

THE ABOLITION OF PERSONAL OWNERSHIP OF PROPERTY

by
Shaikh Mushir Hussain Kidwai

The question of the abolition of personal ownership of any property is not only the most contentious of Bolshevist reforms but also considered to be the most novel and revolutionary, so much so that all the Muslim writers, though sympathetic otherwise towards Bolshevism, consider the abolition of private ownership to be un-Islamic. Even learned Muslim theologians have done so.

The abolition of private property is not quite new. It is a historic fact, that centuries upon centuries ago a king named Muzdak in Iran abolished all personal property. Because Muzdak was before the time when the Emancipator of women was born, woman was also considered to be the private property of man—if unmarried, that of her father or guardian, when married, that of her husband.

Fortunately this kind of degradation of women and exaggeration of the abolition of private property was never repeated. But efforts were made from time to time to bring into practice the extreme form of Socialism in the colony of “New Harmony” and other places by persons who were called “faddists.”

Never before, however, was it given a trial so forcefully and extensively as it is being experimented in Russia since 1917.

As a matter of principle, Islam, over thirteen centuries ago, anticipated this advanced social revolution also. It abolished personal ownership of property in theory as well as in practice. But it did this in its own way. The sanction behind all its reforms and revolutions was moral not physical—not of the Red Army, nor of Cheka, nor of O.G.P.U.

In his *Roads to Freedom* Mr. Bertrand Russell has said : “The ultimate goal of any reformer who aims at liberty can only be reached through persuasion.” Bolsheviki are finding how difficult this reform can be even by the use of force.

Every man has a natural love for property. The very idea that such and such thing is one's own, gives special satisfaction to the heart. Bolshevists can become callous to this human instinct. They can use force. Muhammad was a Prophet. He was a Moral Teacher. He could not be callous or violent. For this reason his effort was to get rid of the evil and the wrong and the totally selfish use of property even if under certain circumstances it could not be abolished altogether. But he basically aimed at the total abolition. In theory the very root of all personal ownership was cut by vesting the ownership of everything, big or small, in Allah.

The Qur-án repeatedly says :—

“To Him belongs all what is in heaven and all what is in the earth.” (II : 255). So all what a man possessed or could possess was owned by Allah.

“Owned by Allah” in the vocabulary or ideology of Islam means “owned collectively by the whole of mankind.”

With this definite investment of all possible property in Allah it seems strange that even those learned writers have expressed their approval of Bolshevism—have said that in the matter of property Bolshevism is as disagreeable to Islam as to other religions and systems.

In the early days of Islam also Abuzar Ghaffari was almost alone in his views in respect of *Kanz* (wealth and property). And this in spite of the fact that even one who knows the ABC of Islam knows that it has laid down as its fundamental law that everything belongs to God; that He indeed is the real owner of each and everything in this Universe. Those Muslims who are very orthodox will not waste even water in their ablutions because they believe that they will have to give an account of that extravagance on the “Day of Judgment” as the water they use is not theirs. It was only in trust with them for its proper uses. One’s house or land or clothes are not really his or hers. They are God’s. The person possessing is only holding it in trust from God. He must not spend it wrongly. If he does he will be held responsible by One Who sees everything, Who knows everything. Man will have to give an account of everything in his charge for the time being. Everybody knows how very great is the responsibility of a trustee in making use of any trust property. The same care should be taken in using anything in possession of anybody. The best use of everything given in trust is to use it for the person giving it in trust. That is, every property possessed by any person for the time being, should be spent, as far as possible, in “the way of Allah”, *i.e.*, for the good of humanity—for the public good. Thus Islam has gone ahead of even Bolshevism in abolishing personal ownership

or in making all people share in the property. And how beautifully this has been done! Private property is a trust and can only be used for the good of the people, in social service.

Well has the Sovereign of Hyderabad said that all he possesses is trust for others except his Faith.

The rule has been laid down :

“ O you who believe, do not devour your property among you falsely.” (The Holy Quran 4 : 29.).

The most difficult task before the Prophet was to take out from the minds of his nation the natural love for property so that every person may really be able of his own free will to use the property which he possessed as if it were a trust property from God Himself given in his custody. So Muslims were warned :

“ Wealth and children are an adornment of the life of this world, and ever-abiding works are better with the Lord in reward and better in expectations ” (*Ibid* 18 : 36).

And they were frankly told :

“ The love and desire of wives and sons and hoarded treasures of gold and silver, and well-bred horses and cattle and tilth is made to seem fair to men, this is the provision of this world, and God is He with Whom is the good goal of life.” (*Ibid.* 62 : 9.)

And again :

“ If your father and your sons, and your brothers, and mates, and your kinsfolk, and the trade, the dullness of

which you fear, and the dwellings which please you, are dearer to you than Allah and His Apostle and fighting in His way, then wait till Allah brings out His Command, and God does not guide the transgressing people” (*Ibid.* 9 : 24.).

The result of such peaceful preaching and persuasion was the same which Bolshevism has achieved in Russia only after the use of much force and after having caused much unhappiness and misery.

Among the early Muslims all property and wealth lost its charm—their attachment to private property was gone. Wealth gave neither power nor prestige nor even much comfort, as all lived a simple strenuous life. In the Prophet’s own lifetime there was a group of Muslims in Madina which was absolutely propertyless. The members of the group, called *As-hab Suffa*, used to be engaged in teaching or in some other work. They were the highly honoured guests of other Muslims turn by turn who fed them and sheltered them as they had really nothing of their own. Yet the richest and proudest men in the land respected and honoured each one of them.

In Muslim Society wealth, even nowadays, does not count very much. Professor Vambéry told me himself that for years and years he had lived in Muslim lands without a penny in his pocket yet he was honoured and respected and his wants were supplied to him as if he was the richest man in the country.

Among Muslims the possession or hoarding of wealth and property gave no advantage, no honour, no position, no privilege. On the contrary they were told :

“Those who spend their property, night and day, secretly and openly, they shall have their reward from their Lord, and they shall have no fear, nor shall they grieve.” (The Holy Qur-an 2 : 174).

All those who possessed any property were commanded :

“And give away your property for the love of Him (*i.e.*, for the public good without any selfish ends) to the near of kin and the orphan, and the needy, and the wayfarer, and those who have to ask for it, and for the emancipation of captives.” (*Ibid.* 2 : 179.)

Such teachings of the Prophet were not in vain. They went to the heart of his disciples who tried to live by his injunctions and advices and to follow them both in letter and spirit.

His disciple, cousin and son-in-law—Ali, gave away all his property for the benefit of the public, and few others, half of all they possessed, including one shoe of the pair.

Few indeed were men in those days who would not feel ashamed if they possessed much wealth while their fellow citizens needed it for their necessities of life. Wealth and property increased responsibility and burden.

The Qur-án vehemently denounced those “who amass wealth and then lock it up.” (20 : 18.). It blessed “those of whose property a due portion is for him who asketh, for him who is propertyless (*mahrum*)”. (70 : 24 and 25.)

The Prophet saw to it always that he himself and all his nearest and dearest relatives were the first to act up to what

he preached. Whatever orders he had to promulgate he informed his family members first.

He himself used to give away in the evening anything he possessed in the day to the extent that there was hardly anything left even for the evening meal.

In Islam there was no question of “Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s and unto God the things that are God’s.” Nothing belonged to Cæsar. All, all, all belonged to God.

The most remarkable point in this connection is that Islam did not only theoretically abolish private and personal ownership but did also put almost exactly the same limit to private property which the Bolshevists have put now and which has raised such a hue and cry in all European countries.

Over thirteen centuries ago the unique Reformer laid it down that :

“The son of man has no right than that he should have a house wherein he may live, and a piece of cloth whereby he may hide his nakedness, and a chip of bread and some water.” (Through Osman in *Tirmizi*).

The rule laid down by the Prophet regarding the distribution of property is as follows :

“He who has with him an excess of carrying animals let him give it to him who has none, and he who has an excess of provision, let him give to him who has not.” “The Prophet made mention of several other things so that we (who wer present) realized that none of us had a right to

anything we had in excess.” (Through Abu-Sa‘id in Muslim and Abu Dáwúd.) What was meant by “excess” has been made clear by the Saying quoted before which limits private or personal property to a house to live in, some clothes to wear, and something for daily meals. Thus was ownership of property abolished not only in theory but also in practice. In Islam a lesser scope for individual property was put than what the Bolshevists have. Even the Bolsheviki could not refuse that much to individuals.

Besides limiting the possession of property, Islam has by its miraculously just and judicious laws of inheritance not only made large dukedoms or a line of multi-millionaires impossible, but it has also made a very sound distribution of property among the people of the same family. Another quite novel law of inheritance which is peculiar to Islam is *Waqf alal awlad*. By this means a check can be put on inheritance even by one’s children. The children may thus be deprived of the full ownership of the property left for public good or charity by their parents, though enough may be left to them so that they may not find themselves in trouble or in destitution. They can hold it only as trustees for the public benefit and must not waste it in personal luxuries if it is given to them under *Waqf alal awlad*.

Thus check upon check has been devised upon the absolute ownership of any property under Islam.

The question was raised when Abuzar Gaffari interpreted certain Quránic verses as indicating the abolition of private wealth and property, and it is being raised by the Muslim Theologians to-day also, that if Islam meant the abolition of

property, why then did it lay down the laws of inheritance and Zakat—and other anti-Capitalist regulations and rules?

The question is not difficult to answer for those who know the mind and the methods of the unique Reformer.

His object was to remove all the religious, moral and social evils for all times, and for every place, for every society in whatever stage of development it might be. He was sent as Rahmat-ul-lilalamin (The Mercy for the Worlds). He meant to be so in actual practice. His desire was to take all the possible good out which was put by Nature in every individual to be used for the benefit of Society at large.

We know that Nature in her scheme of this world when she evolved man put the love for bodily comfort—wealth, property and procreation in him. Thus a comfortable life with wealth and property became a great incentive for men to work and labour. Nature has also designed the procreation of mankind by putting in both men and women a love for their offsprings. Even among animals we see kindness shown to young ones not only by their parents but even by strangers. In this respect also, however, man's sentiments and emotions are distinct from those of other creatures. With other animals, love and affection for even their own young ones ceases to exist when they grow up, in fact they forget the very existence of their young ones and cannot recognise them after a certain period, man cherishes an affection for his progeny all his life—nay, he desires to make all possible arrangement for their comfort, even when he is not there to see it—when he is dead and gone.

No, while Bolshevists want to outrage human instincts

and natural emotions and do not mind if they kill those incentives for voluntary work by force and violence and substitute in the place of those natural incentives the dread of Society and State, of Cheka and O.G.P.U., the Great Humanitarian Prophet adopted such methods as would not violently kill those natural incentives on the one hand and would protect Society and State from the evils of those instincts on the other.

We must not forget that Islam does not believe that man is evilly inclined by nature and is born in sin. The Evolver, the Creator is free from all evil. Nor did He create evil in mankind. It is man who makes evil for himself by making a wrong use of his power, his qualities and his instincts. Because God chose to give free will to man to a certain extent, He did not impose upon him His own will that he should always walk straight. That means that the Evolver did not deprive man of his capacity to misuse the good gifts of God to him.

The Qur-an says :—“Of Allah it is to point out the (right) way, but some turn aside (of their free will) from it. Had He imposed His own will He would have surely led you all aright.” (16 : 9).

And again :

“To every one of you has God given a law and an open way—and if He had pleased (not to give a free will) He would have surely made you one people. But (He designed) that He might try you in what He has given you respectively. Strive then to excel each other in good work., to God is your return altogether, then will He inform you of that concerning which ye disagree.” (5 : 48).

Thus free will (of course with limitations and with responsibility) has been given to man to engage in competition with his fellow-men in doing good to others and in social services.

Man has not been made an automaton.

Even the Prophet was repeatedly warned that he was not "made a keeper" over anybody. He was to use no compulsion. He was only to preach in a gentle, persuasive manner. Man has been asked to use his intelligence. The Qur-an says :

"He has enjoined you with that you may use your intelligence" (6 : 162.)

For his actions he must not seek refuge under the wings of anybody—not even of his parents—and surely not of Rousseau or Lenin.

The Qur-an says :

"And when it is said to them follow what God has revealed, they say: Nay, we follow what we found our ancestors following. What! and though their forefathers had no sense at all, nor did they follow the right way." (2 : 170.)

Man has got many passions and emotions in him. If used properly they are for the good, otherwise they injure Society or sometimes the individual himself. Sometimes even his reason misleads him.

Man wants to fulfil his desires. If he loves wealth he will use all his mental powers and all his physical strength to work for that. He will use all his brains to excel others

in any profession he takes up. He will be ready to undergo sacrifices, to take risks. Suppose circumstances do not disfavour him and he succeeds in his work and in his profession. Suppose he becomes an expert in his profession—a producer of wealth by his brains. He asks for due remuneration for his expert advice. He wants to live a happy and comfortable life. Islam will allow him to do that provided he does not do any harm to Society. The idea of the Bolsheviks is that they would not allow him to do that though at present they do allow some extra wages to foreign experts. But when they stop this, they will not only harm the individual, they will also harm the Society by leaving no incentive for a man to become an expert.

Suppose a man loves wealth. He uses his brains for that. He writes a “best-seller” which is useful to Society. Islam will not rebuke him for getting a good price for his book. But Islam will expect from the author that he will not make a wrong use of the money he has earned by his brains and his pen. Islam will tell him that the real owner of the wealth is God; that the author is only a trustee. Every second of his life adverse circumstances might have intervened which might have made it impossible for him to have succeeded in finishing the work. They did not. Therefore he should be thankful for the protection given to him and in thanksgiving he should give away his wealth to the deserving. He will have to pay Zakat also and will not be allowed to become a Capitalist by anti-capitalist Islamic Laws. He can say to every individual and even to the whole Society that his production is his own. He cannot say this to God Who controls all the circumstances and Who has given him brains.

Or suppose to a man the natural love of his family and children is the incentive for giving his best to the profession or work before him. Islam will not stop the incentive. It has laid down judicious Laws of inheritance which will allow the man's family and children to profit by the earnings he would leave for them to save them from want or penury and to carry on his name after him.

The best effort of the miraculous and God-inspired Prophet has been to put only as much check on the liberty of a person as was absolutely necessary for the good of Society and his own person and to give all inducement to a person for doing his best. For this reason he has not been rigid in his laws. He avoided the necessity of using force as far as possible. He tried to make everybody do good works voluntarily by the force of habit or by natural impulse. This is why he has not stopped natural incentives for good work. This is why inheritance in a well-regulated form has been allowed. Nor has it been urged to forcibly sequester every property left by any person. The Prophet has contented himself by laying down such rules and laws that the wealth or property which anybody has honestly and legitimately collected or left will ultimately be to the advantage of Society. By the *Waqf alal-aulad* even his children can be stopped from misspending a man's hard-earned money which he would leave behind. They can be bound down to spend it not according to their personal whims, nor for personal luxury, but for the public good, while at the same time due provision could be made for the continuance of the family name and reputation. The main object, however, has been to lay such laws as would be anti-capitalist, would distribute wealth, would offer equal

opportunities to all and would help in forming a classless Society and one Brotherhood all over the world. This main object has not been lost sight of even when individual liberty and discretion have been respected.

Everybody knows that all the world is not even to-day governed under Bolshevist principles. Except in Russia nowhere else in the world is private ownership of property abolished. But Islam is for all lands, and for men in all stages of development and progress. If there were no laws of inheritance or for the distribution of property laid down, Islam would have failed in showing the people the right course under such government as had not compulsorily or violently abolished, for one reason or other, even if they were Muslim States, personal or private ownership of all property.

But if all the laws of Islam are obeyed in the letter and spirit the evils of possessing property will be removed. In fact if a man treats his wealth as if it was a trust from God, the possession of private property with full powers to spend it in the way of Allah, will prove a blessing to Society instead of being an evil. If a man really uses any property or wealth as he should use a trust given to him by an All-seeing, All-beneficent God, then it would prove more good for Society that he had used his hands and brains or both to possess wealth and property than if he had remained a pauper or had collected only enough to support himself.

Thus all the evil in the personal ownership of property has been removed and under true Islamic laws it would not make much difference to Society whether private ownership was completely abolished in practice or man was allowed to

possess property and even leave it to his children under the most just, judicious and equitable laws of Islam (far more just, judicious, and equitable than the Swiss Laws or any other laws).

Here we may say in passing that all sensible jurists have admitted the excellence of the Islamic personal laws. So it is not the fault of those laws if they are not properly understood and therefore not properly appreciated by a few persons.

The only point of preference which a representative of Turkey in another country could point out to the author for the Swiss Law was that it had no law of *mahjubul-irs* and that personally he would have suffered if Muslim Law had not been replaced by Swiss Law in Turkey !

We advised our friend to study the latest interpretations of the law of *mahjubul-irs*, and his complaint would disappear. Islam is self-sufficient.

In fact, all statesmen should study the Muslim Laws, particularly of inheritance, very carefully and take the advice of great jurists. One of the greatest modern jurists India produced, Justice Syed Mahmud, said that the best proof that the Quranic Laws were from God was the Islamic Law of Inheritance. Even non-Muslim eminent lawyers like McNaughton write as to their naturalness and excellence thus :—

“ In these provisions we find ample attention paid to the interest of all those whom nature places in the first rank of our affections ; and it is difficult to conceive any system containing rules more strictly just and equitable.”
After such impartial statements what justification can there

be for introducing Swiss or any other law anywhere in place of the Islamic Law ?

Those statesmen who fail to appreciate such “ natural, just and equitable ” laws only demonstrate their own lack of wisdom or their senseless spite and prejudice. The “ just and equitable ” natural Islamic Laws of inheritance were promulgated to meet the demands of Nature although as a principle all private and personal ownership had been abolished.

The Bolshevists know that the greatest charge against Bolshevism is that it allows no liberty to man. It really establishes a dictatorship—it may be the dictatorship of the proletarian class, *i.e.*, a beneficent dictatorship—but sometimes even despotism is beneficent. It has been said that Bolshevism really makes a man a slave—it may be the slave of Society. On every occasion under Bolshevism a man has to obey harsh commands of others—do this and not that. This commanding and domineering Society resolves itself into a few officials or Commissars. For all practical purposes it becomes an oligarchy—even a personal rule of an individual—the Dictator.

Islam avoids all this. For Muslims there is no dictatorship of any man or group of men or class of men. No Muslim is a slave of another man, or group of men or class of men. There is only one Dictator—but he is not a man—He is not Anthropomorphic—“ Vision comprehends Him not.” Man, even the most powerful man, even the greatest Prophet, is a slave, but only of Him Who has “ Nothing as His likeness ”—Who is an Infinite and an Eternal Being, “ without form or place, without issue or

similitude, present to our secret thoughts, existing by the necessity of His own Nature and deriving from Himself all moral and intellectual powers." (Gibbon and Ghazzali.)

In Islam God alone is qualified to command man—He alone is superior to man, لا غالب الا الله He alone is infallible. The majority of men are not always in the right. Sometimes it happens that only one man is in the right. Such occasions arose even in the life of Lenin. So why should a man take commands from others which may, after all, be in the wrong? Why should he not prefer to take commands from Him Who is never in the wrong? Is there any man who would not bow to Allah rather than to a fellow-being or group of fellow-beings or the majority of the fellow-beings or even all the fellow-beings, when there can be no absolute certainty that they are not all in the wrong? Is there any man who would not like to retain his freedom of conscience, thought and action rather than become a slave at the command of others?

Some elasticity was left as regards personal ownership to leave man his liberty and discretion and also his natural incentives for work as far as it was desirable or natural.

We would draw the attention of those who say that if Islam had meant the abolition of private ownership it would not have laid down laws of inheritance in the Qur-án itself, to the fact that one of the names of God is Al-Wáris (The Inheritor) and the Qur-án declares : أنت خير الوارثين

"Thou art the best of Inheritors." And it asks : "And what reason have you that you should not spend in Allah's way? And Allah's is the inheritance of heaven and earth." (57 : 10.)

Thus the Law of Inheritance should not be taken to be in the way of the abolition of personal and private ownership of property. It would be best to leave the Law of Inheritance alone and for every true Muslim to leave his property to the Khairul-Warisin, "the Best of Inheritors."

The Bolsheviks have now behaved more ruthlessly against all property owners, even against Koolaks. This probably Lenin would not have done. Trotsky quotes Lenin thus :

"We must not ignore the resolution of the lower rank of the people, even though we are not in agreement with them We must give full freedom to the creative capacity of the popular masses. The essence of the thing is that the peasantry should have full confidence that there are no more landlords in the country, and let the peasants themselves decide all questions and build their own life."

Here Lenin not only gives freedom to the peasants "to build their own lives" but also admits that there can be "ranks." Trotsky after quoting the above paragraph has put in a query—"Opportunism" ? and has himself answered it :

"No, it was revolutionary realism."

The Bolsheviks will do well to keep "realism" or naturalism in view in all matters—in the question of personal property as in others.

Alas ! there is no Lenin now to guide the Bolsheviks.

However, it is a mistake to think that the Bolsheviks have abolished all personal or private property. Even

when Lenin was alive, the New Economic Policy (N.E.P.) was adopted and it was a concession to private property. The N.E.P. gave freedom to the farmer to sell the remainder of his harvest to whomsoever he liked after having paid, in kind, a fixed graduated tax to the State. Later on, the State permitted private trade, as also the establishment of private industries and private ownership of houses. Thus private property and even Capitalism were recognised to a certain extent.

By private property Bolsheviks mean primarily "the means of production." The Communist manifesto says: "Communism deprives no man of the power to appropriate the product of Society," meaning that certain forms of private property may legitimately be acquired, clothes, a home, a garden, a litter farm, but only for personal use—not for trade, not for profit.

Bolshevism is the enemy of the middle class property owner.

Says the Communist manifesto: "The middle class owner of property must indeed be swept out of the way."

We know that even all inheritance has not been stopped in Russia. Limitations have been fixed, as they were under Islamic law, though on a different scale and in a different way. In Russia, and in several other European countries also, State comes in with "Death Duty" or "Inheritance Tax" on the death of a person.

Briefly, the position of a Muslim in respect of property stands thus:

If he is a true Muslim and wants to follow the ideal set

by Islam in spirit and letter and the example of the Prophet and other saintly Muslims, he will possess, not even as a trustee, much personal property.

The limit put upon a person's property by the Prophet is given in the Hadith quoted earlier in this chapter, *i.e.*, a house to live in, some clothes to wear, and sufficient quantity of food and water. This is the limit to which Private Property is allowed—no more.

But if a person's natural love of wealth and property gets the better of him, Islam will not take him to task for it, provided he does not go against the spirit of Islam, and uses his wealth and property not for his own comfort and contentment alone but also for the benefit of Society.

The State will charge Zakat from him and other taxes. He will be expected to spend his wealth and property for certain given social services.

If a person acts up to the injunctions of the Qur-án he will not have much to leave as an inheritance, but if he has, then the law of inheritance will come into operation and will have the property distributed very judiciously to make large dukedoms, usurious capitalists and multi-millionaires impossible. If the man was very charitable and philanthropic he would have left property by *Waqf* to be spent on some charitable work. If he would have rather liked to continue his own family's connection with that *Waqf* he would have left it as *Waqf alal Aulad*.

Thus without any forceful enc^o & chment upon personal liberty and without depriving men ^{h₁} the^r natural urge the same object has been gained by Islam regarding the

distribution of wealth and the socialisation of property which the Bolshevists have in view.

It must not be forgotten by the Bolshevik that up to the present moment State ownership of wealth, property or of industries has not given much advantage to Russia. The criterion laid down by Trotsky is :

“Victory belongs to that system which provides Society with the highest economic plan.”

But Mr. Hindus asks :—

“What Russia has to match such giants of economic power and efficiency as the Krupp, the Ford Motor Company, etc ? ”

He further says :—

“At present the Russians themselves admit that on the economic side their collectivism can boast of no success which private enterprise is achieving, neither in the province of production nor distribution. . . . In America private enterprise has scored its richest triumphs.”

However, for the present, the experiment in Russia is being carried on. It has been truly said that the industrial struggle has begun. If the Bolsheviks win, collectivism will sweep the world and private property, as a source of income, will vanish. If they fail, the private property in one form or other will flourish even in Russia.

Our reading of the ^{on} situation is that the Bolsheviks will themselves adopt the compromise—which Islam presents. The ideal will continue to remain to be the abolition of private ownership but means will be adopted to give scope

to personal incentive and to the natural urge of children and family, etc.

It must be noted that while Bolshevists are trying to reduce the family urge and the family circle so as to encourage collectivisation, Islam extended "family" circle so as to include in it all creatures and to make all people communistic not only racially or nationally or locally, and not only economically or socially but also internationally by its Universal Brotherhood in Islam.

Contrary to the levelling down process of the Bolshevists we, as Muslims, would adopt the procedure of levelling up and raise the standard of life of the proletariat in respect not only of physical comfort but also of mental happiness, to that of the present-day "middle" or even the "upper class."

It was with this object that Islam did not content itself with the abolition of all private ownership of property as a principle only by vesting it in Allah, *i.e.*, in all His creatures, but also adopted measures, in case of practical difficulties and in view of the human nature, as the second best course, for distributing and dividing all property as generally, as voluntarily, as justly and as equitably as was possible.

Herein lies the superiority of Islam over all other systems, including the Bolshevik.