

THE FRAGRANCE

OF EAST

Vol. VIII No. 3

July to September 2006

Academy of Journalism and Publicity
Post Box No. 93,
Lucknow 226 007

Fax (0522) 2787310

e-mail: nadwa@sancharnet.in

Rs. 30/-

The Fragrance of East

Founder : Syed Abul Hasan Ali Nadwi (RAH)

Advisory Board :

S.M. Rabey Hasani Nadwi
Shah Ebadur Rahman
Wasi Ahmad Siddiqui
S.M. Wazeh Rasheed Nadwi
Shamsul Haque Nadwi

Editor:
Shariq Alavi

CONTENTS

1. From Scholastic learning to religious healing: Unani Medicine and Civil Society in 19th Century India	7
Seema Alavi	
2. Central Asian Muslims under Czars	17
J.G. Tewari	
3. Cult of Pan-Islamism	31
Moin Shakir	
4. The Land of Palestine	61
M.M. Saleh	
5. Islam grants equal rights to both Men and Women	79
Anis Ahmad Nadwi	
6. Spiritual wisdom is necessary	83
Obaidur Rahman Nadwi	
7. Islamic Lecture	85
M.M. Picthal	

Our Representatives Abroad

Britain	:	Mr. Akram Nadwi O.C.I.S.St. Cross College Oxford Ox1 3TU (UK)
Dubai	:	Qari Abdul Hameed Nadwi P.O. Box No. 12525, Dubai U.A.E.
Pakistan	:	Mr. Ataullah Sector A-50, Near SAU Qrs. 109, Township Kaurangi, Karachi 31 (Paakistan)
Qatar	:	Dr. Aftab Alam Nadwi P.O. Box No. 1513 Doha, Qatar
Saudi Arabia:		Mr. Tariq Hassan Askari P.O. Box No. 842 Madina - Munawwara (K.S.A.)
South Africa :		Mr. M. Yahaya Sallo Nadwi P.O. Box No. 388 Vereninging, (South Africa)
U.S.A.	:	Dr. AM. Siddiqui 98-Conklin Ave. Woodmere, New York 11598

Annual Subscription	:	Rs. 100 (per copy Rs. 30) In India \$ 25 (USA, UK, Asian Africa and European Countries)
---------------------	---	---

Cheques and Drafts may please be marked to:

"The Fragrance of East"

and sent to, P.O. Box 93, Tagore Marg, Lucknow 226 007 U.P. India

Out - station cheques will not be accepted.

Editor's Note:

Terrorist Attacks - A National Tragedy

Yes, we all know that terrorism is now a global phenomenon. That it knits together as disparate cities as New York, Madrid, London, New Delhi and Bombay. And that even the world's developed and powerful nations do not have a foolproof guarantee against it. But despite these commonalities what we experience in India is truly exceptional in character. In none of the terrorist affected countries do we witness the shocking phenomenon of three major terrorist attacks in a spell of less than two years: New Delhi, Varanasi and Mumbai. Not to mention the several relatively smaller ones else where and the countless acts of terror in Kashmir. Indian terrorism has left the hapless citizens vulnerable and responsible for their own security. Every Indian is concerned about his own security and that of the nation.

These dastardly attacks have raised many questions. The foremost one being the responsibility of the state in protecting its citizens from abject acts of violence. The state extracts taxes from society and therefore it is the primary responsibility to tighten up its police and intelligence networks. Repeated acts of terrorism are the sign of weak state. One that needs to invest more and tighten up its surveillance network. We do realise that in a country like India, with more than a billion population, it is very difficult to provide surveillance at public spaces: railway stations, markets, airports etc. And therefore the state agencies need the full cooperation of the people in ensuring safety. Each individual has to take upon himself the responsibility of being a vigilant citizen in the interest of public safety.

But what is more alarming is the needle of suspicion in some quarters on the Muslims of this country. It is true that the community will be up for scrutiny if people and organizations with Muslim names perform these condemnable acts. However, what needs to be kept in mind

is that the terrorists and terrorism has no religion. Reacting to the recent Mumbai train blasts Maulana S.M. Rabey Nadwi, Rector Nadwatul Ulema called it a shame for those who involved in the ghastly act of abhorrent serial blasts. Maulana stressed that such acts of violence had nothing to do with any particular religion.

The ethical code and principles propagated both by Prophet Mohammad (PBH) and invoked in the holy Qur'an severely condemn such violence. Qur'an says "That whoever killed a person - unless it be for murder or for spreading mischief in the land, it would be as if he killed the whole mankind. And if anyone saved a life it would be as if he saved the whole mankind". (Maida:32)

The efforts of some political parties to paint all Muslims or Islam with the colour of terror are therefore unfair. In the past innocent Muslims have been the targets of much harassment at the time of such national tragedies. But the government and its agencies need to have a discerning eye. They need to sift the bad fish from the rest which is law abiding. This is precisely what a delegation of prominent Muslims alerted Mrs. Sonia Gandhi to. And unlike in the past, the UPA government has so far shown great sensitivity and alacrity in preventing the communalization of the bombs tragedy. It is indeed heartening to note that Muslim neighbourhoods in Mumbai, under the needle of suspicion, are actively cooperating with the police investigations. So are individuals, organizations and seminaries. After all, the security of the nation is of paramount significance to all Indians irrespective of caste and religion. The terrorist can be isolated only if the community is mobilised. That can happen only when our political leaders give up their habits and strategies of dividing communities. Let us pledge ourselves to protecting and upholding the freedom and security of our great nation. Let us also commit ourselves to assisting the investigating agencies in any way we can to maintain peace and communal harmony in our country. ■

FROM SCHOLASTIC LEARNING TO RELIGIOUS HEALING: UNANI MEDICINE AND CIVIL SOCIETY IN 19TH CENTURY INDIA

Seema Alavi*

This article is out of my book on a Greco-Arabic healing tradition, called unani, and its engagement with colonial medicine in 19th century India. I use the unani-colonial encounter to question the idea of colonialism as the site of culture and power that imposes an exclusionary civil society in India. I also question the idea of colonial public health being a direct import from the western model of civil society. Instead, I de-center the state in my narrative and see the makings of civil in 19th century India being propelled by local communities of 'medical literature': the Persian, Arabic and Urdu driven communities that survive through the colonial era. These represent pools of knowledge that conflict with each other, challenge their traditional custodians, reach out to religious practice, some connect with the state, and others remain beyond its control. Civil society and one of its main pillar-public health reforms- rather than an imposition from the state, emerge out of this dynamic plural medical ethos.

I will elaborate this point through the example of one such strand of knowledge community-the Urdu community of medical literature- that emerged in the 19th century. Its emergence is significant as so far medical knowledge had been closeted in elite families and locked in Arabic and Persian scholarship. This was based narrowly on the theories of philosopher physicians Avicenna, Hippocrates and Galen. Some individuals used the specific conjecture of 19th century, where global capital, print capitalism and ravages of disease and death co-mingled, to push medical knowledge out into the popular vernacularly -Urdu. This

*Professor, History Deptt, J.M.I., New Delhi

enabled unani to spill out of its 'scientific' scholarly mould, and reconstitute itself as a user-friendly culturally embrative medical tradition. It enabled new hakims to reach out to people and culture referents that hitherto lay beyond the purview of traditional unani: the person of the Prophet, Sufi healing and astrology. As unani embraced new medical localisms it diversified and made them part of its own world of 'scientific rational' medicine. Again, contrary to recent formulations, neither were these medical localisms reified nor were they imbued with western scientific instrumentation. Instead, they were incorporated within what had so far been a relatively 'scholastic' unani culture. For instance, the new hakims' stress on medical practice brought him closer to the religious and cultural etiology of illness. And as unani incorporated religious beliefs of illness, the imprint of the 19th century Muslim reformist and revivalist influence on it became more than evident. The new unani with its fresh authors and wider clientele was a critical player in the making of 19th century civil society. It had tremendous potential to challenge both the traditional scholarly medical families as well as the expanding colonial medical system.

In the second part of the paper I argue that efforts to control this new unani brought the traditional families and the colonial state together. Demands for public health reforms and professionalisation voiced by traditional families did not have an anti-colonial shrill. Rather, they were pitted against the new urdu unani. And they had the support of the state. This contradicts the recent understandings of 19th century medical reforms in indigenous healing that see them as efforts by enamoured elites to bring medicine in line with western scientific instrumentation; or else as efforts to cast their medicine as a set of cultural practice and therefor resist the encroachments of the state. Public health measures and the making of civil society, seen against the plural medical ethos of 19th century India, hardly seem as a novel western import that was either outright resisted or simplistically subverted by elites. It had its own momentum

which guided its engagement with colonial medicine. And religious practice and beliefs were very central to its dynamics.

Traditional families had clothed unani in elite Persianate department and scientificity based on the formulas of Greco-Arabic philosopher-medics: Aristotle, Hippocrates and Galen. In the 19th century, that was characterized by both 'modern' capitalistic infrastructure, print culture, as well as the related disturbances of modernity: population explosions, famines, disease, epidemics and death, unani underwent tremendous internal change. As its traditional custodians struggled to cope, men from the service gentry class, hitherto excluded from its ambit, took advantage of this conjecture to fashion a new unani.

They pushed unani out of its narrow family confines and scholastic frame. They used the urdu print culture to reach out to fresh kinds of medical knowledges that lay both within and beyond the purview of the older medical communities. With its longer rope, this unani broke loose of the control of both the older linguistically particularistic medical communities, as well as the colonial medical apparatus. But it borrowed from both. Thus it used the Persian idea of health as individual comportment introduced by Persian Mughal texts; and kept the Arabic Aristotelian and Galenic learning -a feature of the late 18th century unani- as its intellectual core. But to this it added other knowledges like the healing of the Prophet, the Sufis and others figures of religious authority.

The new focus the cultural etiology of disease made the new hakims look to the embrasive Persian rather than the Arabic canonical literature for inspiration. Thus medieval Persian texts like the *Zakhirah-i-Khwarzmshahi* that reflected the Unani shift from canonical materialistic knowledge to demonstrable and culturally diversified beliefs about illness became the models of Urdu medical literature.

The *Zakhirah* was translated into Urdu in 1878. The original text, written by Muhammad Ahmad-al-Hasani-al Jurjani, was one of the first Unani medical texts written in Persian. It represented an important movement at the end of the Abbasid caliphate to pull medicine out of the hold of Arabic educated scholastic elites and locate it in a popular, non-specialist sphere. The *Zakhirah* is in 9 volumes. Collectively they upheld the humoral theory of health. But explain its functioning by constructing a list of popular ideas and responses to illness. God is believed to control the balance of humors that ensures good health.

The *Zakhirah* was a text that claimed culture and religious practice for medicine. It thus served as a useful model for the new unani literature that was looking for a similar embrative recast to contest both its traditional scholarly custodians and colonial authority. In 1878 noted publisher of Lucknow, munshi Newal Kishore, asked hakim Haadi Hasan Khan Moradabadi to translate the text. Haadi Hasan through his translation gave a sharper religious profile to the healing dictums of the *Zakhirah*. Thus the urdu *Zakhirah* gives a new Islamic orientation to healing. In the preface the hakim translator deflected attention from Aristotelian and Galenic rationality that was the defining feature of the Persian original. For Haadi Hasan, it was religious beliefs that shaped body humours and pathology. He claimed religious practice as its defining rationality. Haadi Khan views God as the ultimate healer who created both disease and its cure. The scientia of medicine according to him lie buried in the natural habitat that God had created. The role of the physician was to identify these correctly and apply them appropriately. Extolling God as the ultimate medical authority he dedicates his book to him.

Vert much like his contemporary Indian Muslim reformers, he upheld the Islamic notion of well being that included not just physical but spiritual, moral and psychological health of the body. He projected the Prophet as the centre of his Islamic rationality. Thus unlike the

Persian *Zakhirah* that believes in an abstract God, as the author of the rational natural world, the Urdu *Zakhirah* projects Prophet Muhammad as the guide who helps the individual to comprehend rational knowledge that lies embedded in nature. Khan concluded that Prophet piety and medicine was central to unani.

Home Grown texts: The Mazhar-ul-uloom & the Tibb-i-Nabawi

Late 19th century unani claimed religious practice with a vengeance. The urdu medical writers did not from the established families of hakims. They therefore looked for alternate symbols of authority. Their obvious choice was the person of the Prophet. His authority became the ultimate reference point of legitimacy of unani. And this was only practical. In the 19th century, the heightened pilgrim traffic to cities closely associated with the life of the Prophet, Mecca and Median, at one level increased the fear of diseases as people were seen to carry infection as they traveled across long distances. But it also put the spotlight on his life and teachings and shifted popular attention to his medical experiences and ideas about illness. The shrine at Mecca - the Kaaba-and the fountain of holy water- *aab-i-zam zam*- had a dominant therapeutic narrative closely tied to the person of the Prophet and the history of Islam. Indian pilgrim traffic to Mecca brought these stories home. They further popularized the belief in the Prophet's medicine. In 19th century India the symbol of the Prophet was up for new interpretations by Muslim revivalists and reformers of all hues. They demythologized him and made him more approachable and familiar in the cast of an exemplary human being. Urdu texts on unani were also affected by this trend and added to the expanding genre of literature on the Prophet. And like the reformist literature they too used the Prophet's authority to negotiate colonial intrusions into the medical realm.

Unani more than ever before associated itself with the medicinal knowledge identified with the Prophet. Thus

the belief in the medical knowledge associated with the Prophet, and a life patterned on his conduct with the significance of prayers (*dua*), diet, Islamic bodily deportment and moral and spiritual etiquette became central to unani. Unani had always seen its rationality sanctioned by the Prophet. In the 19th century it saw no contradiction between the Islamic prescriptive path to well being and rational medical knowledge. Indeed, it saw medication very much part of this Islamic notion of well being. In this period many fresh texts on the Prophet's healing exclusively were penned by hakims. The homegrown Urdu texts of the late 19th century made Prophetic medicine and its idea of well being their major theme.

In 1869, Ikaram al Din Hafiz, a practicing hakim of Lucknow, wrote the *Tibb-I-Nabawi* and made a strong case for allying unani with Prophetic medicine. Like Prophetic medicine, he made it more than clear that health was about moral, spiritual, psychological and physical well-being. His 54 pages long texts stresses the critical importance of prayers (*dua*), piety and medicine (*dawa*) to cure. It offers cures of diseases, like anger, that combine medicines with piety. Forms of piety derive from Koranic injunctions and recitation of its holy verses. The sayings of the Prophet Muhammad or His Hadith are the ultimate reference point of all suggested cures. The text prescribes an Islamic way of life as lead by the Prophet as a guarantee of good health. The *Tibb-I-Nabawi* is critical of Greek physicians like Galen who followed Aristotle and frowned on the mixing of medicine with piety. The author categorically states that 'a person who does not know the effects of prayers (*dua*) on bodily health reflects his own foolishness' (*himaqat*).

Tibb-I-Nabawi set the trend. Soon many other hakims used the symbol of the Prophet to convert their medical experience to medical knowledge. Having achieved that they moved on to embrace other dispersed authority referents like those of the Sufi and Fakir healers as well.

In 1878 Ihsan Ali Khan the hakim (*tabeeb*) of, Zillah

Allahbad, wrote the *Maqalat-I-Ihsan*. In these texts very much like the Sufi healing practices of medieval Islam and the Pietist ideas of 18th century Europe he too sees the body and the soul united in health with the soul controlling the body functions. And in his discussion on pharmacy and the making of medicine he does not confine himself to the Prophet's dietary regimen but clearly invokes what he calls the 'superstitious charms of Fakirs' as well. Thus for instance, *mongaa* (precious stone) when tied to pashaani (?) helps in curing headache; the wearing of the Christian cross around the neck is also recommended for its healing qualities etc. He warns the public that such cures are integral to health and should not be dismissed as the superstitious charms of the Fakirs.

In the 19th century the culturally embrative arm of unani reached out also to the Persian norms of medical civility that still simmered in society. Medical texts modeled themselves on the Persian Mughal manuscripts, which had stressed proper bodily deportment and aristocratic virtue as central to good health. Pandit Kaashi Nath's, *Akhlaq-I-Kaashi* written in 1870 for the 'ordinary people' was one such text. *Akhlaq-I-Kaashi* belonged to the genre of polite literature on conduct and etiquette that characterized Persian literary culture. The text defines a perfect man (*kamal I-insaani*) as someone who is not only healthy but is complete with humility (*sharf-I insaan*) and has knowledge of the polite culture of moral self improvement, etiquette and conduct (*ilm-I- tehzeeb-I-Akhlaq*). Very much like Islamic medical knowledge or learning (*quwwat ilmi*) with piety and moral conduct (*akhlaq*), and experience and practice (*quwwat amli*).

Urdu medical texts were debated in the public sphere created by the urdu newspapers. The newspapers mirrored the ambiguities of society as it came to grips with the plurality of unani traditions, and knowledge that seemed uncontrollable by both the state and traditional families. They carried viewpoints on both the new futuristic as well as the

old preservationist unani. And of course, the print capitalist munshi Newal Kishore (1836-95), editor and proprietor of Lucknow's urdu newspaper- the Oudh Akhbar- gave a voice to a range of unani traditions in his columns.

However, since its core readership was in the high echelons of society, it allowed the voice of the elite who supported traditional unani learning to loom over all the others. Indeed, munshi Newal Kishore, a notable Khattri entrepreneur of Lucknow, himself belonged to this upper crust of society. The Oudh Akhbar thus became one important advocate of the old canonical Unani that had the support of the elite.

To Oudh Akhbar published the views of the Iraq sclerotic hakims on the future of unani and projected them as public intellectuals. In the columns of the Oudh Akhbar the Muslim intellectual reworked on the global ideas of professionalisation, historicism and modernity-all associated with public health- from within his own tradition. He challenged the Euro-centric nature of these concepts by offering for them new definitions the attempted to negotiate the tensions between new urdu based knowledges that were beyond the control of the scholastic family and state, and the more controllable medical wisdom or science that lay within the purview of the state and family control. For instance, professionalization of unani for the public intellectual meant freeing society from the clutches of the ill trained Urdu read hakims and the dispensaries that employed them. Professionalisation meant proper state control of Unani: accountability, identification of 'proper' practitioners, formalisation of the terms and conditions of their service, their representation in municipal boards, sanitary commissions and other government bodies and adequate financial inputs for Unani by the estate. Professionalisation was a strategy to streamline Unani, purge it of the urdu read new comers and bring its core Arabic canon and its new scientific experiments to the notice of English medical practice. It was a strategy used by the

well-heeled hakims to withdraw unani into the family fold and place it under the surveillance of the state.

The Muslim public intellectual grounded his professionalisation demand in a critique of Unani practice. Knowledge in urdu that had spilt out of the control of the family and state were the obvious target of attack. These knowledges were represented in the practice of the new style hakims. It was not the system of medicine that was at fault. It was the practitioner who needed to be reformed. Very much like the Arab writers of medieval medical deontology who complained about quacks and charlatans of their times, he complained about the fall in the standards of professional ethics and incompetence of the new hakim. Professionalisation meant tighter state regulation of Unani's public could be best served. The Oudh Akhbar argued that the government needed to intervene to pull unani out of the hands of the new hakims so that it could serve the people better.

Second, the public intellectual while reaching out to state support to hit out at the in-house constituency of urdu hakims, made a case for cannibalizing aspects of western medicine like surgery. He argued that hakims trained in modern surgery techniques could compete better with doctors in finding employment in public health institutions. But again, he did not see this borrowing as emulating the scientific instrumentation of western medicine. Instead, it was viewed as a way to embellish unani's own robust scientific tradition. He demanded that the state invest to reinforce this scientific core of unani. He saw the scientificity of unani as more relevant than that of the British because it had a history in Hindustan that went back to antiquity. Indeed he saw the unique modernity and scientificity of unani as located firmly within the geographical and territorial imaginary of Hindustan as carved out by the colonial state. However, he reconstituted within it a national space for unani through rewriting its history. This national space was a cultural imagery. The new history of unani located its core in

Hindustan that was now seen as a distinct cultural space of the nation. He projected it as part of Indian tradition and culture. He contrasted this lofty status of unani to the mundane status of English medicine whose 'modernity' was located outside this cultural space of the nation. He argued that unani's distinctiveness lay in the fact it had historical roots whereas Western modernity had no history or territoriality in Hindustan.

Thirdly, the public intellectual used the novel technique of the advertisement to balance the tension between the colonial medical space and the national space it had carved out for unani. He encouraged the urdu press to advertise both the colonial as well as the unani medical paharmacies and practitioners. It created a vernacular public. And used it to bring the two systems of medicine in interaction. The newspaper print culture thus located Unani in a lively and vibrant public sphere where medical debates had the potential to spill into the political domain. But significantly, where unani could underline its difference with British medicine and yet demand equal participation in public health measures.

Thus the demand for a more active role in the state's public health institutions and inclusion in its regulations emanated from within the unani tradition and these shaped the public health measures of the Government. Of course, these emanated because of the in house tensions in unani and the contest for control of knowledge that they triggered. And this lent public health concepts like modernization, professionalisation and state regulation a very different meaning as far as the hakims were concerned. However, It was this enormous turmoil in north Indian society, as reflected in the developments within unani medicine, and not a heavy fisted state that defined Indian support or resistance to British medicine.■

CENTRAL ASIAN MUSLIMS UNDER THE CZARS

J.G. Tewari*

The Conquest of Central Asia

The possession of the vast stretches of Central Asia has made Russia a Europe-Asiatic power with a tremendous capacity to expand itself in the rest of Asia.

Although the major conquest of Central Asia was made during the latter part of the nineteenth century, the second for this advance was made much earlier. In the sixteenth century Christian marauders made Muslims slaves and Muslims made Russian Christians slaves. Sharp diplomatic exchanges used to take place between Moscow and Bukhara on the subject of slaves of the one held by the other. Very often these diplomatic exchanges took the form of religious conflicts. In the seventeenth century, Czarts tried to extend their sovereignty over the Khanate of Khiva in order to wrest trade concessions from them, but could not succeed. In 1839 Russia attacked Khiva but was defeated. In 1842 through diplomatic pressure, Russia won a few trade concessions from the Khan of Kokand but failed to subdue it despite use of military. Being thus humbled, it took up a conciliatory attitude towards Central Asian rulers.

Then, for a while, Russian interest in Central Asian conquest waned. A number of factors conspired in favour of this attitude, such as the remoteness of the region, ignorance of its geography and its economic potentialities and Russia's involvement in European affairs. However after its debacle in the Crimean War, it began to realize more and more that its future lay in the East more than any where else. In 1858, when Crimean War had just ended, Russian Prince Gortchakov, Moscow's Minister for Foreign Affairs presented a memorandum to Alexander II stressing

*Former HOD Psychology, S.V. College, Aligarh

the need of shifting Russian forces from Europe toward the East because "the future of Russia lies in the East." The emperor's notation on the memorandum read: "I am in complete agreement with this."

At the same time, to Russia's fledgling trading and industrial classes, Central Asia appeared an unrivalled market for their manufactured goods and a rich source for raw materials. Russian merchants approached the government to establish its control over Central Asia. The idea of a Central Asian campaign grew popular in Russia's ruling circles. The influential newspaper *Golos* (Voice) called up on the government to transform the Caspian sea into a Russian lake. Another influential news organ *Moskovskie vedomosti* (Moscow News) pleaded for energetic measures on the Central Asian front. Blaranburg, a noted figure of his day and a man who had held several important assignments in the Ministry of Finance wrote that the "European market is closed to the Russian manufactured articles due to the competition of almost every state in this region; willy nilly Russia has to turn to the Asian countries for marketing its products."

The Russian Foreign Secretary, Count Nesselrode was even reported to have declared in a cabinet meeting in 1816 that "as long as Central Asia is not ours, we cannot by any means think of conquering the whole of Asia."

These consideration propelled the Russians to make a concerted advance towards the east from Orenburg where it had stayed for nearly a hundred years. Much planning went into the building of Orenburg since it was as important a point in the Czarist expansion as Kazan. Thrice its location was altered to suit strategic considerations. Two best Russian brains I.K. Kirilov, the author of the first geographical atlas of the Russian empire and prominent historian A.N. Tatischev worked in deciding its site.

Before advancing further, in line with the classical strategy of Russian expansion, rows of fortresses were built,

one along with the Ural and the other toward the north-east. Around the middle of the nineteenth century, the Russian troops marched away from Orenburg and occupied the middle course of Syr Darya. Next year they started marching along the fringe of Central Asia. The city of Aulie Ata was captured on June 4, 1864, Chimkent on 22nd September of the same year and on June 17, 1865 Tashkent, one of the most important cities of the region, fell into their hands. The popular resistance against the invading forces was calmed down by giving the assurance—which was never kept—that Islamic faith and customs would be respected. Rivalry between Tadjeks and Uzbeks also helped the invaders. While the invaders were laying siege to the city, its Tadjik settlements were under marauding raids by the strong army surrendered to the mere 1500 soldiers and twelve cannons of General M.G. Chernayev. Only two men were occupation of Tashkent, Russians took possession of Samarkand, at that time one of the finest cities of the world for whose possessions the Asian rulers had to sacrifice tens of thousands of lives. However, the conquest of the Caspian oblast was stiffly resisted by the Muslims. It passed into Russian hands after the battle of Gok Tepa in 1881, after which the invaders indulged in large scale slaughter of the Muslim population by way of reprisals.

After entering Tashkent, Russians turned their eyes to Bukhara. Bukhara being the centre of Islamic culture in Central Asia, it had to be subjugated in order to weaken the hold of Islam over the people, argued the Russians. An inopportune attack on it would arouse the religious sentiments of the people. Therefore Russians began to wait for an opportune moment to march their troops in Bukhara.

Soon Bukhara was riven with internal strife due to popular opposition triggered by heavy taxation and misrule. The Emir of Bukhara was alienated from the clerics and the narrow interests of the native mercantile community prompted them to adopt a compromising stand toward Russians. Taking advantages of civil discord in Emirate of

Bukhara, the Russians sent a mission to the Emir seeking certain trade concessions which were refused. Under the alibi that the Emir was casting covetous eyes on Tashkent, Russian armies under Kaufman attacked Bukhara in 1868. Kaufman was supported by the merchants of the metropolis who were clamoring for total subjugation of Bukhara. The Emir surrendered but his mountainous subjects did not follow suit. Under the leadership of Muslim divines they fought against the invaders and set up an independent state, which the Russians crushed, after some time.

With the conquest of Bukhara, the Khanate of Khiva got encircled by the Russians. This as well as its internal discord marked by a coup on May 29, 1873 invited a Russian aggression. Popular resistance was drowned in blood by the Russian Cossack soldiers who like mad men resorted to indiscriminate slaughter and butchery of men and women and children. The Khan surrendered by signing a peace treaty on Aug. 12, 1873.

Though Khannate of Kokand too was bedevilled by internal disunity, it proved a hard nut to crack for Russians. The common man, the aristocracy and the local army all joined together to resist the invading soldiers of Kaufman. The resistance soon turned into a holy war against the Russians under the leadership of Khan Khudayar, Khan's eldest son Nasriddin Bek. Kaufman's troops had the upper hand and by August 29, 1875 the major portion of the Khanate fell in their hands. Sporadic resistance in Kokand by February 19, 1876 when the Khanate of Kokand was abolished and a Russian governor was put in charge of the administration.

Simultaneously Russian were on the offensive in other areas of Turkestan quelling pockets of resistance. Tekka Turkmans were subdued and Mari Turkmans were forced to lay down arms in 1884 after inflicting heavy losses on the conquerors.

The Russian advance in Central Asia which began

in 1830, in the course of less than half a century, resulted in the total annexation of the territory of Kokand Khanate and the reduction of Emirate of Bukhara and Khanate of Khiva to vassal states. The rulers of these two states, according to the treaties of capitulation with Russia, renounced their right to enter into relation with any foreign power, conceded a number of commercial concessions to Russians and agreed to the stationing of Russian political agents on their territories, thus making themselves semi-independent states existing on mere sufferance on the part of Russian emperor. However unlike the Soviets, the imperial government adopted a policy of non-interference in the internal affairs of the two states.

Administration of Turkestan

In view of the hostile character of the Muslims and the confiscatory and coercive measure of their rule, the Russians set up a purely military administration in Turkestan. In the Regulations for the Administration of Turkestan region it was specifically stated that the incumbent of the office of governor of the oblast must necessarily be a military officer. The Governor was always a top-ranking military general. Both he and the oblast governors were invested with wide civil and military powers. Even in the lower levels of administration there was preponderance of military elements. The Governor General of Turkestan was vested with powers which his counter-parts in the empire did not possess. In addition to the general administrative power and the prerogatives he enjoyed, he was given the authority to suspend or make modifications in any regulation. As the Head of the administration of Turkestan, he enjoyed supreme powers and possessed the authority to commence, wage and suspend a war within the region without previous sanction of authorities in St. Petersburg. He enjoyed the rank of minister plenipotentiary in relation to neighbouring regions.

The governorship of oblasts of Turkestan was meant to be a sort of reward to high military officers and delimitation

of the boundaries of oblasts were frequently made according to the nature of the reward to be given, irrespective of the requirements of administrative efficiency and wishes of the people. This kind of arbitrariness gave rise to widespread corruption. Schuyle reports that the virus of corruption had spread from top to bottom in Turkestan administration and that the army of the regime had become the refuge for the scum of the military society.

During the period of Governor General Kaufman's rule all attempts to eradicate the evil of corruption were discouraged because of the fear that a large scale probe might not lead to the discrediting of Russians in the eyes of the natives. At last in 1908 the Paten Commission succeeded in subjecting the entire Turkestan administration to a thoroughgoing investigation. The facts brought to light by the Commission shocked everyone in Tashkent and Petersburg. In Transcaspean oblast, in particular, corruption was at its worst. A corrupt military clique was running the administration only to suit itself. The Commission suspended no less than two-third of the officials of the oblast and subsequently all of them were convicted.

The administrative divisions of the state of Turkestan cut across the areas of homogenous population in order to obliterate traditional loyalties and to weaken social cohesion. Distinctions between nomads and sedantic people, between language and culture were ignored and people were herded in composite administrative units, creating a sort of Balkanisation which hampered the growth of a united opposition to Russian domination. "...the gerrymandering of boundary lines...split every local nationality into a number of groups each with a different kind of administration to face"

Colonization of Turkestan

According to the opinion of one of the ablest senators of the imperial regime, Turkestan was conquered by Russia to serve a two-fold purpose. On the one hand, according to him, the Turkestan regime was to provide revenues to the

imperial government and a market for Russia's manufactured article, while, on the other, the region was to absorb a part of the surplus population of the gubernias of the Russian empire.

The region was thrown open for colonization first to Don and Ural Cossacks and latter to peasants. In this way the central government decreased the pressure of surplus population at the problem of uneconomic peasant holding and of the rural unemployed in European Russia. By implanting Russians in the newly conquered colonies, the government set up colonies of its supporters to deal with the hostile population. Because of their ferocious character and militant nationalism, Cossacks were given first preference. In course of time, these Russian strength needed to quell local disturbance and dissemination centres for Christianity and Slavic culture. In short, colonization became a panacea for revolutionary upsurge at home and nationalist movement within the colonies.

During the initial stages of occupation of Turkestan, dictated by the exigencies of security, tough Cossacks were encouraged to settle in the region most along the main roads and rails along Syr Darya and in Semirechie oblast.

The first Cossack settlement sprang up in the lower Syr Darya region after the building up railway line in 1847. In the Semirechie oblast Cossacks settlement began under the supervision of the army. In 1867, there were 14 Cossacks Stanitsas (large village) in the oblast with a population of 14,413. By the close of the century Coassack population in the rural area of the oblast rose to 29,323, and, by 1906, to 34,468 persons. These figures do not include illegal Cossack settlement toward which the government turned a Nelson eye.

Because of the rising tide of national consciousness, instead of poor peasants, the government encouraged settlement of *Kulak* peasants so that the settlers may dominate the region more successfully and spread Slavic

culture more vigorously. Large number of economically affluent and politically reliable elements began to trek from European Russia to colonize the borderlands. These new colonies under 1889 Settlement Law were provided with adequate food and medical aid and special provisions were made to procure fertile land for them. Under Statute of 1910, all land 'in excess of local needs,' was confiscated and distributed to European Russian settlers free of charge. Land covered by new irrigation schemes were distributed among Russians.

A few instances are needed to illustrate the pace of peasant settlements. In 1868, 242 families of peasant settlers came to Semirechie oblast. By 1882, the number of peasant settlements rose to 29 with a population of 15,000. By 1889, their number rose to 38,000 persons. In Tashkent uzed one third of the newly irrigated land was allocated to Russian peasants.

This colonization met with serious opposition from the native population, particularly from the Kazakhs and Kirghiz whose cattle began to die in large numbers because of their pastures having passed into the hands of the colonists. In 1879-80, half of the 360,000 cattle heads of Turgai oblast died. Between 1902-07, 35.9 per cent of Kirghiz cattle perished, and as a result of impoverishment caused by such loss, 8 to 9 per cent of Kirghiz population fell. By 1914, 1,500,000 Russian peasant settlers had established themselves in Turkestan. The amount of land confiscated from native peasants for such settlers in the Semirechie oblast alone came to 3,963,000 X 25 desiatins (one desiatins is equal to 2.7 acres).

The opposition of Muslims to this kind of rural colonization, as we shall soon see, rapidly grew in strength. At the same time the availability of land for allocation to Russian colonization by the end of the nineteenth century assumed an urban character and soon Turkestan towns and cities began to be flooded by Russians. In 1970, there were 20 thousand Russians in Tashkent out of its total

population of 1,000,000, 7000 in Fergana out of its total population of 11,000 20,000 in Vermyi out of its total population of 35,000. In 1911 Russians constituted one fifth population of Samarkand and Ashakabad and one sixth population of Andizhan. According to Pierce, by 1914, 1,500,000 Russians had settled in Central Asia. According to the estimate of General N.A. Kuroptkin, the last Governor General of Turkestan, the number of Russians living in Turkestan in 1916 was 540,000 that is 7.5 per cent of the population of the region. In Kazakh steppes the Russian population was in the neighbourhood of 1,500,000, which is an indication of the amount of land steppes Russians constituted 20 per cent of population in 1897 and 40 per cent in 1911.

Economic Exploitation of Turkestan

The desire to secure the region's raw materials and to acquire a market for Russia's manufactured articles had propelled the Russian conquest of Turkestan. The new rulers, therefore, set before themselves the task of transforming Central Asia into an appendage of the metropolitan economy. With this objective, first of all they started building a network of railway lines because those already in existence were constructed to serve military purposes. The new railway lines such as Transcaspiian Railway, the Samarkand Andizhan Railway, the Central Asiatic Railway etc., began to be constructed, and by the end of the last century major towns as well as cotton growing areas were linked with one another and all of them with industrial centres of European Russia.

Hosts of Russian traders migrated to region along with credit institutions and their middlemen. They monopolized the purchase of cotton and dictated prices to cotton growers. The credit advanced to the peasants by them carried an interest rate native peasants and their reduction to the rank of either croppers or agricultural workers. Through coercive measures area under cotton cultivation increased rapidly. In 1902 it was 530,000 acres

and in 1913 it increased to 1,045,000 acres. Between 1840 to 1860 cotton exports to metropolitan textile industrial centres in Asia to European Russia rose from 873,000 poods to 1,364,700 poods. By 1912, the Central Asian region had started supplying four fifth of textile goods from European Russia threw out of employment lakhs of artisans. In addition to this there was mounting taxation to defray the expenses of a corrupt and oppressive administration and of military expeditions sent to curb frequent popular revolts. The taxes levied on the Muslims of the region were 50 to 150 per cent higher than those levied on the people of European Russia.

Along with this Russian capital started flowing into the region rapidly for setting up railways and cotton processing units. By 1914 Russian investment in Central Asia was to the tune of 313,000,000 roublees.

Cultural Impact

The economic changes caused by the new regime brought about a basic change in the cultural milieu of Turkestan. Urbanisation made rapid progress and due to the flooding of towns by Russians, the city culture developed strikingly Slavic traits. The growth of commerce brought into to an intelligentsia, inspired by European thought and revolutionary changes in Turkey. The members of the new intelligentsia vied with one another in issuing journals, setting up libraries, clubs and societies. Turkestan became the scene of a cultural upsurge nourished by the following three schools of thought.

(1) The pro-Russians: This group was composed of pro-Russian zealots who worked for the establishment of friendly relation between the native and Russian, propagated Russian cultural and literary legacies and opened Russian schools among Muslims. Their following was meagre. Russian schools did not became popular in the indigenous population. Their number in 1896 was 28 and it rose to 89 by 1911.

(2) Khadimists: They emerged as a vigorous reaction against the flood of Western culture in Turkestan. They stood for preservation of Islamic orthodoxy and opposed reformation of Islamic society by Western oriented intellectuals. While traditionalism succumbed before modernism in other parts of the world, its strength increased in Central Asia. Muslim religious and cultural institutions were infused with an unprecedented vigour. The Shariat, the Adat, the madarsa and the clergy all became stronger and more assertive than before. The orthodox Muslims were shocked and annoyed at their youngsters flocking to Russian restaurants, clubs, drinking and public houses and they attributed the slackening of morals and religious indifference in them to the influence of the foreign culture of the 'infidels'. The new regime could not relax their control over educational institutions which continued to be ruled exclusively by Islamic orthodoxy. They controlled 7000 schools with a student population of 75,000 in Turkestan administration alone. They gave vent to mass indignation organising popular revolts in a militant manner. They were in fact the precursors of leaders of Muslim rebellion of 1916 and of Basmachi movement against the Soviet regime. They provided ideology and vitality to the large number of open Muslim revolts that erupted against the Tsarist and Soviet regimes.

(3) The Third group, called Djadidists, was mostly constituted of Tartars and was the counterpart of Modernist groups in rest of the Muslim world. Their ideology was an amalgam of ideology of Gulam Mohammed Afghani and Pan-Turkism. They were anti-clerical, anti-feudal and stood for a new kind of Islamic awakening. They stoutly opposed divisive tendencies among Central Asian Muslims, stemming from linguistic and ethnic considerations and proclaimed that Muslims of Central Asia were a homogeneous society with Turkic ancestry. This brought them in open confrontation with Pan-Slavists who were anti-Turkic, pro-Christian and encouraged divisiveness among

the Muslims. In their zeal for modernisation of Islam, they opened new type of schools and established a number of journals the most outstanding of which was *Tardjuman*, edited by their foremost ideologue Ismail Bey Gaspiralia Tarta. The paper had a large circulation and moulded the mind of a number of educated Muslims who as we shall see played an outstanding role in the political development in the years to come. Djadidism was such a powerful cultural and intellectual antidote to Russian Slavism, that the Russian government imposed a ban on Djadid's entry into the teaching profession and acquiring land in the region. The intellectuals of this group worked both against their own kinsmen whose Islam they wanted to modernize and the Russians whom they opposed on political and cultural fronts.

Muslim Rebellions

Russian rule in Central Asia was under constant attack by the native rebels since its very inception. In all there were as many as 250 rebellions against them out of which the uprising of 1885 in Fergana valley under Darvesh Khan Tiuria, the Tashkent Cholera Riot of 1892 and the Andizhan rebellion of 1898 led by Ihsan Naqshbandi were most sanguinary and most prolonged. In Fergana oblast anti-Russian revolts were an annual feature. After 1900, though mass rebellions became steadily rare, small dimensional attacks on Russian settlers and officers were frequent. Between 1899-1916 there were no less than 4922 such attacks in the region, the oblast-wise breakdown of these figures being Fergana 2249, Samarkand 1215, Transcaspia 775, Syr Daria 398, Semirachie 2885. The crime against law and order, a Russian name for rebellions of the natives, rose from 16 to 316 between 1900-1913 in Fergana oblast from 120 to 379 in Samarkand oblast between 1900-1910, from 285 to 2766 in Syr Daria oblast from 1908-1911, and from 492 to 1141 in Transcaspian oblast between 1902-1911. That these revolts took place mostly in rural areas indicates that while urban intellectuals

carried on constitutional anti-Russian activities as we would soon examine, Muslim divines remained involved in militant struggle against the aliens.

Tashkent Cholera Riot

In June 1892 Tashkent was overtaken by a virulent cholera which took a heavy death toll. Col. S.R. Putintsev issued orders that before burial all dead bodies would be inspected by state appointed inspectors. These inspectors, being untrained, were slow in their work, with the result dead bodies remained unburied for a few days before inspectors could give clearance. Because of this delay, they would decompose in the summer heat in overcrowded Muslim localities. The citizens grew indignant. Their feelings ran high. These inspectors disregarded the sanctity of women quarters by insisting upon their right to inspect them. Moreover the 12 old cemeteries of the town proved insufficient for burial purposes in view of the high death rate. Secret burials began to take place. Russians prohibited such burials and started punishing those responsible for them. This triggered a revolt in the city. Governor Putintsev was beaten by an angry crowd. The police station was ransacked. Military was called to shoot at the defiant mob. When firing took place a number of people fell into a nearby dyke while fleeing and died. The entire city was aflame with riot. Governor N.I. Grodevov came from the nearby oblast with additional army and a hostile crowd took shelter in Dzhan mosque. The military ordered it to disperse on pains of being shot down. At this many people bared their chests and shouted "shoot, shoot". The troop fired. The crowd fled, leaving ten dead. Leaders of the revolt were arrested and tried at a military court.

Anidizhan Uprising, 1898

Ihsan Naqshbandhi through his social work and religious devotion gained wide popularity in Fergana oblast. His knowledge of theology was small but he had a winning tongue. He was dedicated to the cause of welfare of the

people, came to their help in times of difficulty, planted trees for them and laboured for providing water to them. He set up a number of religious institutions. The people declared him as their Sheikh. After months of preparation he started a revolt against the Russians with the objective of setting up an independent Kokand State. At the appointed time a large number of people gathered at a spot, dressed in white and riding on white horses. The crowd was led by Ihsan himself who was dressed in green and was riding a white horse. A holy was started in the name of Almighty. Russian military barracks and soldiers were attacked. Military warnings were ignored and the rebellious mass led by Ihsan marched towards Samarkand cutting rail roads and telephone wires. Ihsan was supported by prominent Muslims of the area. The revolt spread all over Fergana district.

General kurupatkin came on the scene with heavily armed troops. The rebels fought with sticks. Most of them came from the impoverished astisans and poor hill Kazakhs and kirghis.

The military resorted to massacring. Ihsan was caught and hanged on June 13, 1898.

The Russian soldiers flogged the people of the area from where the rebels had come, and deported a large of them to barren regions. Their land was allocated to Russians.

After the revolt was crushed Russian settlements were increased in the region and additional arms were given to the Russians to fight the natives. ■

CULT OF PAN-ISLAMISM

Moin Shakir*

Maulana Mohammed Ali (1878-1931) represents a remarkable synthesis of apparently conflicting trends and currents of Muslim religious and political thought in India. He stressed the need of modernity and science as well as the need to follow the spirit and values of Islam.

He was inspired by the Aligarh Movement and was, in a sense, its by product. His dissociation with the Aligarh movement. He was fully aware of the historic importance of Sir Syed's role during the latter half of 19th century. He also considered that the Aligarh movement was in the interests of the Muslims in India. He never denied the usefulness of the western system of education either. But he thought that the western system should not be blindly copied, or the oriental aware that Sir Syed, while supporting the western system, had advocated the need to synthesize philosophy, science and religion. It was apparent, however, that the Aligarh movement with all its merits signally failed to achieve the intended results. While he retained all personal regard for Sir Syed, he was convinced that the Aligarh movement was in need of reform. Even Mohsin-ul-Mulk commanded his respect. Whatever Mohsin-ul-Mulk did, was done with the sincere motive of serving the Muslim community and not out of opportunistic considerations. Mohammed Ali also expressed his gratitude and loyalty towards Viqar-ul-Mulk. On his death, Mohammed Ali said that "India is deprived of a leader and we of or father." Like Shibli Nomani and Maulana Azad, Mohammed Ali vehemently criticized the system of western education which was in vogue in India. "The present generation is an immature product of modern education with crude, half-formed ideas, not familiar with orders of things—new as well as old," wrote Mohammed Ali. He held that the western education, "tended to breed in the student an arrogant

*Former Professor, Politics Science, Marathwada University, Aurangabad

omniscience, and to destroy along with age-old beliefs in superstition all respect for Tradition and Authority." What Mohammed Ali advocated was the genuine spirit of enquiry, the search for truth as well as respect for tradition. He believed that the system of education which had come into vogue was not suited to the genius of the people or even that needs of the modern age. Mohammed Ali also argued that education should not be in the hands of the State. He complained that the modern education had produced men who were "more communal than religious" and who know "so little of their religion and their orthodoxy was more than suspect." Mohammed Ali believed that Sir Syed really did not desire this type of education. He said that "we have no hesitation in saying that we have assisted in the matter in a way that would have met with the approval of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and his cordial and active encouragement, had Providence spared him to guide today the policy of his community and his country." Shibli Nomani and Maulana Azad had also made departure from the political aspect of the Aligarh movement. But Mohammed Ali's deviation is altogether of a different nature. Firstly, he never challenged its necessity and usefulness. Secondly, his ideas had their nucleus in Sir Syed's educational, social and political philosophy. Although Sir Syed's influence on Mohammed Ali was decisive, circumstance obliged him to modify Sir Syed's programmed radically. Mohsin-ul-Mulk and Viqar-ul-Mulk too supported Mohammed Ali's stand. He regarded Sir Syed as "an arch-rebel and not a loyalist of the British Empire for he said that "It is my firm conviction that he had always aimed and intended to produce staunch Muslim and patriotic Indians, even if he could not contemplate a near enough future for India." In 1907 when the strike of the Aligarh students occurred and in the same year fell the death anniversary of Sir Syed, Mohammed Ali said in an Ode written in Urdu:

It is you that had taught the community all this
'Mischief';

If we are its Culmination, you are its Commencement.

Mohammed Ali acknowledged Tilak as his political 'Guru'. Like Tilak, he believed in providing a popular basis to the nationalist movement in the country. Both of them aimed at the same goal—self-Government. Both of them disapproved of the means and methods employed by the liberals. Mohammed Ali favoured militancy and the method of mass agitation. The influence of Tilak made Mohammed Ali the leading exponent of extremist Muslim nationalism. Sir Syed, Mohsin-ul-Mulk, the Aga Khan, Jinnah and a few others had been expatiating on the providential mission of the British Government and supporting the programme of the liberals. No one thought of associating the common people with the political movement. Because of Tilak's influence Mohammed Ali had realized the necessity and significance of mass contact. There is another striking similarity between Tilak and Mohammed Ali. Both of them used religion to provide a mass base to Indian politics. But Mohammed Ali's anti-British stand was the outcome of the British policy towards the Muslim countries. Moreover, the supranational character of Islam awakened and strengthened the latent feelings of Pan-Islamism amongst the Muslim in India.

Mohammed Ali believed that the basic teaching of Islam is peace and not war and hatred. Therefore, he had no hesitation in joining the non-cooperation movement launched by Gandhi. Although Gandhi exercised some influence on Mohammed Ali, he was very conscious of "communal individuality". He said "I do not believe either in the spiritualism or the intuition of Gandhiji. I also do not consider him the saint of God. His religion is different from my religion. But I regard him as my political leader. He is the greatest and most sincere leader of the country. We can become free from the British subjection only through his leadership." Mohammed Ali with all his association with Islamic politics did not lag behind in lending support to Gandhi in the freedom struggle. Political expediency brought

him closer to Gandhiji. He held that "there is no clash between Hindus and Muslims. The real conflict is between Malaviaism and Gandhism. I am supporting the latter to serve India and Islam." To Mohammed Ali, politics should be the hand maid of religion. He held that the Hindu customs and rituals of which Gandhiji was a vigorous champion needed reform. Once he said that "according to my religion and creed, I do hold an adulterous and a fallen Mussalman to be better than Mr. Gandhi." This shows how Mohammed Ali's thinking was dominated by his religious creed and how little was Gandhi's influence on the religious ideas of Mohammed Ali. Mohammed Ali was not prepared to accept anything that conflicted with Islam. According to him "Islam is not a bundle of dogmas and doctrines that theologians plague humanity with. It is a complete scheme of life, a perfect code of right conduct and a comprehensive social polity as wide as the human race and in fact as wide as the human creation." Mohammed Ali's philosophy of religion is comprehensive enough to include all the important aspects of life. It guides "man in every concern of life" and teaches "him how to live and how to die." He believed that religion is not a ritual and that it is "an interpretation of life." It is "a culture, a polity, an outlook on life." He held that Islam alone provides an example of such a true religion. Islam was a complete culture, polity and outlook on life. It keeps tradition reason and mystic intuition "within proper limits." The Qur'an is a book of guidance regulating the activities of all those who prefer Islam. It is a "perennial fountain of truth." According to him the Qur'an propounds two basic principles—unity of God and the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. He held that God is "the Supreme Ruler and Omnipotent Creator, Sustainer and Development of all Creation." He learnt from the creator postulated, the unity of his creation, and all was one vast Theocracy with Allah for its king and Man for his earthly viceregency." Man is the servant of the Lord and his function is "the service of his Maker and the fulfillment of His Divine purpose." He is the rightless slave of God." Mohammed Ali said that

surrender to God "will make him free for ever and equal of kings and emperors in the greatest of all Republics, and even superior to them." Both Mohammed Ali and Iqbal drew heavily on Islam. Mohammed Ali explains that Iqbal's notion of Man's realization of self was the discovery of the purpose of life without which life would be a wilderness. The 'life purpose' is nothing but the divine purpose for which Theocracy exists in Universe. Man identifies his 'life purpose' with God's Purpose running through all his creation. It must not be forgotten that Mohammed Ali, while elaborating the importance of religion in the life of man, had Islam always in his mind. He refused to accept that all religions are as true and sound as Islam. Unlike Maulana Azad he never supported the principles of the unity of all religions. To him Islam in the eternal truth. He said: "Islam was unchanging and has remained unchanged in more than 13 centuries that have passed over" and has been guiding the people in spite of the efforts of Islam mass determined by the prevailing economic, sociological, political and social philosophies. "Ancient Islam" was not concerned with "the wealth, power and glory"; even the feudal orientation of Islam radically changed its character. Mohammed Ali ignored the sociological aspect of religion. He recognised, like most of the liberals, that there existed no conflict between religion and science, i.e., Islam and science. As there is no "possibility of conflict between the two and there is nothing to reconcile." If the interpretation of a particular verse of the Qur'an is rejected and supplemented by a more rational one, it is not a sin. He agreed with Sir Syed who "exposed the futility and the mistake of Ibn Rushd's un-natural and irrational division of mankind into philosophers and fools." He held that Islam is neither opposed to rationalism nor to mysticism, provided that they do not transgress their limits. The philosophers should not "make Muslim theology their battle ground and divert the energies of Muslims from righteous action. At the same time Islam cannot let "Sufism degenerate into a wild fantastic ritual, or worse still, leading him (Sufi) to consider his kind above and beyond the claims

of Islam's Shariat which prescribes the simplest of duties for all alike."

Mohammed Ali's view of Islam was similar to that of the advocates of "romanticism" in politics. Maulana Azad was the most influential representative of this trend till the end of the First World War but Maulana Maudoodi still continues to adhere to it. The romantic approach to religion and its application to politics implies that Islam is the only criterion of truth and could provide an answer to all the problems that confronted mankind. Its exponents do not see any conflict between Islam and modern science because Islam is a progressive force, a rational and scientific system.

Mohammed Ali stood to defend each and every aspect of Islam. This interpretation "suffers from ethical poverty; it makes no demands upon the Muslims, it is beautiful but inspires no actuality."

Mohammed Ali's religiosity does not make any distinction between the spiritual and the mundane. Mohammed Ali thought that secularism would limit the range of Islam and render it ineffective in non-spiritual matters. He held that it was against the spirit and injunctions of the Qur'an and the practices of the Prophet (peace be upon him). He was of the opinion that there is compulsion not in religion but of religion. IN a letter of Maulana Abdul Bari he writes "ordinarily in political affairs there are leaders in every community. But the most important question in life is religion and in this matter we cannot succeed unless some one from the venerable group of Ulema is our leader." He said, "I must disprove that the doctrine that politics should be separated from religion, which either meant that Mussalmans should not be allowed to follow their religion which governed their politics as every other aspect of their private or public life, or that politics should be divorced from all spirituality and should become the plaything of pretenders and self-seeking charlatans. Secularism he thought, is a western notion, which cannot be applied in the East.

According to Mohammed Ali the problem essentially was one of defining the province of religion. In the West politics had set the limits of religion whereas in the East politics were still determined by religion. Mohammed Ali held that "What is politics to the West today, religion is still to the East." This attitude renders human legislation unnecessary and superfluous in the presence of Islamic jurisprudence drawn from the Qur'an and Hadith. Islam should be placed above "human legislation." On this score he criticized the instruction imported at Aligarh and stigmatised it as worldly, and without any concern for the world hereafter. In a letter to Ghulam Bheek Nairang he clearly stated the need of "Islamic Politics" and his opposition to Mustafa Kamal Pasha and Ismat Pasha who were working for a secular state. He admired Sir Syed not because he wanted to keep the state religion distinct but because he was a "zealous and even a stern Muslim in his polemics in defence of his creed against European and Christian critics." He always held that the Islamic polity is realizable— "The post-War Europe would not be the pre-war Europe and after the terrible nightmare of this war it could be easily awakened into a recognition of the Kingdom of God in which every man would be a brother and a fellow—subject of God, the sole, Sovereign of Universe." He was never prepared to discard the notion of divine government. All his social and political ideas were conditioned by his orthodoxy. Mohammed Ali observed "If I am supposed to erreform the right path, the only way to convince me of my error is to refer me to the Holy Qur'an or to the authentic traditions of the last Prophet (peace be upon him).....or religious pronouncement of recognized Muslim Divines, past and present..." Thus Mohammed Ali's approach was traditional and religion-oriented. Unlike Maulana Azad, he never abandoned his romantic approach. All these characteristics of his Islam are reflected in his political ideas. Such an approach logically leads to Pan-Islamism, aggressive Muslim Nationalism and the rejection of democracy.

Mohammed Ali is considered to be initiator of Pan-Islamism in India. This is partly true. In India Pan-Islamism was the concomitant of romanticism of which the best representative was Maulana Azad. Mohammed Ali did not employ the term Pan-Islamism to describe the efforts of the Muslim world to bring about united opposition to the Christian Powers of Europe as it was used originally in the eighties of the 19th century. It was advocated because the spirit of Islam called for the unity of Muslims. Patriotism and Pan-Islamism were not irreconcilable. "If patriotism has a rationale, surely it can be nothing else but the similarity of culture and civilization.—Whether due to similar ethnic origin, geographical unity or identity of historical associations—expressing itself in similar laws and institutions. Now the rationale of the Brotherhood of Islam or Pan-Islamism is exactly the same rationale of patriotism, with the difference however, that the Islamic fraternity has not achieved an identity of laws and institutions through an identity of ethnic origin or geographical unity, but has received it as a direct gift from God." Mohammed Ali asserted that Pan-Islamism is nothing more nor less than Islam itself, "Supernational Sangathan of Muslims in five continents." Islam as a religion and social polity binds all Muslims together. It recognizes neither the sanctity of colour nor the virtue of geography, and by offering a set of common ideals, offers the only rational basis for unity and cooperation among its followers. The sympathies of a Mussalman are co-extensive with his religion because they have been bred into him by the unifying spirit of his creed.

According to Mohammed Ali the basis of Pan-Islamism is one God, One Prophet, One Ka'ba and one Book. But "this spiritual unity would have been of no avail if it did not provide a social unity... a common social policy." He put great emphasis on "the main principles underlying the social synthesis... thought the Islamic World." Pan-Islamism is not an institution, It is not concrete. But Pan-Islamism has been more an abstract and emotional factor than a pragmatic

concept. It was not motivated by hatred against the non-Muslim. Mohammed Ali, therefore, held that Pan-Islamism and Islam are synonymous and neither is aggressive and in the Islamic world. The defeat of the Islamic countries at the hands of the European countries disheartened the Muslims all over the world. It touched the chord of religion in the sub-conscious being of the Muslims. Mohammed Ali described that his feeling during the disastrous war in the Balkans were so overpowering that he even contemplated suicide. Inside the country the "settled fact" of the Partition of Bengal was made null and void. Therefore, he felt that the Muslims are betrayed both in India and abroad. The disillusionment that followed the First World War, led to the development of the idea of the unity of all the Muslims of the world. It was the illusion of subject Muslims who were disappointed due to their helplessness. Though essentially a political issue, Mohammed Ali deliberately made it religious. The Sympathy with Turkey was described as religious and not as political. The purpose was to exercise the "right as British subjects to put such pressure upon our Governments as we lawfully could to respect our religious requirements on the satisfaction of which our political allegiance rested." He declared, 'God before everything—God before loyalty, God before King, God before patriotism, God before my country, God before my Father, Mother and child. This is my faith.' He preached Pan-Islamism from the Khilafat Committee as well as the Congress platforms. Mohammed Ali wanted to accomplish this in India. "To die for a cause is not difficult. The harder thing is to live for a cause, and if need be, suffer for it, and the cause we must live and suffer for must be the realisation in India of the Kingdom of God," Mohammed Ali declared.

For good or ill, Mohammed Ali got an opportunity owing to the Turkish problems immediately after the First World War to advocate Pan-Islamism in the form of the Khilafat movement. It should be particularly mentioned here that the question of Turkey and the Khilafat had been agitating the

minds of the Indian Muslims since the last quarter of the 19th century. Sir Syed too had to deal with it. He held that the king of Turkey would remain the sovereign of Turkey alone. But this view was not acceptable even to his colleges. Mohsin-ul-Mulk declared that loyalty to the government does not exclude the idea of sympathy with one's coreligionists. Those who think that they are conflicting are ignorant both of their religious duties and their political relations. Mohammed Ali's deviation from the Aligarh movement was in his advocacy of Pan-Islamism. He said that the question of Khilafat lay at the root of Islamic polity. To him the Khilafat is "the most essential institution of the Muslim Community throughout the world." He held that "the foundation of the Khilafat unites both temporal and spiritual work, which Islam believes it is charged with doing. At all time since the death of the Prophet there has been a Khilafat, and it must be pressed at all time by the entire body of the Mussalmans. There has been no such thing as merely the spiritual headship of Islam. Islam, as we regard it, is the last word in ethics and the last word in guidance in all our affairs." Therefore, the Khilafat question assumed greater importance consideration, religion was the dynamic factor behind the Khilafat question. Mohammed Ali declared that "our sympathy with Turkey was not political or territorial but religious, for the sovereign of Turkey was the successor of the Prophet and the commander of the faithful." The Caliph is the viceregent at his back and had the entire omnipotence of his Master at his beck and call." So the Muslims were asked to do their best for the preservation of the Institution of Khilafat. Mohammed Ali exploited the Khilafat question for propagating Pan-Islamism. He found no conflict between the Khilafat and the independence movement in India. To him freedom of India was only a springboard for "the realization of Eastern Federalism. For, a "slave India will be of scant help to the Turks and the Khilafat." This gave birth to what can be termed as Islamic Nationalism. Both Khilafat and Islamic Nationalism were the logical result of the Pan-Islamism of Mohammed Ali.

Mohammed Ali, advocating the doctrine Pan-Islamism, thought that the doctrine is an assertion of the supremacy of Islam. The adherence to Islam demands the religious unity of its followers, transcending all territorial and other consideration. The chief aim of Pan-Islamism since Jamaluddin Afghani had been "the unification of all Muslim people under one Islamic Government, over which the Supreme Caliph should bear undisputed rule, as in the glorious days of Islam.

The political doctrine of Pan-Islamism resulted in disastrous consequences to the Muslims because of its inherent incapacity for "readjusting the outlook and realising the aspiration of the Muslim world." The main reason for this was that it was based on the medieval concept of Muslim solidarity which was no more than a "relic of medieval superstition." But neither Afghani nor Mohammed Ali took into account the striking developments in the spirit and organization of modern life, in the fields of law, economics and politics. This it remained "a wrong ideology, romantic and out of touch with actualities." Mention may be made here of the distinction made by Gibb between "Islamic Universalism," and "Pan-Islamism." According to him the former term signified "loyalty to be understood only as loyalty to the political head. Mohammed Ali to distinguish between the two. Even Ibn Khaldun had said that "Government and Kingship are a Caliphate of God amongst men, for the execution of His ordinance amongst them." Mohammed Ali failed to comprehend the real character of the Turkish Government, the extent to which it was executing the ordinance of God, the extent it was popular with the people and whether the 'Caliph' was the true instrument and representative of the sacred law. That is why Gibb says that "it was ardently accepted by those who had least personal experience of the Government of the Ottoman Empire." Though dangerous and illusive, as the doctrine of Pan-Islamism was, it satisfied the ambitions of religious leaders and their ignorant followers who cherished the

supremacy of Islam. The Khilafat movement was opposed by a very few persons, like Jinnah, Fazl-ul-Haq and Fazl-i-Hussain, because denouncing the Khilafat movement meant "obviously a bold step and certain political suicide." The truth was that "with all their petty differences and sectarianism, the whole Muslim world, be it Shiat or Sunniyat has got but one word on the Caliphate. The Caliphate in Islam is the temporal and religious leadership of the Muslims. The doctrine of Pan-Islamism was no dominant among the people that Khilafat was regarded "a necessity for the Muslims, not only because it is rendered necessary by the words of the Holy Qur'an, but also because the word of God had told the Muslims that weakening of the Caliphate means the weakening of religion of Islam, and is a clear sign of insecurity for the Muslim in the World." This attitude, in fact, obstructed the growth of national consciousness among the Indian Muslims. The "Muslim intellectuals of Modern India awoke, not to nationalism, but to the dream of extra-national existence whose realization, however, has been rendered impossible by various factors outside India and beyond their control and comprehension" said Roy. There was no one like Ali Abdul Razzak in India to declare that the Khilafat has always been, and continues to be "a misfortune of Islam" and a "source of evil" and "corruption."

The weakness of Mohammed Ali lies in his ignorance of the movement of secularization which was afoot in Turkey under the energetic leadership of Kamal Pasha and in his support of the Khilafat which was by then a lost cause. It was no more than an "historical relic." It is true that Mustafa Kamal was opposed to religion itself. To him it was poison that had decomposed the body politic and, therefore, required to be rooted out. As Taufiq-Rushdi Arab told Khaliquzzaman, "the small portion of Turkey that was left with us could not be strong enough to justify a claim to retain the Khilafat of the Muslim world. It was not we who abolished it but the Muslim world which made us incapable of retaining it."

Mohammed Ali also did not visualise the disastrous effects of the doctrine of Pan-Islamism. The Khilafat movement led to the emigration of a large number of Muslims from India. Mohammed Ali lacked balanced outlook and a sense of realism. He characterised India as *Darul Harb* while Sir Syed had said that there could be a country like India which in neither *Darul Harb* nor *Darlu Islam*. Mohammed Ali felt if the Muslims could not help them do so, the Muslims should leave India and migrate to some Islamic country. It was nothing but playing with the fate of thousands of people. Such propaganda produced its inevitable and unhealthy consequences. The "latent Muslim feelings of hatred against unbelievers sprang up; the old Muslim religion of the sword was reasserted; the exclusiveness of Arabia was revived; the extra-territorial allegiance to Afghanistan which was shown by Muslim leaders nourished Pan-Islamic tendency; the primary allegiance of Muslims Raj caught many Indian Muslims; the loyalty of Indian Muslims to India was found to be spurious." Gandhiji supported Mohammed Ali in order to attract the support of the Muslims for the National Movement. Gandhiji, by supporting Mohammed Ali, wanted to save the cow. But Thompson says that "he never met a Hindu who thought Khilafat claims anything but nonsense, and rather immoral nonsense at that." Even the educational institution were made the handmaid of the ever-shifting exigencies of politics.

Mohammed Ali, however, never recognized that "the fiasco of the Hijrat (Khilafat emigration) revealed the superficiality of religious sentiment" which was unable "to save the Caliphal empire from dissolution and to prevent that dissolution from following largely national lines." Therefore, when the institution of Khilafat was abolished, Mohammed Ali considered it the greatest mistake, while Iqbal thought it "to be a perfectly sound exercise of the right of *ijtihad*." Khuda Baksh also held the same view. He held that it could open "the path of development of nationalism and remove the embargo in liberalism. It will fashion for Islam

a new sense of unity founded on truth, upon cultural traditions and materialized interests." Unlike Azad, Mohammed Ali was not prepared to abandon romanticism and accept realism, or to recognize the increasing role of nationalism, divesting it of the context of religion.

Nevertheless, Mohammed Ali was able to create a stir among the Muslims in India and to invest Pan-Islamism with the fervour of a mass movement. The Muslims "felt the impulse of the same social upheaval as shook their Hindu compatriots from their age-long resignation and apathy... it was the revolt of the exploited masses still unconscious of their purpose." According to L. Hutchinson "The wretchedness of the Hindu peasants found expression in the National Congress: that of the Muslim peasants in the otherwise absurd Caliphate movement." Hiren Mukerjee insists that the content of the Khilafat movement was anti-Imperialistic or anti-British. The credit for the mobilisation of the mass energy must go to Mohammed Ali. This was earlier accomplished by the Hindu extremists in the history of the Indian nationalist movement. Religion for the Hindu extremists however was not an end but a means whereas to Mohammed Ali religion was an end in itself.

Mohammed Ali was not only the author of Pan-Islamism but also the most important spokesman of Islamic Nationalism. If Pan-Islamism was a reality to him, "Indianism" was no less so. This was no doubt illogical but he was not prepared to surrender either of the two. What Mohammed Ali attempted was a compromise between Pan-Islamism and Indian nationalism. In the Khilafat movement he appeared to see the blending of the two irreconcilable lines of thought—Islamic universalism and Indian (Muslim) nationalism. He declared, "Where God commands I am a Muslim first, and Muslim second, and a Muslim last, and nothing but a Muslim.....but where India is concerned.....I am an Indian First, an Indian second, an Indian last, nothing but an Indian.' He said "I belong to two circles of equal size, but which are not concentric. One is India and the other is the Muslim

world." In India the Muslims are "the blood brothers of the Hindus" but outside India there are millions who share their faith. It "is a priceless heritage, the wonder of the age, the most vital and binding human cement." But the fiasco of the Khilafat Movement obliged him to think in terms of Islamic nationalism. In practical politics it was an emphasis on separateness of the Muslim community as a distinct cultural and political entity.

Mohammed Ali's love of Islam and the Muslim world should not lead to doubt his devotion to Indian nationalism. Though his Indianism was subordinate to his loyalty to Islam he was a true Indian. He accepted one reality —God. But God also made it obligatory to serve the people of one's own country. Thus the country was as fundamental as the faith. Mohammed Ali did not approve of any nationalism which was not based on religion. Mohammed Ali regarded western nationalism as undesirable and harmful because of its secular character. A secular nationalist lacks vision and perspective and the sense of ultimate reality. This nationalism deals with man as a citizen of a particular part of the world. The worship of motherland is its creed. But as a human being he owes loyalty to his faith, which may transcend the limits of nationalism. Even Jesus has preached, Renon says, that "a man's country is not everything, and that man is before, and higher than, the citizen." Islamic theocracy assigns no place to territorial nationalism as it does not make any distinction between an Arab and a non-Arab. Mohd. Ali writes: "The theocracy of Islam naturally condemned the narrow prejudices that created nationality and killed humanity, for to God, the universal King, there would be no distinction between Arab and Ajam, of Aryan and Semitic, of Angle-Saxon and Teuton, I had seen in this terrible war the natural consequences and culmination of nationalism." He held that Islamic theocracy is "supernationalist" in character and therefore opposed to secular nationalism which is the work of Satan and not of God. Nationalism and religion are poles

apart. One divides and the other binds. Nationalism without religion kills our sense of right and wrong. A true Muslim should turn away from the shrine of nationalism that has for its creed "My Country, right or wrong." Whereas nationalism demands worship of one's country, Islam recognises one sovereignty alone, the sovereignty of God, which is supreme and unconditional, invisible and inalienable. Thus the excess of territorial and secular nationalism, for it would then cease to be territorial or secular and become "non-spatial and non-racial." This attitude perfectly agreed with Mohammed Ali's approach to Islam or Pan-Islamism. Maulvi Abdul Haq described this as an extreme type of "Mullaism," which included prejudice, superstition, orthodoxy, hatred and intolerance because for the discussion of every problem he used to bring in God and His Prophet which is repugnant to rationalism. To him the more important question was the liberty of conscience and the preservation of the sanctity of souls. It was an attempt to retain the institution of Khilafat on the one hand, and the unity of the people and independence of the country on the other. Gandhiji was also convinced of the sincerity of Mohammed Ali and the purity of his faith in Islam. "The brave Brothers (Mohammed Ali and Shaukat Ali) are staunch lovers of their country, but they are Muslim first and every thing else after and it must be so with every religiously minded man. The Brothers have for years past represented all that is best and noblest in Islam. No two Mussalman have done more than they to raise the status of Islam in India... They have shown themselves true nationalists" wrote Gandhiji. Gandhiji was so much influenced by Mohammed Ali that "the action of Gandhi in launching non-cooperation on (20th August, 1920) was the direct outcome of the Khilafat movement." The Khilafat movement could mobilize and awaken Muslims but did not bring about the unity of Hindus and Muslims. For, to achieve this end, Mohammed Ali himself wrote that "The communal temper must change and interests must grow identical before the Hindus and Muslims can be welded into a united

nationality."

Mohammed Ali was not obsessed with the question of means to be employed in politics. Even violent and unconstitutional means, he felt, could be employed for achieving the end of Pan-Islamism and Khilafat. Khaliquzzaman described how it was stated by the Ali Brothers that "it was time we started sounding our finish Turkey and the Khilafat, and suggested that we should find some way to explore the conditions of arms' factories in the tribal area and what should be their maximum production at any given time." The extremist wing of the Khilafat leadership also asserted that the Indian Muslims could seek the help of any Muslim Power to invade India. Dr. Ambedkar says that in 1919 the Indian Mussalmans "who were carrying on the Khilafat movement actually went to the length of inviting the Ameer of Afghanistan to invade India," Dr. Kitchlew is also reported to have said that "if you put an obstacle in the path of our *Tanzeem* and do not give us our rights, we shall make common cause with Afghanistan or some other Mussalmans Power and establish our Rule in the country." This was perhaps one of the important though unintended results of Mohammed Ali disclaimed any personal responsibility for the idea of inviting the Ameer of Afghanistan to act as the liberator of India. In 1923 he said that "If India ever needs a humble soldier to resist an aggressor, be he Muslim or non-Muslim, your comrade...will fill his place in the ranks. He certainly will be no deserter." It was a popular belief that the Muslims were trying to get the military aid of the Muslim countries to establish Muslim Raj. Sir Abdul Qadir refuting this said that "this theory seems to be the product of the heated brains of a few faddists and is propagated in order to wean Hindus from nationalism and work upon their fears for party purpose." This may be only an emotional reflection of the helpless and frustrated Indian Muslims.

Mohammed Ali supported the non-cooperation

movement as a proper means for achieving the independence of the country. He argued that it was sanctioned by the Qur'an: Co-operation in righteousness and piety, but not in sinfulness and transgression. But these objects could not be obtained without making sacrifices especially in the cause of religion and freedom. He explained to the Muslims that "*Swaraj* means *Swadharma* and if you value religious freedom more than others as you think, your must be the larger sacrifices. He also advised his countrymen in general and Muslims in particular, not to join the British Army. For God's Command was, "I want you to serve Me and not a creature of Mine." It meant a commitment to complete independence. In his speech at the Round Table Conference, he declared, "I went to go back to my country if I can go back with the substance of freedom in my hand. Otherwise I will not go back to a slave country. I will even prefer to die in a foreign country." On this issue Mohammed Ali even parted company with Gandhi. "We refuse to join Mr. Gandhi," he said, "because his movement is not a movement for the complete independence of India but for making the 70 million of Indian Muslims dependent on the Hindu Sabha." It is generally said about Mohammed Ali that after the end of the Khilafat movement, he turned out to be a communalist. This is far from true. Nationalism in India is not and has never been a concept with a definite meaning accepted by all the leaders of all the communities. To Mohammed Ali nationalism implied independence of the country—as well as freedom for the communities from the fear of domination by one another—and continuity and preservation of what is best in Muslim culture. He also thought that nationalism was unacceptable and harmful to the Muslims if it violated the spirit of Islam. He therefore argued that "in India the nation could be the synthesis of various races and creeds on the political and to some extent, on the social plane." Commenting on B.C. Pal's concept of nationalism, Mohammed Ali said that Pal's definition of nationalism was more in terms of Hindu religion and culture than in terms of Indian geography or in terms of the variety

and complexity of Indian society. Indian nationality cannot be viewed as coextensive with the Hindu religion because it leaves out millions of different creeds, who have considerably influenced Indian society. Mohammed Ali had always been apprehensive of Hindu-oriented Indian nationalism which was upheld by communal patriots. It alarmed the Muslims and had driven them into a position of sullen isolation. "The veils of separation can be broken down only if a radical change takes place in the concept of communal duty and patriotism," he insisted. Mohammed Ali who once regarded the demand for separate electorates as untenable found it necessary later to support it. What he termed as the extremist character of Hindu leadership made Muslims suspicious even of the demand for *Swaraj*. He pleaded for communal representation and separate electorates because the Muslims became "suspicious of *Swaraj* becoming a Hindu Raj in practice." He was of the opinion that the interests of the Muslims were separate and distinctive and required to be safeguarded by separate electorates. Though closely associated with the Indian National Congress, he criticised the attitude of many Congress nationalists— "It is a cant and hypocrisy on the part of a very large section of Hindus to talk of nationalism and to rebuke those who give expression to the apprehensions they feel as regards the rights of minority communities or Backward Classes and who would devise safeguards for them through communal and class representation," he said in 1925. Even in 1913 he had written, "it has been a convenient belief professed by every Congressman that the Indian national unity would best be protected if the Mussalmans ceased to think for themselves. All serious differences in tradition, history, creed, temperament and secular outlook are lightly brushed aside by preferred appeal to non-existent patriotism in the name of the nation that is yet to be." To him such a concept of nationalism would be "sterile sentiment." For the Muslims this type of nationalism and nationalist arguments were "a snare if not a delusion. Mohammed Ali expected can

appreciation and understanding of "vital differences of feelings, temper, ideals and standards" between the members of the two communities. Where nationalism was not tempered by such understanding, it was no more than communalism. He also realized that it was communalism which was becoming popular and giving rise to the idea of revenge in the minds of young men whose education in Indian history was tainted by political interest and bias.

Mohammed Ali's nationalism was not a 'fanatical and irrational revulsion against everything Western." On the contrary, it was based on the faith that Europe had much to teach" and that India, the East, required to be quickened and enlightened by the rapid diffusion of scientific knowledge. But while he emphasized the need for material progress, he warned the country against gross materialism."

The foregoing discussion suggests that Mohammed Ali's ideas of nationalism and religion are interwoven. His concept of nationalism was so much tainted by Islam that ultimately it was difficult to separate the two. Nevertheless, this agrees at some points with Gandhian nationalism which insists on spiritual foundations and that of Nehru and Mohammed Ali had been internationalists in their own ways. All of them believed that internationalism is possible only when nationalism becomes a fact. They, at the same time, condemned the exclusiveness and narrowness of nationalism. It has, however, been mentioned that Mohammed Ali contributed more to the promotion of the feeling of Pan-Islamism than of national consciousness among the Muslims in Indian. This was perhaps natural in view of the medieval traditions of Islam flourishing in the country where in the Muslims were a minority. I cannot be gainsaid that his passion for Pan-Islamism and that even his concern for Muslims in India was subordinated to his major interest in religion.

Mohammed Ali's nationalism was an extremist type of nationalism. There are many similarities between Hindu and Muslim extremist nationalism, for instance, their violent

anti-British tone and the employment of unconstitutional means. The only and perhaps not so very important difference was that the former was inspired by Islam and Muslim domination in India and the latter by Hinduism. The Hindu as well Muslim extremists clearly constitute a break from the loyalist policy of the moderate Congressites and liberal Muslim Leaguers. The basic differences between the nature and spirit of Islam and Hinduism complicated communal problem in India. The Indian Muslims being part of an international community have had a feeling of loyalty and belongingness to the cause of Muslims all over the world. But there could be no real political and economic unity, even among the Muslims in India. Religion was only a factor of identity among them. But to Mohammed Ali it was more than that. It was a source of inspiration for the struggle against the alien British rulers. Mohammed Ali's protests against imperialism and plead for the national liberation of the Indian people was based on by the feeling that the British were the moral enemies of Islam. It was the aggressive spirit of Pan-Islamism which was inspired by the triumph of the young Turks. The analysis of this trend will show that it was the "latent reactionary resistance" which was stronger than the reform movement in Islam. And thus the orthodox Nationalism of the Hindus as well as of the Muslims becomes" a political outburst of the forces for reaction. Seen from this angle, ideologically Mohammed Ali's Islamic nationalism would appear absurd, but politically it played a positive role in creating a mass basis for Indian politics.

Mohammed Ali's ignored that religion as the basis of nationalism would produce competitive nationalities and communal conflict in the country and would always act as a disruptive and destructive force. True to his genius for inconsistency, he also advocated the ideal of the "united faiths in India". He perhaps did not see that unity of faiths was incompatible with his aggressive and illiberal view of Islam. Mohammed Ali also stood for the establishment of a

democratic federation in the country.

To Mohammed Ali, democracy is a form of Government. Considering its merits and demerits, it was comparatively better than any other form of government. That is why Mohammed Ali insisted that the most important problem of any country is to determine the form of its government. If the basic law, that is the constitution, is sound the country would be free. A sound constitution is one which does not make the people slaves of one another, but vests ultimate power in the people. But at the same time Mohammed Ali emphasises the importance of temperament, habits and attitude of the people towards life as more important than even a well framed constitution. Thus monarchy need not necessarily be bad. Under a capable monarch there would be the assurance of speedy progress; but if the monarchy was debased, rapid degeneration would be certain. In democracy, however, there would be neither rapid decline nor rapid progress. Besides, its great virtue is that it is based on the liberty of all the people, and is completely in keeping with human nature. Mohammed Ali substantiated his point by citing the example of monarchy during the Moghal period. When it began to decline even a strong king like Alamgir could not arrest the process of decay. Mohammed Ali also said that the Qur'an and the Bible do not support monarchy; they advocate theocracy. He considered theocracy as "Republicanism, and republicanism that will not have any king but God." While elaborating theocracy he held that "Islam is a theocracy and in the language of the Qur'an there is no government but God's and Him alone are we commended to serve." On the basis of this concept of theocracy Mohammed Ali built up his theory of Khilafat. In Islam the Khalifa is something more than a Pope and cannot be Vaticanised. "But he is also less than the Pope, for he is not infallible and in all matters in which Muslims...cannot see eye to eye with him the arbiter is Allah Himself and we must refer back to the Qur'an and the traditions of the Prophet. We are not at his mercy

and human conscience is still free. In fact, if he persists in un-Islamic conduct we can depose him,..." This concept of theocracy and of the position of Caliph is Islamic "thought it bears a semblance of democracy." It is, however, important to note that the authority of the Caliph is restricted to the religious sphere only. Secondly, the history of Caliphate shows how autocratic and vindictive a Caliph if he persists in un-Islamic conduct. That involves the question of association of the people with the governing authority. He, unlike certain Muslim leaders, held that the people collectively were capable of taking better decisions than an individual; separately the leaders are required only for quick and decisive action. Mohammed Ali wanted that the authority of the people should be real and, therefore, he actively supported the demand for the introduction of adult franchise in India. According to him it will not only bring about the unity of the people but also produce national consciousness among them. The British Government believed in communal and separate representation. Mohammed Ali at the outset considered it a British ploy but later on he realised that separate electorates would hasten rather than hinder Indian Unity. He believed that the creation of separate electorates helped greatly in curbing inter-communal warfare. Mohammed Ali saw that the existing system of electorate had complicated the question of minority and majority. He always advocated power to the majority and adequate protection to the minority.

Since Islam does not preach a war of armed might (the Holy War is a war of spiritual conversion) the Muslims should not be afraid of the Hindu majority. He emphasized that the obedience to the Government was "conditional" upon the protection of religion and its privilege' "We only claim that religious obligations should be respected, since it is on respect that our loyalty to His Majesty has always without violence; that the use of violence for a nation of 320 millions of people should be a matter of reproach to it; and finally,...that victory achieved with violence must be

not the victory of all sections of the nation but mainly of the fighting classes, which are more sharply divided in India from the rest of the Nation...accompanied by the "minimum sacrifice of the maximum number and not the maximum sacrifice by the minimum number."

Mohammed Ali discussed with references to the Indian situation the conditions for successful working of democracy in various articles which he contributed to the "*Comrade*". He thought that unity more than anything else is supremely desirable in the country. He also hinted at the organized movement towards the growth of better relations between Hindus and Mussalmans. He thought that the active cooperation of the people in public affairs is essential. He said that if there is a genuine feeling of goodwill it would "evoke harmony in political work and create the sense of genuine, generous and self-sacrificing patriotism. It would create "a robust faith in the future of Indian Nationalism as any of the most ardent nationalists can have.

Secondly, Mohammed Ali felt that no country in which minorities are insecure could be considered to be real democratic community is the sentiment of healthy patriotism. The minority should feel that the patriotism of the majority community has ceased to be "communal and exclusive." He suggested mixed leagues and conferences, private personal relations and increasing opportunities for social contacts.

Thirdly, Mohammed Ali held that democracy of self government demands supreme sacrifice from the people of the country. According to him "the pride and egotism of race, the glory of self-assertion, the greed of selfishness and the joy of racial battle, are the fatal obstacles in the path of democratic development.

Fourthly, Mohammed Ali held that democracy required a system of education which has got to adapted to the life and genius of the people. To him the existing system of education was inadequate. He spoke of the immaturity of

the present generation which is a consequence of modern education. He, therefore, suggested that the system of education should reflect the needs of the people and should even be managed University movement as manifesting the protest against the artificial system.

Fifthly, Mohammed Ali had realized the importance of public opinion in the functioning of the government. He said that public opinion in India consisted of "loose, disjointed ideas reflecting themselves in many moods," and did not represent a "full grown National mind, finding a complete and united expression." Mohammed Ali said that for having an intelligent and instructed public opinion, there is need for "a vast process of change, rapid, incessant, and even painful—in fact, in all essentials, a revolution." He said that India "is yet in the stage of political tutelage and has not evolved a self-reliant political personality." Indian society had no "organic mind" and the mass-consciousness was still only a medley of unique impressions. Therefore, he concluded that public opinion had not yet become a reality. Mohammed Ali held that if the basic structure of the political system is democratic, public opinion finds many opportunities for effective operation; otherwise it becomes almost non-existent or irresponsible. He argued that "the political language of the community as a whole becomes intemperate simply through the abnormality of the conditions under which its political thinking is done."

Lastly, Mohammed Ali said that women should be encouraged to participate in public affairs for Islam does not discountenance such participation. That "Ayesha was often consulted particularly in matters of women's affairs and in matters of Law generally" showed that there was no such restriction imposed by Islam. Mohammed Ali held that "the Muslim society in India in the days of decadence had sinned against the light in nothing so much as in condemning womanhood to all but universal ignorance." He advocated that "women should not be "confined within the four walls of the Zenana." Their cooperation is needed in the

settlement of communal and national problems. He, therefore, hoped that the conventional Pardah would not last. There should be as many opportunities for female education as possible.

Mohammed Ali thought that the future of India lay in democracy. He evolved his theory of "cultural federalism", of "federation of faiths" in order to meet the unique situation prevailing in India. The basis of this theory of cultural federalism is the principle of unity in diversity, the religious philosophy of oneness of God, tolerance, brotherhood, fraternity and adequate measures of security to ensure the preservation and growth of the culture of various parts which will comprise the Indian nation. Mohammed Ali has been misunderstood because of his advocacy of rights and safeguards for the Muslims in India. His interest in and approach to communal harmony was not different from that of Gandhi. He endeavoured to satisfy "the pressing needs of the present which may inevitably bring it now and then into conflict with other elements in the body politic. It should never lose sight of the prospects of the future when ultimately all communal interests had to be adjusted in order to harmonies with the paramount interest of India." Besides, people in India are attached to religion but at the same time infinitely split-up into communities and sects. These could not be any mechanical solution to the problem of such a cleavage. And the Indian leaders failed to provide a firm foundation to the unity of the country. Mohammed Ali therefore suggested the working out of a new synthesis in which would be embodied a Federation of Faiths. There will be something like a union of faiths in India where every section for the population would contribute "to territorial patriotism without abating a jot of the fervour of their extra-territorial sympathies." In his speech at the Round Table Conference, he explained the nature of this kind of cultural brotherhood, harmonious but not unified, in the following verse:

"Not like to like, but like in difference;

Self reverent and reverencing each;
Distinct individualities,
But like each other even as those who love."

Mohammed Ali thought that the unity achieved through such a purpose would be a permanent reality. It would be based, as Gandhiji has said, upon "exquisitely delicate regard and toleration of one another's views and habits." Mohammed Ali was no doubt aware that the achievement of such unity would be no easy task. But it should be attempted.

"Is not that possible in Palestine and so called Armenia within the scheme of Ottoman sovereignty?" If this is not adopted then India will remain a geographical misnomer. The only ultimate goal according to him would be a union of faiths in India which would be "grander, nobler and infinitely more spiritual than the United States of America." He hoped that "a concord like that of Canada is not beyond that bounds of practicability. It may not be a love marriage, born of romance and poetry but a marriage of convenience honourably contracted and honourably maintained. For Mohammed Ali democracy was desirable for the achievement of self-realisation and India as a whole has not yet realised herself. That lack of unity in India is mainly because of her conflicting interests, warring creeds and rival communities. Even for that the policy should not be to annihilate "the smaller units that may appear to conflict with the ultimate scheme of unity but by recognizing their force and inevitableness." His was a passionate plea for the ideal of a many sided oneness, healthy nationalism, and democracy. In spite of the fact that Mohammed Ali cherished the religious ideal of Pan-Islamism, he emphasized to the Muslims in India that India was their homeland and that their political loyalties ought to be centered on India and not outside.

It is against this background that the charge of communalism levelled against Mohammed Ali need examination. He was, from the very beginning, conscious

of Gandhi's leadership. He felt that what was wanting in Gandhiji was moral courage and sincerity of conviction. Secondly, Mohammed Ali had begun to develop serious differences with the Congress, of which Gandhiji was the guiding spirit, because of its undemocratic character. "I do not wish to create," said Mohammed Ali, "a home-made incubus of a caste of shopkeepers of our own. To my mind most of the agitation is financed, and partly for selfish reasons, by the Banias of Bombay and Gujarat. He regarded this as suicidal to the interests and the ideals of the Congress. In his letter to the Prime Minister of Great Britain in 1931 he said that it was the caste of Banias which aspired to have the sovereign power and the effective hand in determining the faith of the Hindu nation. If it was only on this ground that he parted from the Congress he cannot be accused of being communal in his outlook and policy.

Mohammed Ali was not a gifted thinker. He had neither the mind nor the time for philosophical exercises. He was a passionate propagandist. His preoccupation with journalism was not conducive to philosophizing about religion and politics. Khaliquzzaman rightly said that Mohammed Ali "was not a man to accept facts as facts. He was a born revolutionary aiming to destroy all that did not conform to his ideal, even though he might not be able to reconstruct what he had destroyed." And as a revolutionary he was an egotist interested in his own self with an effort to identify himself with Islam. Afzal Iqbal says, "He started with the life of the Prophet and ended with his own. He carried in his self "the pathos of a great but fallen race." His passion for Islam was understandable. But he made blunders in applying it to politics. The Khilafat movement was based on the unrealistic assessment of the internal conditions of the Muslim countries. It demanded that the Khilafat of Turkey should be maintained as an effective international religious organisation. The failure of the Khilafat movement did not make him a pessimist. Even after the Khilafat institution was abolished by Mustafa Kamal, he wanted to keep the

Khilafat Committee alive and continue to the Arab world with a view to liberating the liberated.

Mohammed Ali consciously and successfully attempted to explore the possibilities of bringing together the Ulema and the western educated youth. He thought that this would strengthen Islam as well as promote Indian Independence. The Ulema as well as the western educated youth would be benefited by such cooperation. The Ulema would inspire religious spirit among the Muslim youth. The Khilafat movement symbolises the unity of the Ulema and the western educated youth by purposively subscribing to the single object of the solidarity of the Muslims. After the death of Mohammed Ali the gulf between the Ulema and the educated youth widened. The legacy of association of the common people with political movement which Mohammed Ali left behind was utilised and exploited by both. The Ulema and the educated youth began to outbid each other in courting the support of the masses—the only lesson they seem to have learned from the teaching and activity of Mohammed Ali. It is a fact that those who followed the technique and strategy of Mohammed Ali “fought the battle of Pakistan and won it.”■

Views expressed by writers are
their own and not necessarily of
the publisher of the Fragrance of
the East

Editor

Terror and terrorism have no religion: Rabey Nadwi

Mohammad Rabey Nadwi of Nadwatul Ulema has called it a shame for those who involved in the "ghastly act of abhorrent serial blasts in Mumbai on July 11" and stressed that such acts of violence had nothing to do with any particular religion.

He said here on Sunday that the terror and terrorism have no religion.

"Attributing them therefore to any religion whatsoever is not fair and justified. Such acts are actually aimed at disturbing the peaceful life of the people", he stated while expressing pain over the violence.

He further said that these acts should be investigated thoroughly and the culprits brought to book at the earliest.

"While condemning this incident I express my sympathy for those injured and express my deep condolences to the members of the bereaved families of those lost their lives", he added.

"Meanwhile, SSP Lucknow, GK Goswami attended a meeting of the leaders of Shia community at Shia College and expressed his happiness over decreasing number of criminal cases in the state capital.

They discussed in details how to encourage frequent dialogues of the people with the police. The religious leaders who attended the meeting included Maulana Yasuf Abbas, Maulana QT Rizvi, Sayyad Zahid, Dr Shabi Raza, Syed Mohammad Ishaq Rizvi, Syed Qamar Ali Rizvi and others. ■

Indian Express, 17-7-06

THE LAND OF PALESTINE

M.M. Saleh*

Palestine is the name of the area located in the southwestern part of Asia; it is bordered by Lebanon from the north, Syria northeast, Jordan east, the Red Sea south, Sinia in Egypt southwest and from the west by the Mediterranean Sea. This area witnessed the first recorded form of civilization in human history in the city of Jericho that was established ten thousand years ago. Ever since, it was inhabited by the Canaanites and the sea immigrants named Philistines who integrated with them later on. It was thereafter invaded by the Romans, the Jews, the Moguls, and the Christian crusaders.

Since the seventh century, most of its population embraced Islam and joined successive Muslim rule until 1917, the year under the British mandate that undertook to facilitate the realization of the Zionist dream of creating a Jewish home in Palestine.

In 1948, the British mandate ended and the area became subject to a military dispute between the local Arab population and the immigrant Jews. The dispute resulted in the establishment of the Zionist "State of Israel" over 77% of the area and the displacement of 900,000 local Arabs, who are the descendants of the early Canaanites, Philistines and the Arab tribes that settled there after the advent of Islam. This was followed by a war in 1967 that resulted in further "Israeli" occupation of more Palestinian land that was at the time under the rule of neighboring Arab countries. Since then, "Israel" maintained direct military occupation of the whole of Palestine and of some areas of Syria, Lebanon and Egypt. But this occupation faced continuous civil and military resistance that brought the area into focus, and reserved for it a significant place in the news and world media.

This article will try to look through all the aspects of

*Associate Professor (History) Malaysia University

this struggle, and introduce to you Palestine and its people, Zionism and the Zionist state and the roots of this over 80 years old dispute.

Palestine, the name

Palestine acquired its name from the Mediterranean immigrants who came from the southern Greek islands in the 12th century B.C., and were known as the “people of the sea”. In the old Egyptian scripts, they were referred to as the P.L.S.T, the N was added later possibly to pluralize the noun; they are referred to as the Philistines. The land, previously known as the Land of Canan, took the name of the new settlers and came to be known as Palestine. Throughout the centuries of Muslim rule, Palestine had been an integral part of a larger geographical unit, *Bilad Al-Sham* or Greater Syria, as a sub-district or “*Jund*” in the language of that time. The sub-district of Palestine embraced a larger area than the present one. The new boundaries were set during the time of British colonization (1918-1948), and on the bases of the Sykes-Picot agreement between France and Britain that divided the territories of the disintegrated Ottoman State. The final borders with Syria and Lebanon were set following a Franco-British agreement in 1920, while the borders with Trans-Jordan were fixed by the British High Commission in 1922, and those with Egypt were set in 1908 by the Ottomans and the Egyptian Khedive. Since then, Palestine included areas west of the Jordan River, south of the Mount Lebanon.

Geography and Climate

The total area of Palestine is 27,009 km², including 704 km² of water surface that is composed of Al-Hula Lake, Tiberias Lake and half of the Dead Sea. Palestine is generally divided into four geographic zones:

1. **The coastal area:** it is a plain land laying along the Mediterranean from north to south; its highest altitude is 180 meters above sea level. This is one of the most fertile areas of Palestine as it enjoys a Mediterranean

climate with full four seasons. It is ideal for growing fruits and floweres by which it is known until today.

2. **The mountainous area:** it is located to the east of the coastal areas and stands parallel to it; the highest altitude reaches 1208 meters in Mount Al-Jarmaq (Merom) in northern Palestine. This area is generally colder than the coastal one, but it still enjoys a Mediterranean climate. Despite its rough topography, the area is ideal for growing grains, beans, figs, olives and grapes; and is widely used for herding.
3. **Al-Ghour (the Rift Valley):** it is also known as the Jordan Vaalley, as the Jordan River divides it into eastern and western parts, in Jordan and Palestine consecutively. Al-Ghour is a fertile land ideal for growing vegetables, fruits and dates. This valley is the lowest dry point on earth; it reaches 395 meters beneath sea level to the point where the Jordan River influxes into the Dead Sea. The Valley then continues south down to the Red Sea with a total length of 460 km². The Dead Sea is he saltiest sea on earth and does not contain any form of marine life. Al-Ghour is generally hot and relatively dry all year round.
4. **The desert area:** it occupies Southern Palestine, and is known as Al-Naqab (Negev) Desert with Beer Al-Sabe (Beersheba) as its main oasis. Al-Naqab occupies almost half the area of Palestine; it covers the area between Al-Khalil (Hebron) east and Gaza west and extends to the northern coast of the Red Sea. Al-Naqab is hot and dry with some wind-driven sands and few oases.

Palestine is thus unique geographically with four different climates; with the lowest point on earth and mountains of 1200m altitude above sea level, with lakes and seas among which one is known for its highest salt concentration that left it with no marine life. All these features are assembled in a small piece of land that connect Asia

and Africa, and comprises no more than 27,009 km².

Main Cities

Since the establishment of the first city, Jericho in 8000 B.C., Palestine has been a center of civilizations that extended along its geographical zones. Most of the civilizational activities were concentrated in the coast and the mountains, and to a lesser extent in the Jordan Valley, and the least were in the desert that had been inhabited by Bedouins thousands of year ago. The main cities of the coast are Yafa (Jaffa), Akka (Acre), Haifa, Gaza and Isdod, while those of the mountainous area are Al-Quds (Jerusalem), Al-Khalil (Hebron), Ramallah, Nablus, Bethlehem, Nazareth and Safad. The main city of the Jordan Valley is Jericho and that of the desert is Beer Al-Sabe (Beersheba).

PALESTINE IN ISLAM

The Holy Land

Over three billion people around the world, i.e. more than half of the world's population, believe that Palestine, or at least some part of it, is holy; no other land on earth is held holy by such a huge number of people. For all the three Abrahamic religions (Islam, Christianity and Judaism), and to some other sects as well, Palestine is a holy land that houses some of the major holy shrines.

For Jews, Palestine is the land in which Prophet Jacob (Ya'quob) (Peace be upon him), the grandfather of the tribes of Israel, lived with his children; it is the land to which they escaped with Moses (Musa) (Peace be upon him) from the Pharaoh, and in which they lived under the righteous rule of Prophets David (Dawud) (Peace be upon him) and his son Solomon (Sulayman) (Peace be upon him). In this land they established their kingdoms, Israel and Judah, which were later on destroyed by the Assyrians and the Babylonians.

For the Christians, Palestine is the land where Jesus of Nazareth (Isa) was born, around it he preached and conveyed his message to the world, and in it, Christians believe, he died on the cross for the salvation of humankind and was resurrected. Christian shrines narrate this story from the beginning until the end in their names: Church of *Al-Mahd* in Bethlehem, his birthplace "The Church of Nativity", and Church of *Qiyamah* "The Church of the Holy Sepulcher (Resurrection)", referring to Christ's believed resurrection.

For Muslims, as Muslims believe in the Prophets of the Judaic and Christian religions, all the above are among the reasons why Muslims hold Palestine as holy. Yaa'qoub (Jacob), Yusuf (Joseph), Dawud (David), Sulayman (Soloman), Yusha' and 'Isa (Jesus) are all Prophets who led the struggle of good against evil, and Islam is the complete and final form of what they preached. For Muslims, Palestine is the land of Prophets; among the Prophets mentioned in the Qur'an and Sunnah 14 lived, preached, and died there, or passed through it. (Besides those mentioned above are: Ibrahim, Lut, Isma'il, Ishaaq, Shu'ayb, Zakariyya, Yahya, and Muhammad (Peace be upon them all)).

Al-Aqsa Mosque

The first *Qibla* (the direction to which Muslims pray), stands in the heart of this land, in Al-Quds (Jerusalem). It is the third holy shrine of Islam preceded by *Al-Haram* in Mecca and the Prophet's Mosque in Medina (now located in Saudi Arabia). A prayer in Al-Aqsa Mosque is equal to 500 prayers, as the Prophet said. It is the second mosque built on earth after Al-Ka'ba in Mecca.

It is from this land that Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) escalated to the heavens (*Mi'raj*), after he reached there from Mecca on his night journey (*Isra*); since then Muslims have called it: "the gate to the heavens". On this journey, Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) led

the Prophets in a night prayer in Al-Aqsa Mosque. This was an honour given to this land and to Muslims, indicating that from then on the leadership and promotion of faith in the whole world became their responsibility. It was during this journey that the five daily prayers were ordained.

Palestine is also described as holy and blessed in the Qur'an and Sunnah. It is the land of Islam in the time of turbulence, and those who live in it and around it are considered *Mujahideen* (strivers in the Way of God). In some *hadiths*, the victorious and righteous group of Muslims live in Palestine and around it; Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) said: *"There shall be a group of my followers who stick to the right and never go astray irrespective of that they may face"*, the companions asked: "Where are they?" He replied: *"In Bait-ul Maqdis (Jerusalem) and its vicinity."*

Historically, many famous Muslim scholars originated, preached or lived in Palestine for some time; amongst them are names that were influential in forming the Muslim mentality. E.g. in historical sequence, Raja' ibn Hayat Al-Kindi, Roh ibn Zinbaç, Malik ibn Deenar, Imam Al-Awza'i, Sufyan Al-Thawri, Ibn Shiahab Al-Zuhri, Imam Al-Shafi'i, Ibrahim ibn Adham, Al-Laith ibn sa'd, Abu Bakr Al-erjane, Ibn Qudama Al-Maqdisi. Other famous figures in this group were Abdulhameed ibn Yahya (known also as Abdulhamid the Writer because he established the art of formal writing and documentation in Arabic), the chemist Khalid ibn Yazeed Al-Umawee, and the famous military leader and conqueror of Andalusia (Iberian Peninsula) Musa ibn Nusair.

WHOSE LAND IS IT?

A Disputed land

The fame of Palestine comes from the over 80 year dispute between its local Arab population and the immigrant Zionist Jews who strove and later managed to establish their

own political entity, the "State of Israel", expelling and depriving the indigenous population. Zionism in brief is a political ideology that believes in the establishment of a "national" home for the Jewish people in Palestine. It works to achieve its aim through all possible means, with violence on top of the agenda. It validates its belief and actions with certain religious arguments derived mainly from Judaism and historical arguments that are based mainly on the Old Testament. However, this neither implies that all Jews are Zionists nor that all Zionists are Jews. There are some non-Zionists and even anti-Zionist Jews and there are many non-Jewish Zionists, most of whom are Protestant Christians. On the path to achieve their goals, the Zionists fought six wars, killing and displacing Palestinians inside or even outside Palestine, who escaped to safety in Lebanon. However, the Zionist view does not consider those killed and displaced as victims; on the contrary, it maintains that its actions are legal and ethical, defending the "undisputable" right of the Jews in their homeland. Let us, now examine this so called "undisputable right".

Zionist Religious Claims

As the chosen people, God rewarded the Jews with the blessed land, the land of milk and honey, in which they established their great righteous kingdoms from which they were expelled by the Assyrians. It is time now for the Jews to return to this land that was given to them by a divine decree; it is time for them to end miserable, two millenniums Diaspora. This rhetoric validates itself with verses from the Old Testament like:

"...The Lord said to Abraham: Leave your land, your tribe, the house of your father and go to the land I am leading you to... So Abraham went as the Lord appeared before Abraham and said: 'To your progeny I give this land'..." (The Book of Creation, 10/1), and: *"... And (Abraham) lived in the land of Canaan. Then the Lord said to him: 'Raise up your eyes and from the place where you were, look around you to the north, south, east and west,*

because all the land that your eyes can see I give to you and to your progeny for ever'... (The Book of Creation, 13/14).

The Old Testament also includes: "... *The Lord made a covenant with Abraham saying to your progeny I give this land, from the river of Egypt to the great river; the Euphrates...*" (The Book of Creation, 5/15).

However, it should be clear to anyone of intellect that this pledge is valid only to its believers; hence, Jews do not have the right to force the local Muslim and Christian population, who do not share this belief, to surrender to it; had they believed in such claims there would have been no dispute from the beginning. Religious claims then are not able to validate anything as long as they are acceptable to one side only, which is the foreign and immigrant side.

Additionally, the Prophets of the Children of Israel (Such as Moses, Joshua, David, and Solomon (peace be upon him) endeavored to house their followers (i.e. the Jews) in the sacred land. Thereupon, under the pretext of having their Prophetic heritage, the Jews alleged that Palestine is their own.

On the other hand, the great indigenous Muslim majority believes that:

First: Muslims are the legitimate heirs of all Prophets who led the struggle of monotheism on this land, the belief in the prophethood of those Prophets is an indispensable part of the Muslim faith, thus, by this logic, the land is theirs. According to the Qur'an, all Prophets were Muslims in faith, hence, Muslims are their most legitimate heirs because their relationship with the Prophets is one of faith, not of language or race; Prophets belong to those who share them the faith, i.e. the Muslims. Here we quote the Qur'anic verse proving these points,

Ibrahim (Abraham) was neither a Jew nor a Christian, but he was a true Muslim Hanifa (Islamic

Monotheism - to worship none but Allah Alone) and he was not of Al-Mushrikun. Verily, among mankind who have the best claim to Ibrahim (Abraham) are those who followed him, and this Prophet (Muhammad) and those who have believed (Muslims). And Allah is the Wali (Protector and Helper) of the believers.

(Al 'Imran 67-68)

They believe that the existing Torah of the Jews of today, is a distorted one that was rewritten by the Jewish rabbis to suit their goals and needs, therefore it is viewed very skeptically.

Second: Muslims, however, believe that this was once given to the followers of Moses. This belief comes from what Qur'an told:

(Moses said): O my people! Enter the Holy Land which God hath assigned unto you, and turn not back ignominiously, for then will ye be overthrown, to your own ruin. They said: O Moses! In this land are a people of exceeding strength: Never shall we enter it until they leave it: if (once) they leave, then shall we enter. They said: O Moses! While they remain there, never shall we be able to enter, to the end of time. Go thou and thy Lord, and fight ye two, while we sit here (and watch)"... "Moses said: O my Lord! I have power only over myself and my brother; so separate us from his rebellious people! Allah said: 'Therefore will the land be out of their reach for forty years: In a distraction will they wander through the land: But sorrow thou not over these Rebellious people

(Al-Ma'idah: 21-26)

God assigned the land to Jews on condition that they constitute a leading monotheistic paradigm based on the revealed teachings, but they did exactly the contrary, and

the agreement therefore is null and void. Since this condition was not fulfilled, God sent His Messengers to other people so that they promote the faith to humanity in a better way than the children of Israel did. And from that time, the right to the holy land went to those who lead this mission of creating the leading example based on the divine revealed teachings, i.e. the Muslims. Indeed, Jews themselves had admitted that they no longer deserved the land because of their deviation and sins, this was said by their Prophet Armiah to Nebuchadnezzar and the Chaldeans. He said, *"Alas, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a brood of evildoers, children who are corruptors! They have forsaken the LORD, they have provoked to anger, The Holy One of Israel, They have turned away backward"*. (The Book of Isaiah, 1.4) In other parts, Scriptures adds, *"The earth is also defiled under its inhabitants, because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant."* (The Book of Isaiah, 24:4-5.)

Third: Even if we endorse the belief of the Jews that the land was given to Ibrahim and his children, then the Arabs have a right to the land as well because Isma'il "Ishmael", the second son of Abraham, is one of their great grandfathers. Thus, according to the same logic, they have equal right to that of the Jews.

Fourth: For Muslims, the Qura'n has explained clearly the meaning of choosing the progeny of Ibrahim for leadership:

... God said: I will make thee an Imam to the Nations. Ibrahim pleaded: And also (Imams) from my offspring! He answered: But My Promise is not within the reach of evil doers [tyrants]

(Al-Baqarah: 124)

The condition for this leadership is not to do evil things, but, on the contrary, the Zionist Jews are using it as an

excuse to kill, displace, torture and oppress, as if God chose them to freely commit evil.

Zionist Historical Claims

Based on the stories narrated in the Torah, the Zionist Jews claim that they are the indigenous people of Palestine and that this land belongs only to them; everybody who entered this land came after them and is considered a colonizer of the land of Israel; he deserves then to be expelled for taking a land that is not his. Many historical studies were directed to support this contention; but they are far from being academic and are value driven as they disregard a huge amount of historical evidence that will be discussed here.

First: Bearing in mind that Prophet Musa (Moses) came in the 13th century B.C. it is easy to refute these claims. Indeed, the great history of Palestine starts far before this age. Traces found in Palestine show that it was inhabited since the early Stone Age (50 000-14,000 B.C.) and continued to be inhabited in the middle Stone Age (14,000-8,000 B.C.) when the first known civilization in human history, the Natufian Civilization, started. Natufians took their name from the caves in the area north of present day Al-Quds (Jerusalem); in 8000 B.C. they established Jericho, which was the first form of human settlement, i.e. the first city in history. The recorded history of Palestine started with the migration of Semitic groups from the Arabian Peninsula. These groups included the Amorites, the Canaanites; and the Jebusites and the Phoenicians, who were all sub-groups of the Canaanites.

The Canaanites, and to a lesser degree the Jebusites, settled in large numbers in the Mountains of Palestine; the Phoenicians settled in Northern Palestine and Lebanon; and the Amorites settled in Jordan. The Canaanites and consequently the land was named after them (The Land of Canaan), a name used even in the Torah. The Canaanites built more than 200 cities and villages; including Shechem

(known now as Nablus), Akka (Acre), Haifa, Asdud, Beer Al-Sabe (Beersheba) and Beit Lahm (Bethlehem). Excavations in the sites of the ancient Syrian civilization of Ugarit, which was affected to a large extent by the Canaanites, discovered a huge amount of cuneiform inscriptions that revealed a lot about the Canaanite religion and mythology. They were stunningly similar to the mythology of the Torah, leading to the conclusion that the Jewish rabbis depended much on the Canaanite literature in writing the Torah, but attributed it to themselves or even to God. Indeed, the Temple of Solomon, mentioned in the Torah, is very much similar to the House of Bacal (built by the Canaanites in the same city in 2600 B.C.); Bacal was the Canaanite god of fertility.

Second: Prophet Ibrahim (Abraham) came to this land around the year 1900 B.C.; in narrating this story the Torah called the area "The Land of Canaan", admitting the existence of a civilization on this land prior even to the coming of Prophet Ibrahim, the great grandfather of Arabs and Jews. His grandson, Ya'qoob (Jacob or Israel), from whom Jews descended, migrated with his children from the Land of Canaan to Egypt, where they stayed until 1250 B.C. in which Moses took them to the Holy Land.

Third: The History of the Jews in Palestine started during this period, between 1250-1000 B.C., but they managed only to settle in few areas, around Al-Quds and in the north. From that time, the reign of Prophets Dawud (David) and Sulayman (Solomon) started, marking the real beginning of Jewish reign over Palestine. The reign of the two Prophets lasted only for 80 years (1004-923 B.C.).

Fourth: Following the death of Sulayman (Solomon), the 12 Jewish tribes engaged in a dispute over who will take the throne:

The Kingdom of Israel (923-721 B.C.): 10 of the Jewish tribes did not support Rehoboam, the son of Sulaiman, and preferred to have Yeroboam from the tribe

of Ephraim as their king. They established the Kingdom of Israel, with Shechem, Terza and finally Samaria as its capital, which had, however, progressively disintegrated by a wave of incursions and invasions, until it finally collapsed at the hands of the Assyrians under Sarjon II. The latter expelled the Jews of these ten tribes and took them to the areas of Iraq, Kurdistan and Persia where they integrated with the local people and remained there.

The Kingdom of Judah: (923-586 B.C.): the remaining two tribes supported Rehoboam and established the Kingdom of Judah, with Jerusalem as its capital. It lasted longer than its counterpart, but was weak and subjected to strong foreign influence. The rulers of Assyria and Egypt invaded Jerusalem frequently, but the kingdom continued until the time of Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, who destroyed it and enslaved 40,000 Jews, while the remaining Jewish population escaped to Egypt.

Bearing the above in mind, it is that the Jewish reign in Palestine continued for four centuries if we include that longest interval, during which they never managed to control the whole area of Palestine, with continuous declination and increasing foreign influence until they eventually vanished. Even during the times of their greatest kings, Prophets Dawud (David) and Sulayman (Solomon), the Jews did not have full control over the whole area of Palestine, the southwestern coastal areas almost from Yafa (Jaffa) to Rafah.

Fifth: Palestine was then incorporated into the Persian Empire (539-332 B.C.). Cyrus II, the Persian Emperor, allowed the Jews to leave Babylon to Palestine. Few of them left and settled in Jerusalem, where they were allowed to establish their autonomy over a radius of 20 km² around the city (around 2.8% only of the area of contemporary Palestine). The rest remained in their new home, Babylon, and seemed to have settled there permanently.

In 332 B.C, Alexander the Macedonian conquered

Palestine which was subjected to Hellenistic rule. Despite continuous wars over the area between the generals of Alexander, the Jewish autonomy remained untouched in the early Hellenistic rule under the Ptolemies, the rulers of Egypt, who managed to control the area from 332 B.C. until 198 B.C. However, things changed when the Seleucids, the rulers of Syria, defeated the Ptolemies and captured the areas they controlled in Syria and Palestine in 213 B.C. By 198 B.C. the Seleucids forced the Jews to abide to Greek traditions and faith, but they later revolted and once more gained a kind of autonomy over Jerusalem that fluctuated between strength and weakness according to the hegemony of the surrounding powers.

Subsequently, the Romans controlled the area in 63 B.C. They kept the Jewish autonomy over Jerusalem intact until 6 A.D., when they assumed direct control over it. The Jews revolted between 66-70 A.D., but the Romans brutally suppressed this revolution and destroyed Jerusalem and its new temple built by Herod. The Jews revolted again and for the last time in 132-135 A.D., the Romans responded more aggressively aiming to end any possible future instability to be brought by the Jews. They destroyed the city that they replaced by a new one built over the area and called it Aelia Capitolina. They placed the statue of Jupiter, the Roman God, over the ruins of the Temple of Herod. By this time, the effective Jewish presence in Palestine came to an end.

Sixth: From that time, 135 A.D. and until the beginning of the twentieth century, the Jews did not have any form of physical ties with Palestine or Jerusalem. However, they claim that their spiritual ties with Jerusalem have always been maintained, and that they would have gone there, had the political conditions allowed them to do so. However, this claim seems to be untrue and exaggerated, especially when we bear the following facts:

When the Persian Emperor Cyrus II allowed the Jews

back from babylon, only a minority returned, while the rest continued to stay in their places of deportation. Historians note also that the number of Jews who stayed in Jerusalem before its destruction in the first century was less than one third of the total population of Jews at that time, (though their autonomy reached the form of a small independent kingdom between 141-27 B.C.). Even today, 60% of the world's Jews live outside the Zionist state, and refuse to migrate to "the homeland", especially those who enjoy prosperous economic condition in U.S. and Western Europe.

Seventh: Indeed, going back to Palestine was religiously prohibited until beginning of the twentieth century and the emergence of Zionism. Jews believed that God had deprived them of living in Palestine because of their evil deeds, and they can only go back when the Messiah, their savior, comes and guides them to good again. Any Jew who called for going back to Palestine to establish a Jewish community there was considered a heterodox.

Eighth: In 395 A.D., the Roman Empire was divided into two parts; Eastern Byzantine with Constantinople as its capital, and Western Rome with Rome as its capital. Palestine remained under continuous Byzantine rule except for a few years when Persia captured the area (610-624 A.D.) The Byzantines maintained indirect rule through their agents in the area, the Arab Ghassani tribes, who migrated from Yemen and embraced Christianity in the fourth century. No massive migration took place from Europe, as the Romans wanted this area to be their frontline during wars and a source of wealth, thus the local demography remained almost the same.

Ninth: Muslims, under the leadership of the Caliph Umar, opened the area in the year 636 A.D./15 H. Umar had personally taken the keys of Jerusalem from its Patriarch and undertook to grant the people freedom of religion, and the right to keep their churches in the famous Covenant of Umar (*Al-Uhda Al-Umariyyah*). The city

witnessed no bloodshed this time. Since then, most of the population, who descended from the Canaanites and Philistines, embraced Islam. During the Umayyad Caliphate, the Dome of the Rock, one of the finest pieces of architecture on earth, was built on the rock from which Prophet Muhammad (peace been upon him) started his journey to heaven (*Mi'raj*). The local population integrated with the immigrants who came from the Arabian Peninsula, and adopted their Arabic language.

Tenth: The continuous Muslim rule interrupted by the Crusaders managed to occupy Al-Quds (Jerusalem) in 1099 A.D.; they inflicted the city with the worst bloodshed that had ever witnessed. They established "the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem" that continued for 88 years until it was crushed by the sword of Salahuddin Al-Ayyubi (Sladin). After the battle of Hittin in July 1187, Salahuddin marched to Al-Quds (Jerusalem) and returned it to the Muslim on 2 October 1187 A.D.

For 1200 years, Palestine was inhabited and ruled by Muslims. For the first time since the time of the early Canaanites, this land was ruled and inhabited by one and the same people. The Muslim era was the longest in the history of Palestine and was only interrupted by the brutal Crusades. Until 1918, followers of the three faiths, Islam, Christianity and Judaism, experienced peace and harmony in Palestine for most of this era, thanks to the accommodating Muslim rule.

Eleventh: Even if we assume that Palestine belonged to the Jews as a race, there is no evidence that today's Jews are the direct descendants of the ancient Jews. On the contrary, historical evidence suggests that they are not. Most of the Jews living in today's world are descendents of the Khazar Jews, a Tartars-Turkish tribe that lived in the Caucasus around the area of the Caspian Sea. Its king, Bulan, became a Jew, probably for strategic reasons, in 740 A.D., and the whole tribe adopted Judaism. Their kingdom was destroyed by a Russo-Byzantine alliance, and

the Khazar Jews, known as the Ashakenazim, come from this origin. Consequently, if the Jews of our days ask to live in the land of their ancestors, it is to southern Russia where they should go, not Palestine.

Twelfth: The modern rule of the Zionists has been based on violence and tyranny; it displaced others and deprived them of their basic rights. Even if the land belonged historically to the Jews, it is by no mean acceptable that they deprive any other from their right, especially since those people are not responsible for the miserable Jewish plight.

Conclusion: In the long and rich Palestinian history, the Jewish history measures like an hour to a week. The Jewish tribes were nothing more than invaders who tried to establish their rule over a nation that is rich materially and culturally. They ended up destroying the land and claiming its culture to be theirs. Commenting on the Jewish history in Palestine after the destruction of their two kingdoms, the famous historian G.H. Wales records in his concise history that "The life of the Hebrews in Palestine was like the life of a man who insists to live in the middle of a busy road so he is always struck by vehicles".

The Canaanites and Philistines, who accepted Christianity during the Byzantine era, and subsequently Islam, are the same people who continued to inhabit the are until 1948, and for the last 4500 years. Thus, they are the legitimate autochthons of this land. Any forceful occupation of their land and denial of their rights should not be legitimized under any conditions whatsoever because it is the basic right of a nation to determine its fate. Due to Zionist terrorism, and until 2002, there were 408 million Palestinians living as refugees around the world and 1.6 million in refugee camps in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, most of whom are direct descendents of the Canaanites and the Philistines who had once given this land its fame as the land of milk and honey. ■

The Academy of Journalism and Publicity has decided to make this quarterly journal monthly. So from January 2007 we propose to take it out every month.

Contributors are requested to send their articles in a concise form. Articles accepted for publication will earn suitable remuneration.

Readers in general are also requested to help us in making this journal more popular and ensure that its subscribers family is appreciably increased. ■

Editor

ISLAM GRANTS EQUAL RIGHT TO BOTH MEN AND WOMEN

Anis Ahamd Nadwi*

Islam is a complete religion, a permanent civilization which provides guidance for all human beings in every aspect of life, irrespective of their races, caste, creed, colour and position. To blame that Islam is only for Muslims is baseless allegation which had been propagated against it to malign its clean image. No doubt Islam is for whole universe, for entire mankind and for all races and places of the world. It is a universal religion.

A cursory glance at women's status in pre-Islamic history, civilizations and religions, will tell you clearly that the women were the most oppressed and suppressed class of society. They were denied of all rights, deprived of ancestral properties, were bought and sold like goods, were treated like slaves, were burnt alive with the dead bodies they were the most harassed tortured and deprived lot. There was no hope of any betterment in their position.

People of those civilizations considered the existence of women itself, ominous. Their mentality and psychology had been portrayed by the Holy Qur'an. *"When if one of them receiveth tidings of the birth of a female, his face remaineth darkened and he is worth inwardly. He hides himself from the folk because of the evil of that where of he hath had tidings, (asking himself): Shall he keep it in contempt, or bury it beneath the dust. Verily evil is their judgement".* 58, 59 Nahl.

Islam came with its message of peace, brotherhood, justice, equality, amity, co-existence and offered the world a very grand culture and civilization. Islam granted equal rights to all men and women without any discrimination between the two genders. The Holy Qur'an says, *"whosoever doth right, whether male or female, and is a*

*Faculty member, Nadwa, Lucknow

believer, him verily, we shall quicknen with good life, and we shall pay them a recompense in proportion to the best of what they used to do". 97 Nahal. Prophet Mohammad (MPBBUH) says, "you are from Adam and Adam was created from clay". Equal religious rights and status were provided to men and women without any discrimination unlike other religions.

The noble status which had been granted to women by Islam and role it played in building world's societal life is very great and marvellous, literate people know them very well. It offered such doctrines and tenets that when they were practised, the exemplary society came into existence. When the teachings of different religions and system of the world are compared with that of Islamic teachings and the role which the latter played in the restoration of women's status in society, one thing becomes clear that it had treated every human being especially women with respect and regard.

Islam has played very important characteristic, distinctive and decisive role in the restoration of women's respect and regard in society as well as in emancipating them from oppressions. It provided them equal rights in society making them secure from oppressive rules and traditions of religion, provided them security from men's selfishness, arrogance and apathy. If you think over those marvellous achievements of Islam certainly you will love it much more. The great scholars admire the respectful status which had been bestowed on the woman folk by Islam.

The rights which have been granted to women in Islam are many but we mention here a few of them: rights of ownership and heirship of properties. Rights of purchase and sell. Rights of estrangement from her husband (If it may be necessary). Rights of cancelling the engagement (If she is not agreed with her would be groom). Right of taking part in both Eid prayers, Jumah as well as daily congregational prayers.

Family is the first unit of society comprising both life partners that are husband and wife in which it is necessary to accept one of them superior to the other. Men, on account of their accountability, earning power, physical structure are superior to women. That's why they had been made sustainer and responsible authority of the family. To run the home, to earn livelihood, to fulfil all the needs of wife and children are their utmost and foremost duties. Allah says in the Holy Qur'an, *"Men are in charge of women because Allah hath made the one of them to excel the other and because they spend of their property"* (For the support of women) (Al Nisa 34)

While women due to their body compulsions, capability to bear child, and to breed them as well as on account of frailty of their mind and body, have been made subordinate to men and had been ordered to stay at home looking after the responsibilities of their husband, children, and home.

If they succeed in bringing up a generation into good, pious, virtuous and responsible citizens then they in fact performed their duties very well. ■

Please ensure regular payment of your subscription. This will help us to serve you in a better way.

Please also help us in increasing the number of subscribers

The holy Qur'an states: "O Allah! Grant that our spouses and offspring be the coolness of our eyes and cause us to be a model for the righteous.

Prophet said: "Every child born on Fitrah (a natural inclination towards Islam). It is his parents who turn him towards Judaism, Christianity or fire worship" (Mishkat)

SPIRITUAL WISDOM IS NECESSARY

Obaidur Rahman Nadwi*

Spiritual wisdom has a status and grandeur in our society. It enables mankind to achieve at least a fraction of the synthesis of East and West. It fosters in man aesthetics, affabilities, sublime attributes including the moral values and norms.

It is needless to say that spiritual wisdom may save the nation from the impending catastrophe and to steer to towards a value based healthy society. The Sufi poet Jalaluddin Rumi says, "He who is far away from his origin, seeks again to be with it." God is pure, you should also remain pure: God does not harass anyone, you should also refrain from injuring anyone, etc., etc.

It should be kept in mind that our body develops by continuous circulation of blood, so does remembrance of God contributes to the development of soul. The Holy Qur'an says "Verily in the remembrance of Allah do hearts find rest." (13-28). It is obvious that if a mirror is dirty, it cannot reflect a true image, so how can the mirror of the heart which is enshrouded by the darkness of sins i.e, violation of spiritual laws, and is hidden by a cloud of worldly desires and mundane indulgence, reflect the reality to Divine attributes?

Jesus Christ probably refers to this stage in the spiritual evolution when he says, "The vision of God is for the pure in heart."

Mystics recommend four practices – eat less, sleep less, speak less and frequent people less. "Less does not mean complete abnegation. Which is some times even impossible (such as in eating and sleeping), and always undesirable, there must always be a moderation. One should eat to live, and not live to eat. To eat for the purpose to having the energy to accomplish the will and the

*Lecturer, Nadwa, Lucknow - 226007

commandments of God, is an act of devotion, and to diminishing the spiritual productivity is sin. Sleep is necessary for health, and is a duty imposed on man, but not laziness, which affects our spiritual progress and mental advancement.

Swami Vivekanand says: "Bhakti is intense love to God. When a man gets it, he loves all, hates none, he becomes satisfied forever. This love cannot be reduced to any worldly benefit, because so long so worldly desire last that kind of love does not come." He further says, "One great advantage of Bhakti is that it is the easiest and the most natural way to reach the great divine and in view its great disadvantage is that in its lower forms it drew in Hinduism, or Muh-madanism, or Christianity have always been almost exclusively recruited from these worshippers on the lower planes of Bhakti."

By spiritualizing the temporal duties, Islam has no other motive but strenghtning the spiritual side of man, who, in this manner far from seeking the material advantage, aspires pleasure of God.

The great mystic Al-Ghazali did not exaggerate when he said, "If somebody worship or fasts for ostentation, it is *shirk* (polythism), a worship to one's self, not of God Almighty, on the contrary if one even cohabits with one's own wife not for casual desire, but for performing the duty imposed by God that is an act of piety and devotion meriting the pleasure of and reward from God." Now, we should think rationally and ask ourselves whether we should lead carefree life or a sorrowful one. ■

ISLAMIC LECTURE

M.M. Picthal*

Culture means cultivation and, as the word is generally used now-a-days when used alone, especially the cultivation of the human mind. Islamic culture differs from other cultures in that it can never be the aim and object of the cultivated individual, since its aim, clearly stated and set before every one, is not the cultivation of the individual or group of individuals, but of the entire human race. No amount of works of art, or works of literature, in any land can be regarded as the justification of Islam so long as wrong, injustice and intolerance remain. No victories of war or peace, however brilliant, can be quoted as the harvest of Islam. Islam has wider objects, grander views. It aims at nothing less than universal human brotherhood. Still, as a religion, it does encourage human effort after self and race-improvement more than any other religion and since it became a Power in the world, it has produced cultural results which will bear comparison with the results achieved by all the other religions, civilizations and philosophies put together. A Muslim can only be astonished at the importance, almost amounting to worship, ascribed to works of art and literature—which one may call the incidental phenomena of culture—in the West; as if they were the justification, and their production the highest aim, of human life. Not that Muslims despise or ever should despise, literary, artistic and scientific achievements; but that they regard them in the light of blessings by the way; either as aids to the end or refreshment for the wayfarer. They do not idolise the aid and the refreshment.

The whole of Islam's great work in science, art and literature is included under these two heads—aid and refreshment. Some of it, such as the finest poetry and architecture, falls under both. All of it recognises one leader, follows one guidance, look towards one Goal. The leader is

*The great British Muslim convert and orientalist, writer of the Glorious Qur'an

the Prophet (Peace be upon him), the guidance is the Holy Qur'an, and the Goal is Allah.

By Islamic culture, I mean not the culture, from whatever source derived, attained at any given moment by people who profess the religion of Islam, but the kind of culture prescribed by a religion of which human progress is the definite and avowed aim.

No one who has ever studied the Qur'an will deny that it promises success *in this world* and hereafter to men who act upon its guidance and obey its laws; that it aims at nothing less than the success of mankind as a whole; and that this success is to be attained by cultivation of man's gifts and faculty.

If any development in Muslim society is not sanctioned by the Qur'an or some express injunction of the Prophet, it is un-Islamic and its origin must be sought outside the Islamic polity. The Muslims cannot expect success from their adoption of it, though it need not necessarily militate against success. If any development is contrary to an express injunction of the Qur'an, and against the teaching and example of the Prophet (Peace be upon him), then it is anti-Islamic; it must militate against success, and Muslims simply court disaster by adopting it.

Certain art-forms were discouraged by Islam at the beginning, because of their association with the idolatrous worship of the pagan Arabs and its vicious orgies, the utter extirpation of which was necessary for the progress of the race; but the discouragement of certain art expressions and encouragement of others were both, like the works of art produced, regarded as subsidiary. The culture of Islam aimed not at beautifying and refining the accessories of human life. There is to-day a large and undoubtedly intellectual school of thought in the West which seems to hold that the production of fine works of art by a small minority of a community is sufficient reason for acclaiming the civilization and culture of that community, even though

the huge majority of they live to lead ugly and degraded lives—nay, there is an intellectual school of thought which seems to hold that the production of fine works of art by minority of any nation is sufficient justification for condemning the majority to conditions of perpetual ugliness, servitude and degradation.

Some of you will, no doubt, remember a discussion in the English Press some years ago. The question was this: Suppose a famous and very beautiful Greek statue, unique of its kind and therefor irreplaceable, is in the same room with a living baby, and the room catches fire; it is only possible to save one or the other: which should be saved? Very many correspondents, men of intellect and good position—I remember—held that the statue should be saved and the child left to perish; their argument being that millions of babies are born every day, whereas that masterpiece of old Greek art could never be replaced. That is a view no Muslim could have taken—the very latest, cultivated form of idol-worship.

Islam forcess, and works for, a radiant future for the human race; and though every Muslim holds his own life cheap in the service of Allah, which is the service of humanity, he would never dream of sacrificing any human life, however insignificant seeming, to the workj of human hands. The adoration—it amounts to that—of works of art is due to disbelief in Allah's guidance and His purpose for mankind. These things are the best that man has produced in the centuries; beauty is decreasing, human beings are deteriorating—so runs the argument—therefore, we must cling to these beautiful productiona of the past as the one ideal left to us. That is pessimism, and Islam is optimistic—optimistic not with the "optimism" satirised by Voltaire in the character of Dr. Pangloss, the absurd philosopher, who kept exclaiming "Tout est pour le mieux dans le meilleur des mondes possibles." (Allah is for the best in this of possible worlds.) That is the kind of remark which passes with the unthinking for optimism, but it is really fata ism—which is a

form of pessimism; and Islam is not fatalistic. Yes, I repeat that statement. In spite of all that has been said and written of the fatalism of the Muslims Islam is not fatalistic in the generally accepted meaning of the word. It does not bid man accept the existing condition as a necessary evil, but commands him never to cease striving for improvement.

Islam is a religion which specifically aims at human progress, and shows the proper way of it in a number of commands and prohibitions covering every avocation of man's daily life, his social life and politics as well as every prompting of his mind and spirit. These commands and prohibitions have been codified into a complete social and political system. It is a practicable system, for it has been practised with a success which is the great astonishment of history. Many writers have tried to explain away the amazing success of Islam by ascribing it to outside causes—weakness of the surrounding nations, free use of the sword, the credulity of the times, and so forth. Both how would they explain away the fact that so long as the Muslims implicitly obeyed a particular injunction of the Sacred Law they succeeded in the sphere of that injunction, and whenever they neglected to obey it failed; and how would they explain the fact that any non-Muslims, doing what the Muslims are enjoined to do, have always succeeded in that special direction, except by the supposition that the injunctions of the Qur'an and the Holy Prophet (Peace be upon him) are laws for all mankind—natural laws which men transgress at their peril, or rather at the peril of the race? It was because those laws could not be found out by individual experiment, and could only partly be detected in the long run of history by a student and a thinker here and there, that they required to be revealed by a Prophet (Peace be upon him). Otherwise they are as natural as the physical laws which govern our existence evidently and which none would dream of disputing.

Other religions promise success in another life to those who qualify themselves for it by privation and austerity on

earth. Islam promises success and fruition in this life—just as much as in the other—to all men, if they will but obey certain laws and plain rules of conduct. The division between this world and the other vanishes for the true Muslims, since Allah is the Lord of the Heavens and the Earth, the Sovereign of this world just as much as of the others. The other life has its beginning now, and not at death, for all who perform the act of Al-Islam—that Self-Surrender to the Will of God which the Holy Prophet meant when he advised us:

“Die before you die.”

The success in this world promised by Islam is not the success of one human being at the expense of others, nor of one nation to the detriment and despair of others, but the success of mankind as a whole. Five times a day, from every mosque in the world, the call goes forth. “Come to falah! Come to falah!” The Arabic word “falah” means success through cultivation. And there is another Arabic word, in common use among Muslims, of which the original meaning is often forgotten in its technical application: “Zakat” meaning, “cultivation by pruning,” “causing to grow straight.” It is the name given to the Islamic poor-tax, so frequently enjoined in the Qur’an as a duty equal to worship, which truly was a cause of cultivated growth to the community.

“A tax shall be taken from the rich and given to the poor,” said the Prophet (may God bless and keep him). When that tax was regularly collected the condition of Muslim society became such that, though the dispensers of “Zakat” sought far and wide, no proper objects of “Zakat” that is, destitute and ignorant Muslims—could be found and the money was expended upon works of public benefit.

In the Holy Qur’an we read:

“He is indeed successful who causeth it (the human soul) to grow aright,

And he is indeed a failure who stunteth and starveth it”.

And again

"He is successful who groweth

And remembereth the name of his Lord, so prayeth."

Some may think that these are mere religious aspirations and expressions apart from life. Islam is nothing if not practical, and the expressions have been no dead letter in Islam, since they were translated practically into a system of organised relief and charity upon the granddest scale ever attempted, and solved all social problems in the Muslim world for centuries. The Qur'an informs us that true religion is practical, not *theoretical* or formal.

"It is not righteousness that ye turn your face to the East and the West, but righteous is he who believeth in Allah and the last Day and the Angles and the Scripture and the Prophets (may god bless and keep him), and giveth his wealth for love of Him to kindred and to orphans and to the needy and the homeless and to beggars and to set slaves free; and those who are regular in prayer and pay the poor their legal portion. And those who keep their promise when they make one, and the peresevering in adversity and tribulation. These are they who are sincere. These are they who keep from evil."

"Those who believe and do good."

How often does that phrase occur in the Holy Qur'an. "Those who believe and do nothing" cannot exist in Islam. "Those who believe and do wrong" are inconceivable, for Islam means man's surrender to God's will, and so obedience to His Law which is a law of effort not of idleness.

There was no distinction between secular education and religious education in the great days of Islam. All education was brought into the religious sphere. To quote a recent European writer: "It was the glory of Islam that it gave to other sciences the same footing which it gave to the study of the Qur'an and the Hadith and Fiqh (that is, Muslim Jurisprudence), a place in the Mosque." Lectures on

chemistry and physics, botany, medicine and astronomy were given in the mosque equally with lectures on the above-named subjects; for the Mosque was the University of Islam in the great days, and it deserved the name of University, since it welcomed to its precincts all the knowledge of the age from every quarter. It was this unit and exaltation of all learning which gave to the old Muslim writers that peculiar quality which every reader of them must have noticed, the calm serenity of orbéd minds.

In Islam, there are no such terms as secular and religious, for true religion includes the whole sphere of man's activities. The distinction drawn in the Holy Qur'an is between good, that which is helpful to man's growth, and evil, that which is detrimental and noxious to it. Islam is a rational religion. It has no place for the man who can say, with St. Augustine: "*Credo quia absurdum est*"—"I believe *because* it is incredible." Again and again does the Qur'an denounce irrational religion as religion evidently false. Again and again does it appeal to men to use their reason and especially their common sense in matters of religion. All historical experience goes to prove that a large measure of free thought is absolutely necessary to human progress, and at the same time their nations which lose faith in God deteriorate. Are the two things, the living faith in God and the large measure of free thought, incompatible?

A considerable school of thought in the West seems to think that they are incompatible. Islam has proved that they are perfectly compatible. In the early, the successful centuries of Islam, and intense faith in God was combined with free thought upon every earthly subject; for Islam held nothing upon earth so sacred as to be immune from criticism. There was only One Supernatural, only One Incomprehensible, Whose Unity, having been once accepted, admitted of no further discussion. He was One for all, Beneficent and Merciful towards all alike, and He had bestowed on man the gift of reason, which is extolled by Muslim writers as the highest gift, to be used quite freely

in the name of Allah—that is to say, with the purpose of pursuing what is good and eschewing what is evil, for which the Sacred Law affords guidance and safeguards. There is no priesthood in Islam. All the prerogatives and responsibilities which in other religions have been arrogated to a priesthood, in the system of Islam are vested in the individual human mind. So the most wise and learned men became the natural leaders.

Since an unenlightened mind would be a sorry lamp to light the steps of any man or woman, this exaltation of reason carried with it the command for universal education. The Prophet (may god bless and keep him) himself said:

“To seek knowledge is a duty for every Muslim (male) and every Muslimah (female).” Universal education both of men and women thus became the Sacred Law of Islam thirteen centuries before it was adopted by the civiliazation of the West. He also is reported to have said (though the saying is not well authenticated): “Seek knowledge though it be in China”; and the following well authenticated saying shows the importance not only of acquiring knowledge but of spreading knowledge among the people:

“Verily Allah doth not keep knowledge as a thing apart that he withholdeth from. His servants, but he doth keep it in the grasp of men of knowledge, so that if he shall cause not a man of knowledge to remain, mankind will take foolish heads, and they well be questioned and give fatwas, and they will err and lead others into error.” The picture is too clearly of the present condition of Islam, when we have plenty of narrow theologians, for us to doubt but that the meaning of the word knowledge as here used is something wider and more human than the knowledge they possess.

He said: “The ink of the scholar is more holy than the blood of the martyr.” He said: “An hour’s contemplation and study of God’s creation is better than a year of adoration.”

He said: “He dieth not who seeketh knowledge.” “Whosoever revereth the learned, revereth me.” “The first

thing created was reason." "Allah hath not created anything better than reason. The benefits which Allah giveth are on account of it, and understanding is by it; and Allah's displeasure is caused by it, and by it are rewards a punishments." He said: "To listen to the words of the learned and to instil into others the lessons of science is better than religious exercises."

"He who leaveth his home in search of knowledge, walketh in the path of Allah."

Acquire knowledge. It enableth the possessor to distinguish right from wrong; it lighteth up the path to Heaven. It is our friend in the desert, our society in solitude, our companion when friendless. It guideth to happiness, it sustaineth in adversity. It is an ornament among friends, and an armour against enemies."

"Lo! the angels offer their wings to the seeker of knowledge."

"Are those who have knowledge on an equality with those who have no knowledge?"

"The preferment of the learned man above the devotee is as my preferment above the lowest of you."

He said that a man may have performed prayers, fasting, alms-giving, pilgrimage and all other religious duties, but he will be regarded only in proportion to the common sense which he employed. And he said that he who has learning but knows not how to apply it to the conduct of life is "like a donkey carrying books."

Neither the Holy Qur'an nor the Holy Prophet (may god bless and keep him) ever contemplated the existence of an ignorant Muslim. Indeed, "ignorant Muslim" is a contradiction in terms. In the great days of Islam, an ignorant Muslim, like an indigent Muslim, could hardly have been found.

Islam brought religion back into its proper sphere of action, which is daily life. The light of Allah, spoken of in the

Qur'an, is known to everyone who follows Allah's guidance, for it is the light of every day transfigured and glorified by the knowledge of His immanence. The aim of religion is no far distant object, situated in a future life; it is present here and now, in service of our fellow-men. The idolators of Arabia kept asking the Holy Prophet (may god bless and keep him) for some miracle that might enforce the truth of what he said:

"And they say: What manner of a messenger of God is this who eats food and walks in the bazaars? Why is not an angel sent down to be a warner with him?

"Or (why is not) a treasure bestowed on him? (Or why) hath he not a paradise from which to eat? The evil-doers say: Ye are but following a man bewitched."

And Allah answered the evil-doers in words which plainly show that miracles are not a proof of the divine messenger, who must appeal to men's reason, not their senses of their curiosity.

"We sent not before thee any messengers but such as verily and eat food and walk in the bazaars."

That is to say, all those Prophets of old whom the people thought as super-natural beings had been men appealing to the minds of others in God's name.

Miracles, according to the teaching of Islam, are not the proof of divinity, much less do they violate the laws of nature which are themselves divine, being ordained of God. They are evidences of a certain stage of human progress towards the Goal, at which laws hidden from the multitude become apparent. Many miracles are related of Muhammad (God bless him!) but no Muslim would think of quoting them as a proof of his divine mission. The message and the work achieved—the Qur'an and the Holy Prophet's (may god bless and keep him) preaching, and their consequences—speak for themselves, and are above all miracles.

It is, of course, a fact that the majority of professed

Muslims are ignorant and superstitious to-day, accepting a vast mass of legends and absurd beliefs: but where man's mind is so exalted in the standing orders of the community, vain beliefs are always threatened with the sword of scepticism. Indeed a large proportion of this mass of legend and superstition merely represents the science of a by-gone day. The spirit of Islam expects it to be superseded by the science of to-day; for the Muslim's mind is free in all affairs of earth, provided that he complies with certain rules of conduct imposed with a view to his bodily, mental and spiritual health; and it is his duty to explore the science of his day, and to accept what his mind approves of it—aye, even thought it dissipates beliefs or fancies long accepted among Muslims. It cannot touch his creed: "There is no God except Allah, and Muhammad (may god bless and keep him) is the Messenger of Allah"—a creed which that grand old sceptic, Gibbon, pronounced to be "composed of an eternal truth and a necessary fiction." Even he had to confess that the "fiction" had been justified in the historic sequel.

There is a great and growing tendency in the Muslim brotherhood to distinguish once for all between the living body of Islamic teaching and the folklore which has been thrown about it like a garment of an antique fashion. How little the discrimination of the robe affects the faith will astonish only those critics, who, misled by the practice of Christianity, have *identified* the latter with the former; which Muslims never did.

In the Qur'an, men are bidden to observe the phenomena of nature, the alternation of day and night, the properties of earth and air and fire and water, the mysteries of birth and death, growth and decay—evidences of a law and order which man never made and which man can never is not the sovereign of this world; his province of free-will, research and fruitful effort is but a delegated power within an absolute sovereignty; which absolute sovereignty belongs to Allah, the Creator and Sustaner of the Universe,

the Lord of all the World. Man does not, as a rule, realise the marvels of his natural condition and of the providence surrounding him, because they never fail him. Surrounded by a wonder of creative energy which never fails; placed in a universe subject to a code of laws which are never broken; manifestly subject, being unable to inhale a breath, or lift a finger, or speak a word or think a thought without obeying laws he never made; man in general thinks but little of such matters, absorbed in the interests of his own restricted sphere of energy, like any insect. Idolising his own restricted sphere, he looks for a providence which will back him in his special aims, oblivious of the needs of the whole creation and of the purpose of the Creator.

Obviously, if we admit that there is a Creator and a purpose, we must not expect special treatment, but must seek to conform to the divine will and purpose in creation; then only can we hope for success.

“Nay, verily man is rebellious

“That he deemeth himself independent

“Verily unto thy Lord is the return.”

Some years ago there appeared a book written by a Scottish divine—not a very interesting book—which made a little stir in the English-speaking world. It was called “The Natural Law in the Spiritual World.” I only mention it on account of the title, because the revelation of Islam might be more aptly described as: “The Natural Law in the Spiritual world and in the Social world and in the Political world.” It is to the Islam appeals for proof of Allah’s actual Kingship, and then goes on to show how laws precisely similar govern man’s spiritual and collective life. All the miracles related of all the Prophets and saints are held so unimportant that belief in them is not obligatory. All that is obligatory is belief in Allah’s universal sovereignty and in the mission of Muhammad (may God bless and keep him!) and all other Prophets as His human messengers. It was this natural and reasonable basis of Islam which made the

greatest of German poets, Goethe, exclaim, after reading a translation of the Qur'an: If this is Islam, then every thinking man among us is, in fact, a Muslim.

A section—the most vocal section—of the modern world would make objection to Islamic Culture on the ground that it is unsuitable to modern thought and conditions, being founded on the principle, not of democracy or aristocracy or plutocracy—or any other of the systems which have been tried in modern times, and, one may add, have, every one of them, been found wanting—but is founded on the principle of pure theocracy. Not a remote ideal of theocracy, to be contemplated only at hours of worship and forgotten at all other hours; but an actual, practical, complete theocracy acknowledged and obeyed at all times. A great European statesman is credited with having said: "The Almighty has no part in practical politics," and the chief defect in European politics is, evidently to those who study recent history, that it makes no allowance for the unforeseen event, the Act of God, upsetting careful plans. Allah's law of consequences still operates; the consequence of good is still good, and the consequence of evil, in the long run, however much men shut their eyes to the fact. The Russian Revolution and the failure of the Greek attempt upon the life of Turkey are two out of many instances, in our own time, of the unforeseen event, the act of God, frustrating projects of ambition, well-laid plans of statesmen, which seemed humanly speaking to be certain of success.

Indeed, to me, it seems that, as regards the Kingdom of Allah as preached and, to some extent, established by Islam, the position of the modern world is not at all different from that of the mediaeval world. The objectors simply argue on a false analogy. Because the ideal of theocracy which prevailed in Europe in the Middle Ages happened to be associated with miraculous legends and Church ceremonies and regarded as a refuge from a wicked world, these people postulate that all theocracy must be unpractical a hermit's or fanatic's dream. Miracles have been discredited by

modern science, and men have come to think of the exploitation of the riches of this world and of the improvement of their own position of their condition, than of improving the condition of their fellowmen. Thus an ideal of theocracy based on the miraculous, and so remote from actual human needs; which was in its very nature pessimistic, regarding this world as the devil's province and bidding all who sought solvating flee from it, may truly be regarded as antiquated and unsuitable to modern circumstances. Not so an ideal of theocracy based upon the natural and the actual. Such an ideal is the crying need of modern life to check its suicidal selfishness—an ideal of which the foundations cannot be shaken by the discoveries of science or the thought of man, for they are in nature itself. The greater the wonders of the natural world as revealed by the progressive work of science, the more triumphantly is Allah's Majesty and Providence and Soverignty made clear to the true Muslim. So long as the natural laws stand firm, and certain consequences, good or evil, follow certain acts of men and nations, so long must stand the need for man to recognise in human life a higher will and purpose than his own, and to expect a higher judgment than his own; so long must stand the need of man's surrender to that higher will and purpose—which is Islam, as the Qur'an teaches—if he would succeed.

Islam offers a complete political and social system as an alternative to socialism, fascism, syndactylisms, bolshevism and all the other 'isms' offered as alternative, to a system which is manifestly threatened with extinction. The system of Islam has the great advantage over all those nostrums, that it has been practised with success—the greater the success the more complete the practice. Every Muslim believes that it must eventually be adopted in its essentials by all nations whether as Muslims or non-Muslims in the technical sense, because its laws are the natural (or divine) laws which govern human progress, and men without the revelation of them, must find their way to them course of time and painfully, after trying every other way and

meeting failure. The system of Islam promises peace and stability where now we see the strife of classes and of nations, and nothing steadfast. It would surely be mere folly on the part of any one to refuse even to study the advantages or disadvantages of such a system merely because it is a system founded on the thought of God, and claiming to have been revealed by a Messenger of God. That would be sheer bigotry of atheism.

But it is not only because it is theocratic that the Islamic system of human culture is despised. It is because of the position and conduct of the Muslims in the world to-day and yesterday and for many yesterdays Christendom in the Middle Ages could not consider it because Christendom was then in bondage to the priests who then, as to-day, called Muhammad (may God bless and keep him!) "the false Prophet", and would not allow anyone even to think that his religion might hold anything good and useful to man-kind: and the tradition of war between the followers of the two religions has been a mighty barrier until the present time, perpetuating intolerance. To-day, when the barrier is practically down, the position of the Muslims in the world is not such as to lead outsiders to suppose that such men know the secret of the way of human progress. The conduct and condition of the Muslims now is a very bad advertisement for the teaching of Islam. It is not astonishing if people, seeing it, should turn away and think Islam to a blame for their abasement. The point is, that Islam is not to blame for this, any more than ecclesiastical Christianity is to be praised for the present material progress of Christendom. Christianity had a priesthood and no freedom of thought. The centuries in which the Christian Church was supreme are now referred to as the dark ages. Islam had no priesthood, it had freedom of thought, and the ages when Islam prevailed in all its purity were ages of a singularly clear and brilliant light. It is their falling away from pure Islam which has brought ruin to the Muslims, their acceptance of something indistinguishable from a priesthood—or, in the

words of the Qur'an, their "taking others quibbles, their neglect of the advice to seek knowledge everywhere as a religious duty, their denial of free thought and their distrust of reason. At a certain period of their history, they began to turn their backs upon a part of what had been enjoined to them, they discarded half the Shari'ah—part which ordered them to seek knowledge and education, and to study God's creation. And the Christians of the West about the same time, began to act according to that portion of the Shari'ah which the Muslims were discarding, and so advanced inspite of all the anathemas of their priesthood. The reason why it was ordained that there should be no priesthood in Islam is because ecclesiasticism is an enemy to human progress, and, therefore, opposed to true religion, of which the aim is shown in the Qur'an to be the progress and the liberation of humanity, not its stagnation and enslavement. Muslims all over the world are now awake to this; they know that their humiliation is their own handiwork, and they see that they can only regain a noble status in the world by a return to Islam.

You may think that in this lecture I have wandered off from my appointed subject, which is culture, into the religious field. Islamic culture is so intricately bound up with religion, so imbued with the idea of Allah's universal sovereignty that I could not treat the subject properly without first giving you the indications I have given in this first address. In its grandeur and in its decadence, Islamic culture—whether we survey it in the field of science, or of art, or of literature, or of social welfare—has everywhere and always this religious inference, this all-pervading ideal of universal and complete theocracy. In all its various productions—some of them far from being what is usually called religious—this is evident. It is this which makes Islamic nationalism one with internationalism. For acceptance of the fact of Allah's universal sovereignty entails acceptance of the complementary fact of universal human brotherhood. ■