid you anything as my opinion, then I am only a man.

(Rafi b. Khadij in Muslim.)

The socialistic manners taught by the Prophet were these:—

The most perfect of *momins* in point of faith is he who is the best among them in manners and the best among them to his womenfolk. (Abu Hurairah.)

When there are three men, let not two engage in a private discourse without the third, for that may grieve him.

(Ibne Omar in Bukhari.)

Take each other by the hand, all grudge shall go off from you and make presents to each other this will increase love among you and take away the deepest hatred. (Ata al Khurasany.)

Beware of the sitting on the roadside! said the Prophet. They said: But we sit there and talk of business. Then said the Prophet: Do as it ought to be done. And how ought it to be done? they asked. The Prophet replied, "Lower your eyes to the ground, restrain yourselves from hurting any one, return the salutation of him who salutes, bid what is reasonable, and forbid what is wrong, relieve the aggrieved and guide the erring.

(Abu Said al Khadry in Bukhari.)

What is remarkable in this connection is that the *right value* of "old morality" has been clearly indicated as in the following among many other sayings:—

1. How many men fast who have nothing of fasting but thirst, and how many men stand up (to pray all night) who have nothing of prayer except keeping awake. (Abu Hurairah.)

2. He who is not thankful to men is not thankful to God. (Abu Said.)

3. The Tyrant shall not enter Paradise. (Uqbah b. Amir.)

4. The excellence of a learned man over a mere worshipper is as the excellence of the full moon over the stars.

5. A time will come over men when nothing will remain of Islam except its name, nor anything of the Quran except its formalities; their places of worship will be well preserved and in use, while they will (really) be ruined because of their action; their learned men will be the worst of (all) who are under the heaven; from these will come forth mischief-making, and in them will it settle. (Ali.)

6. The Prophet mentioned something (of strife and bloodshed), and said, "That will be at the time when knowledge will depart (from you). I said, 'O Prophet of God! and how will knowledge depart (from us), when we read the Quran, and make our children read it, and our children will make their children read it, till the day of resurrection?' The Prophet said, 'Alas for thee! I considered thee to be the most intelligent man in Madina. Do not these Jews and Christians read the Torah and the Evangel, and act not at all what is in them both?' (Ziyad b. Labid, Abu-Umamah.)

7. In the latter days there will come forth men who will deceive the world by religion, clothed before men in sheep-skin because of gentleness, their tongues sweeter than sugar and their hearts the hearts of wolves. (Abu Hurairah.)

8. An Arab of the desert came to the Prophet, and said, 'Teach me a work that may make me enter into paradise.' The Prophet said, 'Thou hast asked a great question although thou hast cut short thy speech: Set free (all) breathing beings, and set free the necks (of men from servitude): And love (thy) kinsman who wrongs thee; and if thou art not able to do that, then feed the hungry and give drink to the thirsty, and bid what is good and forbid what is wrong; and if thou cannot do that, then withhold thy tongue unless from good.'

(Bara b. 'Azib.')

9. 'Shall I tell you of something more excellent in degree than fasting and almsgiving and prayer? It is to improve concord, for, verily, discord shaves smooth quite.' (Abu Darda.)

10. God will say on the day of resurrection, 'O son of Man, I was sick, and thou didst not visit Me'; the man will say, 'O my Lord! how could I visit Thee when Thou art the Lord of all the world?' God will say, 'Didst thou not know that such an one of My servants was sick, and thou didst not visit him? Didst thou not know that if thou hadst visited him, thou hadst surely found Me with him?' God will say, 'O son of Man! I asked food of thee, and thou didst not feed Me.' The man will say, 'O my Lord! how could I feed Thee when Thou art the Lord of all the world?' God will say, 'Didst thou not know that such an one of My servants asked food of thee, and thou didst

not feed him ? Didst thou not know that if thou hadst fed him, thou wouldst surely have found that with Me ?' God will say, 'O son of Man ! I asked drink of thee, and thou didst not give Me to drink.' The man will say, 'O my Lord ! how could I give Thee to drink when Thou art the Lord of all the world ?' God will say, 'Such an one of My servants asked drink of thee, and thou didst not give him to drink ; verily, if thou hadst given him to drink, thou hadst surely found that with Me.'

(Abu Hurairah.)

11. God is not merciful to him who is not merciful to men.
(Jarir b. Abdu'llah.)

12. As ye will be so will be those who shall be put in command over you. (Yahya b. Hashim).

13. He is not a *Momin* who eats his fill while his neighbour lies hungry by his side. (Ibne Abbas.)

The fact is that it is the wonderful and unique combination of the new and the old which makes Islam, simple and natural, though it is beyond the grasp at times of both the old and the young in certain respects.

For instance, the old get puzzled and find it difficult to acknowledge that Islam taught ultra-modern "New Morality" or it deprecated even prayers and fasting, etc., if they have no moral background or right motive and that it meant to abolish private property as the Bolshevists have done and so on, while the young fail to fully understand or appreciate why Islam, for instance, insists so much on prayers or has made a belief in Allah the corner-stone of itself both as a religion and as an institution ?

Our young men do not grasp fully the challenge, the cry of *Allah-o-Akbar* throws down to all spiritualists as well to all materialists—to the worldly or the unworldly, to the metaphysicists and mystics, as to the scientists and philosophers and even to the politicians.

To the spiritualists or metaphysicists, etc., the cry of *Allah-o-Akbar* is a challenge that all other gods or idols worshipped by men are inferior and defective, sometimes even impure; that they do not reach to the sublimity, grandeur and perfection of Allah who alone is worthy of worship ; that every soul can find rest only in Him—pleasing and well pleased, and that He alone is **really Great,** all else is as nothing, nothing, nothing, and men should go to none but Him—the **Great Allah,** for their spiritual salvation and elevation.

To the scientist and philosopher *Allah-o-Akbar* is a challenge that it will be impossible to solve many intricate problems of the world and to know the "How and Why ?" of this universe unless one believes in Allah as the self-evident Truth—The **Great Mind, the Great Reality, the Great Originator, the Great**

Evolver (Rabb and **Sustainer), the Great Lord of Nature** who has set definite laws and given special properties and capacities to everything in nature—in the heavens or on the earth: Who has given the mind or the reasoning faculties to Man to overlord other things and bring the sun and the moon and the electricity and all, and all, under his subservience.

Politically Allah-o-Akbar is a challenge that man must not allow himself to be overawed or domineered by any other man be he a King or Emperor or any Despot or Dictator camouflaged even as a President or a "Mahatma" or a Commissar; that every man should have his freedom of conscience and discretion to himself not to be slavishly and blindly subordinated or subjected to any other man as all mankind is one; that no man is really great—all are mortal and pass away; that all governments are transitory, and only Allah is Supreme and Eternal and Great. In short, there is nothing which demolishes all personal autocracy or even governmental highhandedness or conceit than the cry of Allah-o-Akbar. Allah-o-Akbar is really a wonderful democratic, political, even socialistic and communistic cry and a remarkable challenge to all autocrats and tin-gods.

Thus has Islam combined religion and politics and science in such a beneficial way to help the individuals as well as the State and Society from the most modern point of view as it did in the old, old times.

And because it was no other person of all men ever born but Muhammad who worked the permanent miracle, effecting such a harmonious and beneficent combination of the *New* and the *Old* for the Human Individual and Society that his final Prophethood has become almost as self-evident a truth as the Oneness and Greatness of Allah.

And so the cry goes out five times a day all over the world from every Mosque:—

La illaha illa Allah, Muhammad rasul Allah.

There is no God but Allah. Muhammad is a messenger of Allah.

The last part is a necessary adjunct of the Unity of God formula because otherwise the Islamic conception of God might have proved too subtle or too sublime for human intellect, and intelligent men would have given their worship to the Mighty Superman—Muhammad. Even Gibbon had had to exclaim:—

"A creed too sublime perhaps for our present faculties. What object remains for the fancy, or even the understanding

where we have abstracted from the unknown substance all idea of time and space, of motion and matter, of sensation and reflection."

Yes, if Muhammad's personality were not there to convince every soul of his own unshakable belief in a God of the nature which Gibbon has described, and if Muhammad's own ever-living example and words used with the greatest possible emphasis were not there to assure all that even the mighty Muhammad himself worshipped in all possible humility and submission that Allah, there might have been doubts as to the existence of a God of those qualities. But when the world received the incorruptible Message, pure and enlightening and convincing Message, from a Messenger, perfect in his human qualities and in his fitness for being the Final Messenger, then all doubts vanished and upto the present moment every Muslim drops on the ground in all humility and with the full conviction in His Reality in a *sijda* to the Unseen Allah from Whom all the limitations of space and time and motion and matter and sensation and reflection must be abstracted as Ghazzali had said.

The over-proud Author of these lines who would refuse to stoop before any other man ever born, would quote at the end of this chapter a couple of his own couplets which run thus:—

Jahan men talibane Haq hain jitney
Subhon ke rahnuma tum ho Muhammad.
Khuda ke bandai mahbub ho tum
Magar mre Khuda tum ho Muhammad.

Ruhi fidaka ya Rasul Allah, Ruhi fidaka ya Rasul Allah, Ruhi fidaka ya Rasul Allah,—Sallallah alaih vasallam.

VIII.—A Friendly Advice to the Bolshevists and Others.

It is because the Author of these pages has the greatest sympathy with the Bolshevists in their most arduous task of removing poverty from the world and because Bolshevism is so near to Pan-Islamism which has been his life-long mission, and because Bolshevism has boldly taken up the very mission of Pan-Islamism in certain respects, that he is inclined to give a friendly advice to Bolshevists for their own as well as for the general good.

Everywhere in the world, excepting Russia, Communism has been denounced. It was "hacked to death" wherever it raised its head. In most of the so-called civilized countries it has been made unlawful. But the Author thinks that to every *Muslim*, if he is a true follower of Islam and of the Prophet, it should be *the* social and political principle for the conduct of his life. The Author has never concealed the fact that he is a *Communist*. He believed in Communism before Bolshevism was born. He will remain a believer, *Insha Allah*, in Communism even if Bolshevism is dead or destroyed. He thinks Bolshevism is now slowly dying, although it heroically saved itself before from destruction more through the military and organising genius of Trotsky than anything else. Now there should be less danger of its being destroyed by force than there was before. Russia has a strong army and Europe is too busy with its own troubles to think of destroying the Bolshevist régime. Besides, Europe has been disheartened because of its failure in destroying it, by a united effort, during the civil war at a time when Bolshevists could not possibly get any outside support. Now the Bolshevik régime has strengthened itself by diplomatic acts even at the expense of its principal objective—world revolution. It has joined the League of Rigidly Imperialist Governments. If proof were needed to convince anybody that the "League of Nations" was really a League of Imperialist Governments only one example of India, which is one of the original members and which contributes colossal sums annually to the League while her own people starve and die like flies, should have been sufficient. Bolshevism is dying because it has given up its chief aims which were the life breath to it.

In the Imperialist League, Bolshevik Russia did cut a very sorry figure only a few months after its entry when one Imperialist State successfully defied the League and carried out to its heart's content its cruel Imperialist work of destroying the liberty of a weaker member of the League. It was strange that Russia joined that League. It is stranger that Russia—Bolshevik Russia—anti-Imperialist Russia—remains a member still of such an

Imperialist League. If Russia joined the League with any idea of receiving any help from other members at any time of a crisis in her life, the ruthless destruction of Abyssinia should have convinced her that she or any other member of the League can only live on her own strength or possibly by the help of treaties and Pacts, formed by her outside the League and that as far as the League was concerned "collective security" was only a myth.

The fact is that there is no danger now of a "collective" attack upon Russia. For any single quarrel with any other nation, Russia should be herself strong enough to triumph without the need of any outside protection or help, least of all of any help from the League of Imperialists ; every powerful member of which would behave exactly as Italy has done, if it gets an opportunity.

But no non-Russian is concerned with what is the diplomatic external policy of Russia or what is her internal political plan or programme. What concerns the world is whether the experiment of anti-Capitalism and anti-Imperialism as well as of the generous and universal Communism which she has declared to have taken up, not for herself alone but for the world, is successful or not. Because of this, the world is also interested in the way in which that experiment is being carried on. The world would also like to know if those countries which are weak and those peoples who are groaning under Imperialism should expect any help from Bolshevik Russia or is she now concerned only with affairs within her own boundaries ? That is, whether the ambition of Russia is the same as Trotsky's of effecting a permanent World-Revolution or now some form or other of hide-bound European Nationalism, *and not the world internationalism*, is the objective of the Bolshevists of Russia. If the latter is the case, as it would appear now to be, then the interests of non-Russians will naturally die out and the little interest that may remain would become only academic. The Bolshevists know that two other political experiments are being watched by the world, Hitlerism and Mussolinism (Fascism and Nazi-ism). The Author has heard it said that for countries like India, and probably also England, with their inherent conservatism, Fascism is more suited. But Fascism had never possessed any ambitions of making any world-revolution. Mussolini was only concerned with the people and the position of Italy and who can deny that he has more than achieved his object which was limited from the first. While the Bolsheviks are far, and very far away, from their objective which was undoubtedly very high, even for Russia internally, although they had a start over the Fascists. Even Hitler has in a few years succeeded in realising his chief objects. Germany recovered almost completely her lost position and prestige and

recovered it after having boldly kicked the "League of Nations" and disregarded the need of any "collective security" which Russia has timidly sought by joining a group of "Imperialist Bandits". Unfortunately for the principles of Communism which were all applaudable the Bolshevists have not carried out Socialist Reforms in an attractive and captivating manner as Islam had done. On the contrary they have adopted fierce and ferocious methods as in the case of *Kolhoization* or " collective farming " or the abolition of property, to effect Communistic reforms, which have naturally frightened away other countries. The reforms they have tried to effect in Russia have deprived the people of that country of every liberty of conscience, and of speech, liberty of congregation and association, liberty of the Press and of writing and so forth.

George Seldes quotes Signor Mussolini in the *World Panorama* 1918—1932 :—

"Both in Russia and Italy (we would add Turkey and Germany) it has been demonstrated that it is possible to govern outside, above, and against all liberal ideas. Neither Communism nor Fascism has anything in common with liberty."

And Mr. Maurice Hindus says in his *The Great Offensive* : "The Soviets are creating a strange and formidable human being to whom all the old familiar words, Religion and Freedom, Wealth, Home and Family are losing their significance and whose body and mind have but one purpose, to serve their aim and the new Society."

How can it be expected that other peoples will be attracted by such measures or by men of such slavish mentality. So Bolshevism is dying mentally even if it looks strong physically.

Therefore the advice, and a very friendly advice, of one who considers that in Communism alone lies the salvation of Humanity, is that Bolshevists would do well to adopt quite different methods and a different kind of propaganda for Communism to what they have been adopting. They should stop using relentless force and should set in Russia an attractive example, a pattern, a model as the Prophet did in Medina—in Arabia. They should stop brutal methods and take more and more to persuasion. They should follow the example of Islam. For instance, the Prophet fixed almost the same limits on private property which the Bolshevists have done, but he put this by a Saying of his own. No exact limit has been put in the Islamic Statute—the Holy QURAN. If it were in the Holy Quran then the successsors of the Prophet would have used even force to have it obeyed not only in spirit but even in letter as they enforced *Zakat*.

The Prophet always took such precautions. Most of his reforms were gradually made. He adopted the best means of making his Mission a success—by practising personally what he

preached and by presenting a model individual, a model Society, a model State. The world could not help but adopt these models soon after. Exclusive China, which was surrounded by four impenetrable walls, and where the Sword of Islam has not reached upto the present date, counts Muhammad's followers by millions at this moment. But what is the case regarding Bolshevism? Even if a few people outside Russia are being attracted by the Communistic principles preached by the Bolshevists in Russia, and by certain grand and wholly beneficent works of the Russian Bolshevists like the spreading of education and improvement of hygienics and the equalising of opportunities for all to get expert medical advice and the best education, while people are attracted by the Russians removing in practice the distinction of race and colour, etc., they are repulsed by certain pernicious and extremely cruel methods adopted by Russia and they are repulsed most of all by the deprivation of liberty, particularly liberty of conscience.

In the circumstances the advice of one whose very name is *Mushir* (Counsellor) to his Bolshevist friends is to take immediate steps to make Russia a model State and its people a model people—a model in mutual love and in love for the whole humanity, a model in freedom, in honesty and other moral virtues so as to become trustworthy, and in good-will towards all—a model in Pan-Islamic International, Universal Brotherhood.

Credit must be given to Stalin for having made marvellous progress in the Industrialisation of Russia or in agricultural improvements. Nor can he be denied his due share in his communistic experiments which, as Lord Passfield (Sidney Webb) says, is "one of the biggest things that have ever happened in the world." It is Stalin who has been mainly responsible for the present democratisation of the Russian Constitution. But the fact remains that upto the present moment the government in Russia has not passed the experimental stage and the condition of the Russian workmen is not any better than that of the British or American workmen, though it is probably better than that of "the British workmen on the dole."

We have said that economics alone cannot solve the problems facing the world to-day: It cannot bring peace and happiness to human Society. In truth, it is bringing nearer and nearer a world-wide cataclysm. Every thinking man will admit that it is the question of economics—*it is not religion in any case*, which has made the whole of Europe a war camp. Everywhere feverish activity can be seen for the coming war. Colossal sums are being spent by every nation to get ready to destroy, to annihilate, to torture another nation. Why? To get more money, more raw

materials. The Bolshevists say that this is due to wrong economic ideas prevailing in Europe. But in fact this is not the case. Suppose the whole world were to accept the Bolshevist theories of economics, will the mutual rivalry and jealousy stop ? Suppose Japan, Italy and Germany got Bolshevised. Will they cease to think for a field for their cooped up nationals, and for an easy supply of the raw materials to keep their factories (the more so if they are Government factories) busy night and day ? Suppose England is Bolshevised. Will she shut up her shops and factories and like to starve her people and refuse to exploit others to get even bread for her citizens which she cannot produce herself ? Will she be willing to make a free gift to other nations of her raw materials and millions of customers in her Colonies ? No, no. We repeat that economics alone cannot solve the world problems. It is mainly economics that have brought the world to this unhappy situation and the more value is attached to economics, the worse will the world-position get. The present situation is due to the fact that while before only one or two nations were engaged in making pounds, shillings and pence at the sacrifice of their soul, by robbing and milching poor peoples and nations, now there are half a dozen who do the same. And the fact is that it was because of this industrial and economic rivalry of two nations in particular, namely, the British, who had monopolised trade of the whole of Asia, Africa, and even undeveloped Europe, as Russia was, for a long time, and the budding and newly rising industrialism of Germany, together with Russian Imperialism, which brought about the world cataclysm. The military might of Germany also frightened her neighbour France and because geographically she was more vulnerable than Britain therefore she sought refuge under the apron of Britannia and of her ally Russia and as Germany had no statesman of the calibre of Bismarck the shrewd diplomats of Britain succeeded in arraying the whole world against their rival—Germany.

Though Germany was crushed for the moment but Britain could not continue to monopolise the trade as she used to because an industrial and economic sense had already developed in several nations and Bolshevism had risen to give a new and rather exaggerated importance to economics. Because of this world-wide industrialization the supply became greater than the demand and a search for markets increased bringing in its turn not only world-wide economic depression and unemployment but also a keener rivalry and hence bitterness between one European nation and another, intensifying more and more the struggle for existence in Europe and a rush for armaments began. We do not say that nations should give up looking after their finances or should not do their best to increase their incomes. We do not say that

the Bolsheviks should not continue to experiment with their new economic theories together with social and political ones, but what we do advise them is that they must not lose the sense of proportion lest they increase mutual rivalry and jealousy. *We certainly* say that they should forge some moral and spiritual bond together with a community of material interests to create a sense of brotherly co-operation between nation and nation, race and race, country and country instead of unhealthy, selfish competition and the resulting jealousy between nation and nation. For this purpose, we submit, that so far generations-old experience has proved that Pan-Islamism is the best means, if correctly applied. Pan-Islamism will *not* obstruct even the most modern economic and communist theories. It will rather help their application but with that it will provide a medium for world contact and a moral restraint for human jealousies and selfish animal passions in man. The Bolsheviks must not forget that at the present moment their system is included in the Totalitarian system while they should try to make it democratic and universal by making it acceptable to all the people and should not rest self-contented even when they succeed in gaining the majority in Russia or even in Bolshevising the whole of Russia in economics or in Communism.

But the other nations must realize that it is not necessary for each and all of them to copy the Russian Communism in all its items. On the contrary each nation should adopt Communism according to its own needs and circumstances as Lenin himself would have advised them to do. For instance, in India extreme Communism for the present will have to be kept in abeyance until the chief object which every patriotic Indian should have in view—that is the freedom of India from foreign yoke and exploitation and a revolution in the whole social and political outlook has been obtained and the superstitions of the people through lack of proper education, are removed. Even the agrarian problem in India cannot be solved in a day. It is linked up with the social system and the laws of inheritance among the people. There are generally very small holdings in India which cannot possibly be improved on modern lines because the modern instruments and implements of husbandry cannot be bought or used by the peasants with their tiny holdings even if they are given full occupancy rights. The chief cause of the smallness of the holding is the law of succession which divides the holdings among all the sons of the deceased peasant who most often dies head and ears in debt of a Shylock or *mahajan* or *bania* leaving the same legacy to his children. If the laws of inheritance are changed at once they will cause a revolution against the Indian Reformers themselves because they are based upon religion and this will terribly strengthen the militant Imperialists who have an overwhelming military organisation at their command and whose

one of the chief secrets of strength is the division among Indians themselves with their superstitions. We must not forget that politics do not depend upon "might have been." We have to face hard, concrete facts. Blind or unthinking or unadapting doctrinairism is a crime in politics.

Among the great statesmen of the century Lenin was gifted with the greatest sense of practicability. It will be wise on the part of those who want to follow him to keep this fact in view.

At the present moment nothing, howsoever important, should be done to create any schism among the Indians and everything possible should be done to present a united front to Imperialism.

Alas! unfortunate India has not many leaders of first class merits. Even some leaders at the top live a life of camouflage or are open to bribes, not necessarily of money, but of position and name. Some of them pander to the superstitions of the masses to exploit them and to keep their hold on them. Lately these leaders have made a bargain, under a camouflage, with Imperialism, and have actually been entrapped by the shrewd and cunning British politicians so as to give up their fight in practice, though not in words, against Imperialism and exploitation and drain of India's resources, and have even given an undertaking to confine themselves to matters which are likely to give rise to bitter differences among Indians themselves, even probably Civil War, and thus to further strengthen the hands of the Imperialists and foreign interests. A great bitterness has already been created between the two political organizations—the Congress, which is run by the Majority Community under an autocratic demi-god who lives for the moment a double life (political yet non-political, exclusively communistic yet national, of superstitious religious bigotry yet of toleration, of dictatorship yet of helplessness) and has a religious hold over the superstitious, illiterate, unthinking mob and is ostentatiously devoting himself exclusively to his own religion and his own community even to the revival of his own dead religious language,—and the Muslim League, which is the political organization of the Minority Community but is led, more or less, by armchair politicians. The greatest bitterness has been caused by the insistence by the rather inexperienced leader of the first Institution upon the fact that the Minority Institution should commit suicide at his bidding and take recourse to complete self-annihilation and merger, and by his arrogant obstinacy in inflicting upon that Institution his own convictions and programmes which he has yielded on vital occasions to his own Community. It is strange that while the Minority organization is violently attacked the Majority's own rigidly exclusive organization—the Mahasabha, which extends at times its communal influences on the Congress itself, is almost let alone.

The fact has been forgotten that even in the days of the Khilafat-cum-Swaraj agitation, when Indian nationalism was at its highest and the two organizations passed identical resolutions from their respective platforms and met at one and the same place where almost the same persons led both of them, the two organizations kept their *separate* identity. It must, however, be admitted here that the Muslim organisation lacks vitality because nothing has been done so far for it to reach the masses, although the Muslim masses have a far greater political instinct than the Hindu masses and can much more easily be aroused to their political and social needs of the present day. Even if the Muslim League were to go to the urban masses or to the poor peasants with the cry "down with the Capitalists and *Mahajans*" (Muslims are more poverty stricken than are the members of the Majority Community and even the Congress is said to be under the influence of Capitalists and Bankers) and organise Zakat for social services, and co-operative businesses even with *Qarze Hasna* and take up the cause of village uplift, and of the town and city Industries, the Muslim League can become a more powerful organisation than the other one is, and the struggle against Imperialism would become far more lively and effective. As matters stand now the Minority Community has every reason to be dissatisfied with the Majority Community where it has got power in its hands. This fact should never, never, never be lost sight of by the Majority Community that not only would it be impossible to make India free without the hearty and zealous co-operation of the Muslim minority but that even if India does get free its freedom will be only transitory if the minority is not satisfied. History warns us that discontented minorities have ruined great and powerful Empires.

In India, Muslims also should never adopt a non-nationalistic attitude. It was unwise to give their political demands an exclusively religious colouring. Europe itself now recognises the right of minorities to defend themselves in all democratic institutions by certain necessary clauses in the Constitution. But we go to the extent of saying that Muslims need not be frightened (thanks to Pan-Islamism) of their being in a minority in India. There is a belt of Muslim States from Indus to Maritza. That belt may be unorganised at present but only because it is in being it will keep the Majority Community in India on its best behaviour and if it is tyrannical towards the ninety million Muslims of India it will soon lose the Country itself as it did before.

We hold that if Muslims in India become true to Islam it will be they who will get the ascendancy by merits and even in numbers by attracting non-Muslims to themselves. *They have a wonderful asset in Islam as in Pan-Islamism.*

But what a sad irony it is that the very Nation (*ummat*) which was meant to be the best (*khairan*) Model to unite all mankind has divided itself into many quarrelling groups or schools and in countries like India two of those groups which call themselves Shiahs and Sunnis respectively, occasionally shed each others blood againt all the dictates of God and the Prophet.

They madly take it into their heads that they have set the clock back 1340 years or so and are contemporaries of Ali and Abu Bakr and actually begin to fight to change the course of *past* (!) history. They make political views their religious beliefs to denounce each other—the Shiahs going to the extent of denouncing most violently the three Khalifs preceding Ali and do all they can to take revenge on *his behalf* from those who cheerfully accept the unalterable facts of history as they came into existence over thirteen centuries ago. However, it is a happy sign that the Shah of Iran, the head of the Shiah State, has taken steps to cure his people of this rank madness and degenerated India will sooner or later (let us hope sooner) follow the same example. In the case of India there is a further irony. The *Sunnis* have accepted as their political leaders most of such prominent Muslims as belong to the other school yet even a political centre like Lucknow has seen terrible Shiah and Sunni riots. The bitterness disgracefully continues with the result that the Muslims of India instead of solidly establishing their position and power to help the cause of India's freedom, earn the contempt of both the Hindus and the British. So besides the Hindu and Muslim quarrels which are current due to the lack of political sense and ignorance on both sides and which strengthen the hands of the Imperialists, Muslims have added to their own weakness which was already there because of their being in the minority in the Country. Fate thus continues to help the Imperialists in the shape of internecine and sectarian quarrels. It has made the people mad, if not actually to destroy them, to at least keep them as slaves. The madness is also evident from the fact that the Majority Community has now taken into its head to impose its own culture and civilization, even its own primitive dress and living upon the minority proud of its own superior and more up-to-date culture, and has imbibed the same domineering Imperial spirit which it has been denouncing in the British. Further, it has itself acquired that bigoted communal outlook which it blamed the Minority Community of possessing and that it has done to the extent that even its greatest leader, who was the greatest *nationalist* leader, only a few years back, is devoting himself exclusively to his community and religion, though with a camouflaged tinge. The worst spirit of bigotry and communalism as of Imperalism is shown when efforts are

being made to impose upon the whole of India the religious language of the Majority Community in place of a language which is a living monument of the Hindu and Muslim unity, and which has done more than anything else in evolving a common culture and in coalescing the two parts of the Indian Nation and which together (Muslims and Hindus) have succeeded in making one of the sweetest, if not the sweetest, language in the world. If the Majority Community succeeds in its efforts it will divide India as it was never divided before. Urdu is the common literary heritage and heirloom for both. It was a recognised common language of all the cultured Hindus and Muslims. Hindi had no place even among the educated Hindus. The Right Honourable Dr. Tej Bahadur Sapru says :—

"ہندو اس کوشش میں ہیں کہ انکے آباء و اجداد جس زبان کو ترک کرکے دوسری زبان کو اپنی زبان بنا چکے تھے - آج پھر اوسی مرکز قدیم کی طرف رجعت کی جائے"۔

Hindi remained only as a provincial dialect which had no grammar of its own and a Hindu authority admits even the present superiority and utility of Urdu in these words :—

अब तक उर्दू की भाषाशैली हिन्दी से कई अंशों में अधिक है।

* * * * *

उर्दू में महावरों का जैसा सुन्दर प्रयोग होता है वैसा प्रयोग हिन्दी में वही लेखक कर सकते हैं जिन्हें उर्दू का ज्ञान है।

* * * * *

मेरी दृढ़ धारणा है कि उर्दू जाने बिना कोई भी पुक्त हिन्दी का लेखक नहीं हो सकता।

"*Kotna Komdi*" *by Ram Naraish Tripathi.*

We give importance to the subject because from a National or even International point it is one of the most deadly crimes which is being committed when the two parts of the Indian Nation are being divided even in their language from their very infancy. Hindus must not forget that the days of Chandergupta, Vikramajit and Asoka are gone. They must broadbase their views. India is not populated by Hindus only now.

However, if the Hindus, who have rigid caste divisions and distinctions, who cannot fully grasp the modern demands of Society, who inhabit India alone and have no international interests or any Socialistic outlook, are narrow-minded or have a limited vision they should be excused. But when Muslims themselves show a lack of solidarity and of the Pan-Islamic spirit, and possess a very narrow view of Islam itself they cannot be excused. For this reason

when our advice to the Bolshevists is to change their methods and their angle of vision without changing any of their noble objects to uplift mankind, our advice to the Pan-Islamists (Muslims) is to take the broadest possible view of Islam which we have indicated in this Book and which we have no doubt is the view that was taken by the Prophet and his immediate Successors, and when we ask the Bolsheviks to give up their anti-God and anti-religious policy and give a moral and spiritual basis to Bolshevism, we ask the Muslims at the same time to have **really the Islamic Conception** of God—the *Rabbul alamin*, and attend to the political and social and economic commands of Islam (Pan-Islamism) as to its ethical and spiritual. This will effect a close understanding and an abiding harmony between Islam and Communism, Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism.

If Muslims ally themselves to Bolshevism they can repeat history. They would then be admired and respected, even feared, from Hooghly to Maritza—maybe again to the Danube. So for their own sake and for the sake of the world they must revive, on the most modern lines, their old *Islam* with its political and social aspects, that means *Pan-Islamism*—again that means *Communism or Bolshevism.*

لا تهنوا و لا تحزنوا انتم الاعلون ان كُنتم مومنين—(Al-Quran)

Finis.

APPENDIX—I

What is religion ?

I have openly preached religion (and undoubtedly the most acceptable religion to Allah is Islam) and have deliberately advocated universal and international Brotherhood which in its best form is Pan-Islamism indeed, therefore I think I had better explain what I mean by Religion and Pan-Islamism.

I wrote on page 54 of *Islam and Socialism*:—

By religion is meant that moralising factor which carries man above the narrow limits of materialism and egoism and gives him a pleasure in living not only for his own good but for that of the others. By religion is meant that inner force which separates what is animal and carnal in man from what there is godly and altruistic in him—which makes him feel the difference between the feelings of satisfaction when he has satiated his own hunger and the feelings of inward happiness when he has relieved the suffering of his fellowbeing—nay that of even an animal, a bird or an ant. By religion is meant that power which restrains people from committing any crime or sin even in the darkest and loneliest place, concealed from society and individuals. By religion is meant that impelling power which makes one do good to others without any expectation of return ; that strong sense of right and wrong which perfects morality. By religion is meant that relation which exists between the Creator and the created and which intuitively makes the created soar aloft in actions and aspirations to imitate the Creator in His All-Lofty Attributes and Power, as Maulana Rumi - the great Sufi poet, has said:—

Khalk ma bar surate khud kard Ilah.
Wasfe ma as wasf oo giad sabah.

(God created us after His own Image and we take inspiration from His attributes for our ideals). By Religion is meant that discriminating intellect which demarcates the position of man in the economy of the world and makes him realize the responsibility that rests upon the shoulders of the Creator's Vicegerent on the earth and the relations that he should have with his fellow-being. To a scientist and naturalist there is but little difference between man and animal and according to that eminent Indian scientist, Professor Bose, even between man and plants so far as the responsiveness and vibration is concerned. The greatest materialist of the age, Haeckel, has declared material monism to be the rule in creation, yet there is clearly a difference between man and other creatures; there is an inexplicable, undefinable, yet plainly manifest consciousness in man which is distinctly his own, the teaching of that consciousness is Religion and it is that very consciousness which enables man to deal with other men with sympathy, magnanimity and love.

I said:—

Materialism teaches selfishness and egoism. One who has nothing beyond this worldly existence to look to, one whose only object in life is to secure for himself the most luxurious life possible, cannot tolerate any subordination of his interests and of his pleasures to any other person or body of persons.

And to impress the importance of religion I quoted Renan and Mazzini as follows.

Renan wrote:—

"Why, it will be said, take account of these chimeras ? Let the future take care of itself, and have to do with the present. My answer is that nothing can be done without chimeras. Man needs in order that he may bring into play all his activity to place before himself an object capable of rousing his energies. What is the use of labouring for the future if the future is to be colourless and insignificant ? Would it not be better to think of ease and pleasure in this life-time to sacrifice himself for a void?"

Joseph Mazzini's words might carry more weight with the modern Socialist Reformers and therefore they are quoted below. He says:—

"And I have seen, with deep sadness, the sons of the people, educated in materialism by those men, turn false to their mission and their future ; false to their country

and themselves, betrayed by some foolish, immoral hope of obtaining material happiness, through furthering the caprice or interest of a despotism.

"I have seen the working-men of France stand by, indifferent spectators of the *coup d'etat* of the 2nd December, because all the great social questions had dwindled in their minds into a question of material prosperity; and they foolishly believed that the promises, artfully made to them by him who had destroyed the liberty of their country, would be kept. Now they mourn their lost liberty, without having acquired even the promised material well-being.

"No: without God, without the sense of a moral law, without morality, without a spirit of sacrifice, and by merely following after men who have neither faith, nor reverence for truth, nor holiness of life, nor aught to guide them but the vanity of their own systems—I repeat it, with deep conviction—you will never succeed. You may achieve temporary benefits, but you will never realize the true Great Revolution, you and I alike desire—a revolution, not the offspring and illusion of irritated egotism, but of religious conviction. Your own improvement and that of others, this must be the supreme hope and aim of every social transformation.

"You cannot change the fate of man by merely embellishing his material dwelling. You will never induce the society to which you belong to substitute a system of Association for a system of salary and wages, unless you convince them that your association will result in improved production and collective prosperity. And you can only prove this by showing yourselves capable of founding and maintaining association through your own honesty, mutual goodwill, love of labour, and capacity of self-sacrifice."

By Pan-Islamism is meant that International link and National vigour which is established not through animal instincts of only material advantages and benefits but as a human duty and moral obligation to be ready with even some sacrifice on the part of each Nation to obtain general peace and happiness and goodwill of all Mankind irrespective of colour or country, etc., and to make each individual fit to take a prominent part in internal Progress and Prosperity by his superior merits both mental and spiritual. Keeping *this* Islam and Pan-Islamism in view I say it, and say it as a challenge that if Civilization can be saved for man it can be only when Communism (Bolshevism) works hand in hand with Islam (Pan-Islamism).

But the ultra orthodox Muslims must not make Islamic laws as rigid as are the Jewish and their formalities and rituals as unelastic as those of Hinduism. They should remember the *always uptodate* such Sayings of the Everliving Teacher and Guide:—"Verily, ye are in an age in which he among you who shall abandon one-tenth of what is bidden will be ruined; then will come a time when he among them who shall act upon one-tenth of what is bidden, will be saved". (Abu Hurairah.)

And:—"O, Abu Dharr! There is no wisdom like organising, and no abstinence like self-restraint, and no distinction like good manners". (Abu Dharr.)

And:—"Whoso sets a good example in Islam shall have his own reward and the reward of him who shall act upon it after him, without detracting anything from the latter's rewards . . . . . ". (Jarir.)

Appendix II.—Kemal and Palestine.

I have repeatedly said in the Book itself that I cannot get over the remorse that I had had to strongly criticise certain policies and actions of Ghazi Mustafa Kemal and his regime, soulless and wooden, in Turkey, although I foretold a change (See Page 194), as they were injurious to the best interests of Turkey and the Turkish nation itself which Kemal so ardently loves. I am glad to notice that even before my Book is finally out of the Press the attitude adopted by Ata Turk on the Palestine question —the most burning Pan-Islamic topic of the day, has given hope that my prophecy will be fulfilled even sooner than what I had expected. Be it so!

I am giving here the full text of Ghazi Mustafa Kemal's remarks, on the outrageous Imperialist proposals of partitioning Palestine, as given in Indian Papers, which have gladdened the heart of every Muslim in India as elsewhere because Kemal had superceded all other modern Muslim Heroes in the heart of all Muslims and his place was still there for him to occupy and to take the lead of the whole Muslim world in his hands. Almost all the Muslim Papers in India proudly and cheerfully write:—

The Turkish Paper, "Hakimiatimillia", publishes a report of a speech delivered by Kemal Ataturk in the Turkish Parliament.

The following are excerpts from the speech referring to the proposed partition of Palestine:—

"It is regrettable that the Arabs did not understand European diplomacy and became victims to the lure of so-called independence, and in this way made all the Arab countries slaves of European Imperialism."

Describing the proposed partition of Palestine as an operation on the heart of Arabia, Kemal Ataturk said that this wrong to the Arabs would be regarded as intolerable by the Turks also.

"No one can realise the discontent and restlessness among the Arabs as much as we. We have kept ourselves aloof from the Arabs for some years. But we are now self-reliant, and powerful enough to prevent the holy land of Islam from going under the control of the Jews and Christians. We wish to make this declaration that we shall not allow it to become the playground of European Imperialism. We have been accused of being irreligious and indifferent to Islam. But in spite of this accusation, even to-day we are prepared to shed our blood to carry out the last wish of the Prophet that the Holy Land must always remain in possession and control of Muslims. With reliance on God's grace, we are powerful enough to make this declaration that the Turks will not permit foreign Possession and control over a land for whose sake their ancestors under the leadership of Salahuddin fought against the Christians.

"We are certain that if Europe took any step in the direction of taking possession of, and controlling the Holy Land, the whole Islamic world will be roused to action."

Printed by B. N. Chopra, at the Pioneer Press, Lucknow. 2960.

CORRIGENDA.

Frontispiece Photo.				*Read*	1933	*Instead of*	1937.
Page	10	*Line*	1	,,	in	,,	by
,,	10	,,	40	,,	feelings	,,	feeling
,,	44	,,	21	,,	hindrance	,,	hinderance
,,	48	,,	last	,,	system	,,	vstem
,,	54	,,	26	,,	Sanatoriums	,,	Sanatorium
,,	67	,,	20	,,	antagonists	,,	antagonits
,,	77	,,	2	,,	preparations	,,	peparations
,,	77	,,	16	,,	to	,,	o
,,	78	,,	32	,,	would	,,	ould
,,	115	,,	5	,,	نفسا	,,	نخسا
,,	115	,,	20	,,	يغفر	,,	ايغفر
,,	115	,,	21	,,	نو	,,	أو
,,	122	,,	41	,,	the world	,,	world
,,	136	,,	,,	,,	a	,,	an
,,	162	,,	,,	,,	القليمي		
,,	183	,,	21	,,	against	,,	againt
,,	,,	,,	41	,,	laments	,,	lementsin
,,	,,	,,	41	*Delete*	'in' after 'thus'		
,,	,,	,,	41	*Read*	the	,,	The
,,	186	,,	last	,,	The Bolshevists	,,	Bolsheviks
,,	187	,,	39	,,	the liberty	,,	liberty
,,	198	,,	28	,,	The Author claims	,,	we claim
,,	198	,,	38	,,	the *Khalifa*	,,	*Khalifa*
,,	199	,,	3	,,	un-understandable	,,	understandable
,,	217	,,	38	,,	اولي الامر منكم	,,	الو ا لا مر منكم
,,	217	,,	42	,,	socialistic	,,	socialist
,,	228	,,	5	,,	poverty	,,	property
,,	242	,,	22	,,	Levine	,,	Lenin
,,	246	,,	43	,,	Vusta	,,	Vasta
,,	253	,,	last	,,	Yuzharahu	,,	yazharahu
,,	255	,,	13	,,	Amar	,,	Amir
,,	257	,,	25	,,	Behdget	,,	Bhedget
,,	257	,,	31	,,	Amar	,,	Amir
,,	265	,,	1	,,	vein	,,	voin
,,	270	,,	3	,,	made	,,	maed
,,	271	,,	last	*Delete*	or		
,,	278	,,	3	*Read*	Gibb	,,	Gibbs
,,	279	,,	2	,,	deeds. Calling	,,	deeds calling
,,	283	,,	4	,,	forms	,,	form
,,	287	,,	17	*Insert*	foolstop	,,	comma
,,	291	,,	4	*Read*	Prophetic	,,	Prophtic
,,	292	,,	22	,,	and	,,	ande
,,	299	,,	31	,,	Prophet	,,	Prophe
,,	333	,,	33	,,	theory	,,	theor
,,	340	,,	43	,,	Moscow	,,	Muscow
,,	349	,,	1	,,	للناس	,,	لا ناس
,,	385	,,	4	,,	Spiritualists		
,,	386	,,	2	,,	Khalifa's	,,	Khalifas,
,,	405	,,	34	,,	desperation	,,	desecration
,,	427	,,	10	,,	He	,,	he
,,	427	,,	11	,,	it	,,	him
,,	427	,,	14	*Delete*	best		
,,	449	,,	34	*Read*	(Rahman)	,,	(Yasin)
,,	458	,,	18	,,	natural though it is,	,,	natural, though it is
,,	464	,,	27	*Delete*	'his' after 'in'		
,,	464	,,	28	*Read*	experiment	,,	experiments
,,	467	,,	29	,,	communalistic	,,	communistic