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The Fundamental Causes of the War

AND

Their Remedy through Religion

Sir Francis Younghusband:

Ladies and Gentlemen: I must first tell you that I am not Sir Ronald Storrs.* Sir Ronald Storrs will, I suppose, very soon be coming, but until he comes there are just one or two words I should like to say to you in regard to our Movement.

You know, of course, that our Movement is an inter-religious Movement. We try to bring together representatives of all religions in the world in defeating this terrible spirit of anti-God and anti-Christianity which is tremendously prevalent in the world at the present time. And our Movement tries to promote that spirit of fellowship which is preached by every religion.

*Originally Sir Ronald Storrs was billed to preside. Hence the apology of Sir Francis Younghusband.
And every religion, at any rate, preaches those high standards which all of us here would like to see established.

To give an illustration of the importance of the work we are doing I would like to tell you of a very interesting plan for an inter-religious league which was formulated some ten years ago by that very distinguished German theologian, Rudolf Otto, the author of *The Idea of the Holy* and of several other books. Professor Otto studied religion in Japan and India and he saw the importance, as we have, of combining the religions to form the basis of any political reorganisation of the world that might be attempted. His argument was that politicians and economists, though they might make the outward structure of any new world order, yet they could not probe deep enough and stir deep enough to get men to create a strong world opinion and a world conscience. He said that only men of religion could do this and that was their work, but that it must be the work of men, not only of Christianity but of all religions,
Hindus, Buddhists, Muslims, Confucianists and Jews as well as Christians. Now he drew out his theme and it was published in an article in the *Hibbert Journal* in July, 1931, and he was supported by Professor Hauer, who had been a German missionary in India.

There was the scheme most beautifully drawn out: all the arguments as good as they could be and drawn out by a man of great experience of all the religions. But nothing came of it and we can see now that if Germans had followed Professor Otto and Professor Hauer instead of Hitler there would not have been the present World War.

That is the first point I would wish to make. The second is that here in England we have at least started a Movement on precisely those lines which they would not adopt in Germany. We have got a Congress in being, we have had our meetings at London, Oxford, Cambridge, and last year most successfully at the Sorbonne in Paris. So we are moving in the right direction, but still I am sorry to say that though in
England we are religious yet we are not religious half enough. We want ever so much more support from public opinion and from the public press and that is what we are trying to do now with this series of lectures. Last Wednesday we made a most excellent start with the address by Professor Sauraţ with Mr. Mazaryk in the chair, giving the fundamental causes of the war. We are very fortunate to-day to have the Imam of the Mosque at Woking to give us his view on "The Remedy through Religion," speaking of course from the point of view of the Muslims. I will ask the Imam kindly to address us.
ISLAM AND THE FUNDAMENTAL CAUSES OF THE WAR*

The Imam:

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—
"The Fundamental Causes of the War and their Remedies through the Religion of Islam" is my subject. Before I proceed further I am rather anxious to remove some of the grotesque misrepresentations existing about Islam in this country. First of all, it is seldom realised that we Muslims cannot become and remain Muslims unless we accept the veracity of the missions of all the prophets of God, and for that matter, unless we accept Jesus as a Prophet of God. The word "Muhammadanism" is liable to give a wrong conception of the religion of Islam, especially to the unwary and is, as a matter of fact, coined after the fashion of such words as Christianity, Buddhism, etc. You will under-

Mr. Abdul Majid, M.A., Imam of Shah Jehan Mosque, Woking, presented the Muslim point of view on "the Fundamental Causes of the War and their Remedies through Religion" at one of the series of meetings arranged by the World Congress of Faiths, London. This lecture was given on the 22nd of January, 1940. Sir Francis Younghusband was in the chair.
stand our not liking this appellation because it leads the hearer to understand that we are the worshippers of Muhammad. We are not the worshippers of Muhammad. We address our prayers to God direct. The word Islam, on the other hand, means "to submit oneself to the will of God" and "to make peace": its active participle form "Muslim" has been defined by the Prophet Muhammad as "one who makes peace" and as "one from whose hands and tongue all men are safe." The idea of "peace" is very prominent in Islam. We Muslims, when we meet, say to one another "Assalamualaikum!" which phrase means "Peace be upon you!" One of the attributes of God, as given in the Qur-an, is "As-Salam" which means "Peace." Of course, many of my audience may consider this rather impudent on my part, especially when you remind yourselves of the wars which are associated with the name of us, Muslims. I shall say a few words about this later on; and in order to create a better sympathy with my few words addressed to you this afternoon, let me assure you that Islam is the
only religion that condemns aggressive wars in the most lucid terms. Islam permits war only in self-defence. The wars conducted by the Prophet Muhammad were in self-defence. This is a subject in itself, but as the time at my disposal is limited, I have to content myself with giving you my assurance and guarantee for the correctness of this statement of mine and I hope it will be accepted by you especially in view of the topic which we are discussing this afternoon.

This was a digression which, I believe, was essential to the interest of the subject which is, “What contribution the religion of Islam has to make towards the all-too-important problem of war.” I shall first try to show if Islam has any right to intrude itself on the solution of the problem. Perhaps my mind will become clear to you if I can show to you that Islam is in no way inferior, to its sister religions in the matter of enabling man to rise above himself.
THE CO-OPERATION OF RELIGION

We are now busy exploring all the approaches to this problem in the hope that we shall find some, if not the final, remedy and it is in this connection that the domain of religion has been approached. We all know that after the last Great War people had begun to understand that there was something valuable in religion or religions, and even those who accused it of parochialism began to proclaim that religion was universal. It was a la mode, for instance, before the last War, to say that religion was nothing but another name for doctrines of set virtues and partiality and exclusiveness and intolerance towards other, so that it was alleged that religion was a doctrine of war of one nation against another.

But now without-even noticing the change, we have begun to believe that in religion, perhaps, there is a message of peace and universality and of universal fraternity, of equality, of social justice and of charity to all and that the strength of religion could be used to serve the
weak and the humble and the oppressed, to rehabilitate the cause of truth and righteousness and to fight against iniquity and unmerited suffering. Mankind is, in a word, anxious to release such forces as can overcome aggression and unrighteousness through the help of religion. Every religion is thus being called upon to do its bit in this direction. My purpose this afternoon is to show you the ways and means which the religion of Islam adopts to release these forces.

This change in mankind becomes all the more noticeable if one studies the last century or, to be more exact, the period before the last Great War. At that time one devoted one’s attention to a kind of civilisation that applied itself assiduously and wholly to industry and utilitarian and materialistic organisation of the economic life, of the political and of social life. In other words, the individual had no spiritual entity or value in his environment or milieu; he was appreciated and judged by his contribution to the pleasures and comforts of this life. This materialistic exaltation of the individual inspired ideas which began to be the guiding force of the
construction of materialistic culture and which resulted in a perverted egoism whose main function was to exploit the poor in the interest of the rich. This materialistic exaltation of the individual, denuded of his spiritual background, set all religious life on one side and even those who professed to be religious had come to the conclusion that religion could not be useful or serve as a source of inspiration in our worldly affairs.

But now the state of affairs which came into existence after the war imposed on one and all the need of transforming our individual, national and international outlook by reason of the pressure brought to bear upon us by rapid discoveries of science, in rapid means of communication and, what is more, by a humanity that was more and more being dominated by its ever-increasing desires and inordinate and insatiable demands.

This state of affairs presented a dilemma to traditional religion. Should it retain its old conservatism or should it adapt itself to the new state of affairs? The trend everywhere is to in-
terpret the values of religion in the light of modern life and experience. And it is also being realised that religion, if it is to be of service and use to mankind in the solution of its problems, must not be a mere idealism, a mere mystic, but must be something more than that. For experience has taught us that mere idealism or truth received through pure reason, although it has changed the lives of individuals, has not been able anywhere to influence the lives of communities as a whole. This is the reason that where pure reason and idealism have failed, religion has succeeded. The idealism of Europe or of other countries has never been a living factor. But all religions, in their own ways, have put a prominent stamp of their own on the lives of individuals and communities. All religions in their higher forms or even in their lower forms, have set their stamp upon humanity through certain formalisms and institutions which they imposed on their adherents. The ensuing results of these institutions have been varied and extremely interesting ecologically.
CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAM ALONE AFFIRM THE VALUE OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Now the basic factor of our political, moral and economic structure is individual liberty, which, as is borne out by a study of the history of the spiritual education of mankind, was first preached by Christianity which affirmed that every man possessed an immortal soul. The recognition of this value of the human soul in all classes of society opened new vistas of freedom to mankind.

This recognition of, and the emphasis on, the value of the human soul and the individual put the slave, who had not been regarded as part of the human species, on an equal footing with his fellow being; it established equality between man and man, equality before God, the same rules of religion and the same conditions of salvation for all. This implied that every one, no matter to what class he belonged, could become a servant of God, that is to say, a priest, a member of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. But it was in this very thing that the mistake was made by
the interpreters of the mind of Jesus Christ; for the institution of priesthood blurred the vision of the absolute equality of man. Islam came and reaffirmed the equality of man and man and took care that sacerdotalism was not grafted upon its spiritualised system of life.

In Judaism the emphasis is on the nation or the group and one who belonged to that group or nation could alone lay claim to the favours of God by virtue of his being a member of that group or nation, chosen by God, but both Islam and Christianity changed the emphasis from the group to the individual. It was a new outlook on life and a new attitude to all moral problems. For the first time let it be said, to the credit of Christianity, that man was recognised as a personality, a moral entity in his own right, not as dependent upon any chosen race or tribe or nation for the favours of God. Thus all man’s actions whether they regard himself or his fellow beings become fraught with a new and a pro-founder significance.
CO-OPERATION OF CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAM AGAINST THE PRESENT CHAOS

The immense newness of this outlook on life preached by Christianity for the first time and later reaffirmed and rehabilitated by Islam in its pristine purity led to the exaltation of the individual and penetrated the profundities of the intelligences that began to apply themselves to the secrets of nature. The renaissance of the sciences and philosophy of modern times proceeds from the extension of this message which was revealed to mankind through Christianity and relit by Islam to the secular domain. But it is interesting to remark that the positive sciences, after they had developed themselves beyond recognition in relation to their origin, forgot that they owed their origin to this noble outlook on life. Every one knows, especially those who have studied Draper's *Intellectual Development of Europe*, the important part played by Muslims in the rise of the positive sciences of modern times. It is being realised that, if mankind is to preserve its soul, its dignity, its happiness, it should have recourse, once again, to the moral
sources from which its present-day civilisation has sprung. For is it not a fact that those countries that are regarded as backward have been noticed as possessing idealistic virtues, while countries that are regarded as civilised and "cultured" are every day becoming a prey to the perversions of material culture, are becoming more and more inhumane and intolerant, and are taking pride in the non-recognition of their duties to others? The present chaos, civil wars, the existing miserable conditions and the exploitation of one nation by another, have been caused not by the backward races, but by the so-called civilised races, whose every individual, through his intense desire to be secure and to be safe, has created a society, an authority, a sort of religion, a nationalism in whose shelter he hides and takes comfort. Selfishness, fear, hatred, class distinction and the division of man against man are due to the withdrawal of those spiritual forces which had initially made man free. It is becoming more and more evident that the message of fraternity preached by Christianity and Islam should be restated and
reaffirmed with a vigour and fervour greater and more intense than ever. It is evident that only such a call can release the pride in man and can counteract any effort against spiritual ascension and can accelerate a progressive spiritualisation of the material civilisation. These views are necessary to throw into the limbo the sophism of racialism. But it is equally true to say that mere idealism, monism, humanitarianism and philosophy which to some people seemed to be sufficient some time ago to withstand the feverish race for the enjoyment of material comforts reveal themselves more and more every day incapable of reacting against the temptations born of forces set free by the conquest of nature by man and the powerful ambitions which result therefrom. For an idealism not having for its source of inspiration the transcendence of God is nothing but an impoverished ideal whose force languishes and diminishes in proportion to the increase of temptations and over-excited desires of man.

Experience shows that all ideals, excepting
the idea of a transcendent God, have failed to keep mankind on the right path. Monism has failed; so has humanitarianism; so has the mystic of nationalism or that of national socialism or that of Bolshevism. The thing which makes us rise above ourselves and makes us charitable is a belief in the transcendental God. All idealistic substitutes have failed to engender that feeling of charity for one another which, I believe, our forefathers possessed in a higher degree.

It is becoming clearer every day that, in the face of the spiritual traditions of Islam and Christianity, there is arising the tendency of the false mystic of force and racialism; it is also becoming clearer that it is more than urgent that we should have recourse to an evocation of the liberty and the dignity of man and the dignity of his soul, of his spiritual and moral powers, and an evocation to the fulness of the riches and wealth of those powers and his transcendental destiny.

I hope my attempt to emphasise the simi-
larity between the ideals of Christianity and Islam has succeeded in making you appreciate the necessity and importance of a closer and yet closer co-operation between both of them. Both religions can help the world against the fundamental causes of unrest, against the growing tendency of non-recognition of our duty, against injustice and inhumanity and those various causes that go under various names, such as Bolshevism, Communism, class-war, Fascism, Aryan theory, unequal distribution of wealth amongst individuals and nations.

THE PROBLEM OF THE WORLD’S UNREST IS MORAL-RELIGIOUS

From the above remarks it will become clear that the problem of the world is in its release from the mental, moral and spiritual leprosy which has struck it. Modern writers have also come to the same conclusion. Professor Alfred Zimmermann in his pamphlet, *The Prospects of Civilisation* (Oxford, 1939), says that although it is true to say that the problem of the world is threefold—political, economical and moral—and
it is in this order that its problem has been generally dealt with, yet it is exactly for this reason that the problem has remained unsolved. The political problem was tackled first because it is the most urgent, but actually it is not the most important. He says: "The moral problem is the most important but the least urgent, since it is a permanent problem in all political life."

Now much will depend on the signification you will attach to the phrase "moral problem." If you are to depose that mankind is sinful and rotten to the core, I, for one, cannot see how we can reform it. But if you start with the assumption that man is sound at the core, then a healthy system and outlook auguring well for the future can be constructed. It is a fact that on the assumption of indefinable axioms all the exact sciences are based. Thus much depends on the foundation on which to raise the superstructure of your moral system for mankind. If you make a wrong assumption, your superstructure will be wrong and warped; so will be the results. But if the basis is right, then the results
will be good and conducive to a harmonious life. It is for this reason that Islam rejects all theories and beliefs which inculcate that mankind is rotten at the core and is incorrigible. It stoutly maintains that sin is an attitude rather than a disposition of man. It says that it is man’s duty to overcome all his faults and develop the heritage of good in him. In Islam sin is identical with deliberate and conscious moral transgression. It is not a condition of mankind as, for instance, the Church, or the doctrine of Reincarnation would have us believe. The point is very important because on this assumption will depend whether a religion can be of help to us in eradicating the evils of war, for instance. If mankind is evil in its essence or has come to this world to pay for its past misdeeds, then, religion or no religion, nothing will help. The thing which will help and give us the fire of conviction will be the assumption that mankind is good and sound at the core and that if it refuses to listen to truth to-day, it will listen to it the next day, provided the truth is repeated to it again and again.
Thus Islam, believing that mankind is solid and sound at the core does not believe in war as integral and essential part for the development of the life of nations or individuals, as, for instance, we are told by the totalitarian sophism, although it is true to say that, according to Islam, it is a biological necessity for which provision should be made. For, in case some individuals or nations do make transgressions and would not let their neighbours live in peace, then Islam has an ethic of war. Such an ethic was essential; for human society can never be expected to consist of saints and angels. Man must be told and guided by certain principles having for their source and sanction the Divine Will where to unsheathe and where not to unsheathe his sword. Thus if Islam contains such a code that deals with war, it should be regarded as more of completion of its system than a defect. I know there are religions that are silent on the subject of war. Their silence on such an important biological necessity has been looked upon as a point of merit and because Islam provided for and lays down guid-
ing principles for this contingency of life, its critics have seen in it a defect and weakness!

THE FUNDAMENTAL CAUSES OF WAR

For the sake of simplification we can say that war takes three forms:

(1) Hatred between one individual and another, because their minds refuse to extend the horizon of their outlook to give up habits and ideas which do not appreciate the limitations and sentiments of the other fellow-being;

(2) War between social classes which shut themselves up against each other and refuse to understand each other and also refuse each other mutual concessions;

(3) Wars between nations that revolt against each other and do not understand the value of reciprocity and the advantage of an intelligent co-operation with each other.
WHAT ARE THE REMEDIES THAT ISLAM SUGGESTS TO REMOVE THESE FUNDAMENTAL CAUSES

As to number one, Islam is the only religion which makes it compulsory for its followers to believe in all the prophets of God of all religions and all ages. Accordingly we accept Jesus, Krishna, and others as the prophets of God. This widens our sympathies and makes us charitable to all non-Muslims.

Islam's real aim is to establish freedom of conscience and action in general and particularly in religion. Its entire body politic is guided by the 256th verse of the 2nd chapter of the Holy Qur'an which lays down in categorical terms: "Let there be no compulsion in matters religious." A Muslim may not wage war against any person of his own religion nor against any of any other creed merely because he is afraid of that creed. A Muslim, on the other hand, is bound to wage war against any person, whether of his own kith and kin and religion or not, if he interferes with
the beliefs of a non-Muslim. This state of affairs has been styled by the Qur'an " Faith for God " (2:193), that is to say, every one must be allowed to choose his own faith and worship his God in the manner he thinks fit. It is a disturbance of this state of affairs that compels a Muslim to draw his sword against any person, Muslim or otherwise, who violates the above condition. Liberty of conscience was unknown before Islam. The feeling in Islam for religious freedom is so strong that a Muslim is enjoined to act as a policeman, as it were, in the protection of all religious houses. For example, a Muslim is ordered to protect a Christian church from a Muslim attack. The Qur'an is too clear on this point to allow of any other conduct. We read in the Qur'an: "And had there not been God's repelling some people by others, certainly there would have been pulled down cloisters and churches and synagogues and mosques in which God's name is much mentioned, and surely God will help him who helps His cause (22:40)."

In this verse the Qur'an identifies the main-
tenance of religious houses of every faith with the "Cause of God." It is to be noted that Muslims are ordered to sacrifice their lives not only to save their mosques but the religious houses of other peoples as well. Even in time of war a Muslim is forbidden to touch an alien house of worship. He must also spare the lives of their religious teachers.

From the above it follows that Islam is a religion that can help tremendously to release the highest and noblest in man to stand against unrighteousness and aggression.

**INSTITUTIONALISM IN ISLAM**

To enable you to understand better the value of the ways adopted by Islam to, eradicate the other two causes above referred to, I wish to make a digression. I wish to say a few words on the importance of institutionalism in the life of man.

Islam has been condemned by its critics as a religion of rules. One has tried to see its weakness in this special feature of this religion. These
critics wish to convey the impression that the religion of Islam leaves no freedom to the individual. Observed superficially this criticism seems to be true. But let us analyse it a bit further. The truth of the matter is that Islam is a spiritualised system of life in which each and every action of the individual receives the leaven of the religious. Even the trivialities of daily life become matters of religious importance to a Muslim. Hardly any detail is to be found in the whole business of daily life, even including occupations, which may be regarded as unclean by some, that is not invested with religious significance. The state, society, the individual, economics and morality, all duties of man to God and to his fellow-beings are placed under the influence of religion.

From this it will become clear that if a certain community lived, say, under the influence of certain institutions introduced by the religion it professes, it will exhibit certain manifestations resulting therefrom which will be at once strange and interesting to us. For example, if we find the caste system amongst the Hindus of India,
then we could easily trace it to certain formalism and teaching of Hinduism; again if we found snobbery and class distinction in English life, we could either trace it to the presence or lack of certain tenets or formalism, and institutions imposed on English life by the organised and traditional religion. Thus beliefs and the various forms of institutions introduced by various religions affect radically the ways and habits of nations and peoples. In Islam this is very marked because Islam permeates every action of its followers and makes no distinction between what is worldly and what is religious. The religious is closely intertwined and preached with the worldly. Thus, though its critics have tried to see a weakness in this peculiarity of Islam, it is, as a matter of fact, a point of strength and has proved a blessing in the case of its followers. It is absolutely a wrong reading and untrue appraisal of the teaching of Islam to assert that it has fossilised the vitality of its peoples. The present backwardness of the Muslim world is due to causes other than the control and regulation by Islam of the life of the individual.
Islam wants to deal exhaustively with the physical, moral and spiritual life of the individual. The critics of Islam forget when they describe its permeation into the life of the individual as unfair infringement on his life, that the regulation of the physical aspect is an essential to the building up of his moral life upon which in turn is based his spiritual life. Such objections betray their ignorance of the inter-relations existing between the physical and the spiritual life of man.

It is thus that Islam evolves out of the individual, a harmonious whole and a complete being in whom all the capacities have been rightly proportioned and developed. It is clear from this that according to Islam any system that develops one aspect of an individual at the expense of the other, the physical to the detriment of the spiritual, or vice versa, is failing in its function and to this disequilibrium and lack of harmony between the physical and moral and spiritual stages of the life of individual it is that all the troubles in this world are to be traced. But after having dealt with the individual as an
individual, Islam is equally anxious to link him up to the group to which he may belong and the group to the outside world. How Islam has done this I shall explain later. An individual’s own evolution, not accompanied by ways of how to fit himself into the world order, leaves the problem in hand unsolved. An individual’s life and the life of the group in which he may live have both been taken into consideration and fully dealt with by Islam. Thus the individual easily dovetails into his social group.

With regard to number two, Islam adopts methods that attempt to establish harmonious relations between the rich and the poor and also to a fairly equal distribution of wealth amongst the members of the Muslim community. I shall deal with them later and show how Islam interferes with and regulates the economic life of its own communities. Suffice it to say for the present that we Muslims find it impossible to understand, for instance, the class distinctions in England. Similarly it is next to impossible for an Englishman of the masses to understand the
ease and freedom in Muslim countries with which the poor move among all conditions of men. The rich also show no trace of consciousness of class. We have our poor of course, but poverty is one thing and inferiority another. With us there is an equality that is real enough to override the greatest inequality. Priority in faith and spiritual eminence are the only claims to real distinction. Thus there is harmony between the classes and the masses in Islamic countries.

With regard to number three, Islam has found that the two greatest obstacles in the way of understanding the value of reciprocity are to be found in theories that exalt the race or the class. Communism, Bolshevism and Capitalism exalt the class whereas Nazism, Hinduism, Fascism and Judaism exalt the race. Islam has a system of its own to deal with both these evils which being as natural as the other instincts of man, should be controlled, if wars are to be avoided.
THE RACE PROBLEM

Let us first deal with the evil of colour or the exaltation of the race.

I would step aside and let others speak for me in the first place on the disappearance of colour prejudice from among one-sixth of mankind, which constitutes the number of the Muslims of the world.

Count Hermann Keyserling, the German philosopher, has the following observations to make on the Islamic structure of society: "The national character always seems somewhat blurred wherever the crescent moon illuminates the landscape, which is particularly noticeable here in India where the types are otherwise outlined so clearly. But its place is taken by a more universal and none-the-less definite character: that of the Mussulman. Every single Mohammedan whom I asked what he is, replied 'I am a Mussulman.' Why has this religion alone understood to substitute national feeling by something wider? And by something which
is stronger and significant? How is it that Islam, without a corresponding dogma, achieves the ideals of Brotherhood, whereas Christianity fails in spite of its ideals? It must be due to the intimate relations existing between the underlying tendencies of this peculiar faith and the fundamental nature of man.” (Travel Diary of a Philosopher, London, 1925, p. 201.) I will also quote from Dr. Maude Royden’s The Problem of Palestine, London, 1939, page 37: “The religion of Mahommed proclaimed the first real democracy ever conceived in the mind of man. His God is of such transcendent greatness that before him all differences were nought and even the deep and cruel cleavage of colour ceased to count: There are social ranks among Moslems as elsewhere, but fundamentally (that is to say, spiritually) all believers are equal and this fundamental equality is not a fiction as so commonly found among Christians; it is accepted and is real. This accounts very largely for its extraordinarily rapid spread among different peoples. It accounts for its strength to-day in Africa where the Christian missionary preaches
an equality which is everywhere mocked by the arrogance of the white races and the existence of the colour bar. The Moslem, black, brown or white, alone finds himself accepted as a brother not according to his colour but his creed.

"During the war in France I was told of some Indian Moslem soldiers who created a disturbance on finding black troops from Senegal in the same estaminet as they were. When they were about to proceed to violence some of the better informed stated that these blacks were Moslems. Instantly the protests were silenced and an apology offered. White Christians do not always behave so, whether in London or American hotels."

Now it should not be thought that it was merely the verses of the Qur'án or the words of the Prophet Muhammad that enabled the Muslims to blur their national character. For beautiful homilies and platitudes are common to all religions; all religions use the phrase "brotherhood of men" and keep it among their ideals. Every sage and prophet has wished for
it. But nowhere, excepting in Islamic countries, have the phrases “the children of God” and “brotherhood of men” become a reality. The reason for that is that we Muslims have the secret which lies in the institution of prayer as conceived by the genius of the Prophet Muhammad culminating in the institution of the Pilgrimage to Makka. I have no time to go into the details of this institution which is responsible for the removing of colour prejudice and race-consciousness from the whole world of Islam. If Islam had done nothing else for mankind except the removing of colour prejudice from 300 millions of Muslims, it would have claim enough to hold the world its debtor for all time to come. We Muslims alone can teach the world how to abolish racial consciousness. In Islam we have a proposition for establishing human brotherhood based on a concept of moral and spiritual equality.

THE CLASS PROBLEM

The second great evil from which the world is suffering and which sets sinister forces upset-
ting the peace of the world is the hatred that exists between one class and the other. The capitalist does not seem to harbour feelings of love for the labourer; similarly the worker does not seem to realise the limitations of his employer. The tug-of-war continues. If Islam would not have dealt with this economic aspect of the life of the individual, the capitalist and the worker, the employer and the employed, its work done in the blurring of the racial differences would have been undone as speedily as it was done. Conscious of the fact that unless the individual was free from the economic shackles which class-consciousness tries to forge round the liberties of the opposed class, Islam took requisite steps to establish a harmony, an equilibrium in their mutual relations.

Islam adopts means which on the one hand prevent the wealth of the nation from concentrating in the hands of a few individuals and, on the other, adopts methods which take away the sting of bitter hatred that every poor man carries in his breast against the rich. The following, in
a few words, are the ways and means adopted by Islam to realise this twofold aim:

(1) The socialisation of all the forces of nature which are the means of production and the object of great industry and have been created by God. This means that a piece of land belonging to a private individual is fundamentally a part of the state property.

(2) The non-recognition by Islam of the law of primogeniture. The Islamic law of inheritance deals a death-blow to large estates and dukedoms. These are continually being divided amongst the descendants.

(3) The interdiction of usury and the forbidding of the lending of money at exorbitant rates. This is an effective blow to capitalism.

(4) The interdiction of monopoly, the accumulation of profit by private individuals through the cornering of commodities.
(5) An efficacious control of the personal private profit-making property through the institution of "Zakat"—a fixed poor rate levied on the earning of every Muslim come of age. This last method implies that although potentially every man is entitled to everything in the world, because all the world's goods have been created by God for the use of man, yet a brake is also set upon his personal private profit-making inclinations. Islam has set a limit to the right of a man to accumulate private profit. The fixed levy under "Zakat" is one of the most potent limitations to capitalism and also one of the most efficacious ways of making the rich feel that the poor have a share in their good fortune and the poor to realise that the rich are their friends.

From the above remarks it is plain, I hope, that Islam does not dismiss private property; for the average man finds it difficult to give up his
possessions and adopt a secluded life like a recluse. The outlook on life encouraged by Islam is towards mysticism rather than asceticism, which is condemned by it. But it also remembers that man cannot get contentment by submitting himself solely to the materialistic side of his life. Where we find that Christianity and Buddhism would suggest a flight from this world, Islam accepts a positive attitude and suggests how to hold the golden mean between what man is and what man ought to be. In Islam the trend of its teachings is towards transferring, ennobling the instincts of man rather than towards strangling them. We Muslims never forget that as yet it is only the one-sixth of mankind, the Muslims being about 300 millions, that has tasted the delicious fruit of equality and fraternity. With the happenings of the last few years, in Europe the duty of Muslims towards their fellow-beings who are materially better off than they are, who possess all the advantages that accrue from the natural sciences is more pressing than ever. The world is in sore need of the ways which could teach it to blur its racial differences and forget
its class antipathies. About fifty years ago the need was perhaps not so urgent. Race theories and the economic theories of the unequal distribution of wealth were more or less confined to ethnologists and economists. But now one has begun to preach and glorify the virtues of the doctrine of servitude, of exclusiveness, of partiality, of intolerance towards people not belonging to the Aryan race. The message of the moral fraternity, of the equality of souls, of social justice, of charity towards all, of protecting the weak and the oppressed, is being pooh-poohed and derided openly. We Muslims, in common with our Christian friends, possess the certitude, the conviction of the fact that the individual does not develop but through devotion to others, through service to his fellow-beings. But there is something that we possess and other people do not possess. When I say this I do not wish to offend any one. We are the only people that are spiritually democratic in the true sense of the word. For there is no community other than of Islam that is free from the blight of sacerdotalism. All religions have
succeeded in changing the lives of individuals and they do so every day; but it is a fact recognised by all that Islam alone succeeds in transforming communities as communities.

As yet five-sixths of the world are groaning under the crushing burden of race and class consciousness, a passionate exclusiveness and other ridiculous superiority complexes and this five-sixths have not as yet realised that each and every one of them is to be a servant of each other rather than an enemy of each other.

If we want peace, we have not only to learn to subordinate all life whether it be personal, social, economic, national or international, to an inspiration entirely opposed to the conflicts of race, of prestige, of organisations confined to the conquerors and to the technique of a still further and a greater materialism but also we have to devise ways to put them into practice. Meré wishes, especially when they are empty of spiritual values, will not lead us anywhere.

Sir Francis Younghusband:

It is our custom to have discussions after-
wards. I am sure you will all agree with me that we realise from what the lecturer has said the great contribution which Islam has to give to the objects of our World Congress, which is the promotion of the spirit of fellowship.

Having lived for many years with Muslims I can corroborate what the lecturer has said as regards their feeling of fraternity that is tremendously strong with all Muslims as he has pointed out.

However, you have heard me already and I would like perhaps Miss Peters to make a contribution.

*Miss Peters:*

There are one or two interesting points from the point of view of discussion. The point of the relation of the individual to society is a big question and I will not go into it now except to mention that it is one of the problems of to-day to find the true relationship of the individual to society and we are glad of any help from the Islamic community in solving the question of
the rights of the individual and his duties towards society. On the one side there is the pressure of government and state on the individual and on the other side there is the idea of the too great a freedom of the individual from his obligations to society.

I have one little point of criticism of where our speaker told us of the complete soundness of man in Islam. We know that in Christianity there is also the great sense of original sin and I cannot help thinking that while believing in a fundamental soundness it is a great help to recognise that there is an element to be taken into account in the Christian doctrine of original sin. That seems to be a point on which we can go terribly wrong. Some of you will remember a poem of Browning in which he says that Christianity threw its doubt on the perfection of man by its doctrine of original sin. He makes this statement at the end of a story of imperfection. Without some sense of evil in man it is difficult to understand the present state of the world.*

*According to Islam, although the nature of man is perfect it is too apt to go wrong. But this going wrong is an accident which can be averted if man avails of Divine guidance available in individual life through sincere prayer and in collective life through the God-sent Prophet or reformer of the age.—Publishers.
I was interested in the speaker’s remark that it was not the backward races who were to blame for our present condition. It is what are called the forward races, who are advancing on one point but have been left behind on others which the backward races have still kept.

I was also interested in the insistence on the doctrine of the transcendence of God in order to reach the real sense of equality, because fraternity and equality do depend upon that sense. As Lamonet said, we should never realise that we were brothers until we believed in one God.

The points of mysticism and asceticism, I suppose, are contrary, but that is a big point. Is there a sufficient sense of fraternity in India at present between the Hindus and the Muslims?

It does seem as though it was one of the things preventing the happy settlement of India at present.

I wish to thank the speaker very sincerely.
The Imam:

With regard to India that was outside the purview of my talk; unfortunately both Hindus and Muslims have got outlooks on life directly opposed to each other. That is the reason why no understanding exists between them. We Muslims are democratic, whereas the Hindus are inspired by class ideals.

We want to break down the grasp of the priestly class, the Brahmins, and the Brahmins do not like it.

Mr. Sewell:

Sir, I should like to congratulate you on having chosen for the opener of these talks on Peace Through Religion the leader of Islam in England. I think it is a very good start. It is difficult for me to comment on the paper; I feel I should like to have it with me for an hour and read it over carefully and then comment on it; it seems to contain several interesting points.

I would like to ask the scientific world about what the Imam said about Muslims being in the forefront of science. The thought of those great
names, Avicenna and Averroes and the great impetus given to science at that time makes me wonder if it is continuing at the present time. I should also like to ask about the World Fellowship. I am very much interested in that because I am connected with a society which is doing the same sort of thing in a different kind of way—The National Adult School Union. We are a classless union, have no politics and no sectarianism and we work for peace in any way we can. I should like to mention that only this time last year one of the lessons in London was taken by the Imam.

I am not sure whether it was by yourself or your predecessor that gave us a great impetus. The help given then caused us to arrange a combined meeting of Christians, Muslims and Jews which was held at our headquarters in Bloomsbury Street. These things are apt to start and then peter out. It is the continuity that is wanted.

I feel very privileged to have listened to such a good start in the series on the road to peace
through religion. All religions can contribute as our speaker has said. There is a great deal in sacerdotolism that is not important. It is the inner light that matters. There our friends, the Quakers, are right. That is the track to follow to get peace in the world. Surely war is caused by materialism. What we want is a moral and mental and spiritual rearmament and not materialism. If the world went on those lines we might soon come to a time when wars would cease. We have had a very good lead this afternoon and I should like to thank the Imam very much indeed.

Sir Francis Younghusband:

Is there anyone else?

Mr. Charleston-Rae:

I listened to Professor Saurat last week. We have had two fine addresses. I still think that the fundamental point is this. We hear a lot about institutions, but I think we must realise that we are the institutions. That the institutions are really a reflection of our own thoughts and all the limitations of those institutions are
limitations of ourselves. An important point was raised—that of original sin. It would take too long to deal with it, but emanating from it I think we have just that fundamental which makes all the differences to our lives. Somewhere we know we have gone wrong. Is it not that fear possesses us? Whether this originate in original sin or whether fear is a later development is too difficult to deal with now, but because we fear everything we continue warring. May it not be possible, when we really understand Christianity and turn the light of Christianity upon ourselves we shall eliminate that fear and transform the shortcomings of our social institutions and then live in peace with God and ourselves.

*Sir Francis Younghusband*:

Time is going on and I think we must close our discussion but there are one or two things I should like to say as a result of the discussions. When we have these inter-religious discussions certain fundamental differences between the different religions do come out and
also the fundamental unity. The lecturer spoke about the differences between the Hindus and Muslims in India. There is that very strong difference. The Hindus have their caste system which is the most remarkable in the world and the Muslims have their idea of fundamental fraternity and equality. All the same the Hindus and the Muslims do manage to get on together extraordinarily well. The differences arising at present in India are mainly political and one can see the value of the Hindus for their caste system, which they themselves acknowledge has gone too far, yet all the same has preserved through thousands of years their great religion. They have had their Brahmin caste for thousands of years. It has preserved the Hindu culture at a time when in Greece and Rome culture fell away. To this day in India it has been preserved and it preceded the culture of Greece. The caste system has had that advantage even though they themselves now admit it has gone to excess. Then the Muslims introduced this sense of fraternity and equality which does affect the Hindus. I remember on one occasion (I
was resident at the court of a Hindu ruler) the Prince and Princess of Wales, afterwards King George V and Queen Mary, came there. Before the service on Sunday morning the Maharaja went in to see what arrangements were being made. He saw two big golden chairs put up in the front rank. He asked whom these were for and received the reply, "for the Prince and Princess of Wales." He said: "That is all wrong. The Prince and Princess of Wales in the Church ceremony should be just on the same equality as anybody else." You see there how the Hindus also have this sense of fraternity and equality.

I know you would like me to thank on your behalf the lecturer this afternoon. He has given—at a very rapid pace I am sorry to say—the fundamentals of Islam. We hope to have those to read because it will be very valuable to read what he has said this afternoon.