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WHAT OTHERS SAY ABOUT

The Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha’at-i-Islam, Lahore.

"Taken out of this environment the movement resolves itself mainly into liberal Islam with the peculiarity that it has a definitely propagandist spirit and feels confident that it can make an appeal to Western nations, an appeal which has already been made with some measure of success. If it be thought that this success be insignificant it must be remembered that missionary progress in India, where the Muslim community is now the largest in the world, was slow" (Islam at the Cross Road, p. 108).

"The Ahmadiyya are an interesting exception to the generally prevailing communal spirit of Islam. They concentrate on religious propaganda and abstain from all politics. ... in this respect they are a very remarkable group in modern Islam, the only group that has purely missionary aims. They are marked by a devotion, zeal and self-sacrifice that call for genuine admiration notwithstanding their harassing and bitterly aggressive tactics. Their founder Mirza Ghulam Ahmad must have been a powerful personality...

"The Lahore group who have seceded from the original community on the ground that they venerate their founder as a Mujaddid (renewer of religion, and not as a prophet, are therefore more acceptable to public opinion in Islam. They have the same spirit of opposition against Christianity as the Qadianis, but their activity is more exclusively concentrated on the proclamation of Islam as the only religion that is in conformity with reason and nature. The crisis of Christian Europe gives them much material to expose this religion and extol Islam ... In their bitter aggressiveness they mete out the same treatment to Christianity that has often been meted out by Christianity to Islam ... Their influence is far wider than the number of their adherents would suggest. Their vindication and defence of Islam is accepted by many educated Moslems as, the form in which they can remain intellectually loyal to Islam." (Rev. H. Krämer in "The Moslem world." Vol. XXXI, pp. (170-171).

The movement represents a reaction to the naturalistic interpretations of Islam as set forth by the Aligarh reformers while at the same time repudiating the authority of the orthodox Mulla..............the Ahmadies are at present the most active propagandists of Islam in the world ("Indian Islam," p 217).
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The Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha’at-i-Islam, Lahore (Pakistan)
We believe in the finality of prophethood in Muhammad. In the words of the founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement. "No Prophet old or new, will come after our Holy Prophet". "The man who denies the finality of prophethood must be considered as having no faith in, and being outside the pale of Islam.”

2. We believe the Holy Quran to be the final and perfect Book of God, no portion of which has ever been or shall ever be abrogated.

3. We look upon every one as a Muslim who professes faith in the kalima, La-ilaha-ill-a Allah, to whatever sect or school of thought in Islam he may belong.

4. We accept Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, the founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, as the Mujaddid of the 14th century and we affirm that he never claimed to be a prophet as, he himself writes: “I lay no claim to prophethood, but claim only to be a Muhaddath” (a non-prophet to whom God speaks): “I am not a claimant to prophethood; on the other hand, I regard such a claimant as outside the pale of Islam;” "they have devised a lie against me who say that I claim to be a prophet.”

5. All the companion of the Holy Prophet and all the Imams with whom the different sects of Islam associate themselves, are worthy of our reverence.

6. All the century Mujaddids must be recognised and sought light from.

7. Islam is destined once more to be the leading cultural force in the world.

NOTE:—The doctrines held by the Qadian section that the founder of the Movement is a prophet and that all non-Ahmadis are kafirs, have been repeatedly refuted by us.
"And thus did We make for every prophet an enemy, the devils from among men and jinn, some of them suggesting to others varnished falsehood to deceive (them) and had your Lord pleased they would not have done it, therefore, leave them and that which they forge;

And that the hearts of those who do not believe in the hereafter may incline to it and they may be well pleased with it and that they may earn what they are going to earn (of evil)."

—The Holy Qur'an Ch. vi: verses 113 and 114.

The Russian Revolution of 1917, generally known as the October Revolution, is decidedly a great event in the history of Europe. It is the culmination of many such revolutions that preceded it, aiming at the liberation of the down-trodden masses of the West from the tyrannies of their rulers. In the opinion of M. Morozov, whose well-written article on this subject has been published by the U.S.S.R. Embassy in Karachi:

The October Revolution differs in principle from all preceding revolutions, which only replaced one form of exploitation of the working people by another, but exploitation remained. Only the great October Socialist Revolution overthrew all the exploiters and set itself the aim—to abolish all exploitation and to eliminate every kind of exploiter and enslaver.

Not only M. Morozov, but all Soviet writers and speakers, and indeed all Marxists and friends of Marxism, have been lavishing their praises on this
event in European history. Marshall Stalin speaks of it as "a radical change in the life and traditions, in the culture and ideology, of the exploited masses throughout the world."

In the background of the horrible atrocities perpetrated on the masses of Christians by their heartless rulers for long, long centuries, such exaggerations in estimating the importance and value of this revolution is understandable, but the real merits of such praises in the light of reason and facts of history yet remain questionable. We have great regard for the sentiments of the toiling masses and their leader in the West. We have great sympathy for their agonies and sufferings. And we appreciate their disappointment at the tragic failure of their ancestral faith in accomplishing their social salvation. It is really a pity that a religion that came as a gospel for the poor and the humble, for the hungry and the destitute, a religion that spoke of the impossibility of a rich man's entry into heaven, should become the hand-maid of exploitation by rich men and prove a message of despair for the toiling masses in actual facts of life.

But with all this sympathy of ours, we cannot easily swallow the claim made on behalf of the Socialist Revolution of Russia that it "signifies a radical change in the history of mankind." We may concede that it is a radical change in the history of Christendom or at least of that section of it which has come under the sway of Soviet Russia. It is another thing that our haustful friends of the West consider their own peoples as equivalent to the whole world and their small history as
equivalent to the whole history of mankind. We may admire their self-confidence but not their judgement in this regard. A neutral observer will find it altogether a different story. Fortunately, the history of mankind has in no way been similar to the history of Western Christendom. It has never seen the callous and scornful indifference of the rich for the poor. Nor has it seen anything like the violent reaction to this state of affairs in the form of Western revolutions. Devoid of any definite social code, the Western people have, from the beginning of their history, been living in the midst of a social anarchy. The violent and persistent suppressions from above and their equally violent and frequent reactions from below, were quite natural under the circumstances. We are afraid, we are unable to find any message in these blasts and counter-blasts for the rest of humanity. They may serve as warnings but not as models.

As for exploitation, we are in a way sure that no end has been put to it in the Bolshevik regime. The word ‘exploitation’ in its traditional, harmless sense, will always be there, if human social life continues to be what it has been until now. The gifted minority in any society must, in the course of events and in the interest of the society at large, exploit or utilise the labour of the majority who are not similarly gifted. The Commissars of the U.S.S.R. are undoubtedly at this moment the gifted minority in Soviet Russia just as the much-criticised capitalists or administrators are the corresponding minority in countries that have not fallen in with the Marxist
view of life and society.

As for the newly acquired meaning of the word ‘exploitation,’ i.e., fraudulent appropriation of the fruits of others’ labours, we can only say that we are not in a position to ascertain the truth or otherwise of the Soviet contention that this has ceased to exist under Soviet regime. The fact is that for want of true access of outside neutral observers into the territories of Soviet Russia, no reliable evidence is available on this particular subject. And if one is allowed to form any opinion on the basis of the system prevailing there, one is tempted to conclude that there must be more of exploitation going on in Soviet Russia in this particular sense than anywhere else in the world. Because the system of government there is avowedly dictatorial, albeit in the name of the proletariat. And it has never been claimed that selfishness has been eliminated from the Russian mind after the establishment of socialist economic system in that country. The modified socialist dictum “to each according to his work,” is a frank admission of the existence of this human weakness in that dreamland of Marxism, as anywhere else in the world. As a matter of fact, it has been most unphilosophical and illogical from the very beginning to have expected any altruism from the followers of a creed that is professedly materialistic at its foundation. And the matter has been made worse, as we have said, by the dictatorial nature of the government. The reason is that the only check on the universal selfishness of man, in the absence of moral consideration, is protest and rebellion of its victims, whereas it is exactly these
things which are an utter impossibility under a totalitarian form of government such as one that prevails in the present-day Russia. It is time to realise that exploitation in its bad sense is no monopoly of Capital, as the Communist propaganda would have us believe. 'Capital and its owners' unfettered freedom to employ it are not the only privileges that open the door to exploitation. Any privilege, whether of political power or of administrative authority or skill in any art or craft, can be equally used as a means of exploitation. A clever man has hundred and one ways of exploitation. Whereas in Soviet Russia private capital has been debarred from the privilege of exploitation, the other factors that have similar privileges are allowed complete freedom for the same. As a matter of fact, in the absence of private capital to contend the monopoly of these other exploitations, the administrative authorities may be, for all we know, exploiting the people of Russia in a manner unknown to any generation of people before. It is not at all difficult to see how the exploited masses can be better off in a system where there are two or more rival exploiters than in one where there is a monopoly of exploitation. No amount of suffrage can in any way alleviate the distressing position of the unimaginative and toiling masses, otherwise known as the proletariat, under such a system. So, whatever the professed sympathy for the real proletariat, when the time comes for the appropriation of national wealth, a clever Communist leader must be as anxious for the exploitation of this unfortunate section of humanity as the most despicable lot of bourgeois capitalists. As a matter
of fact, this irony of fate becomes all the more ironical by the fact that having risen to power in the name and with the help of the exploited labour, these pseudo-saviours would themselves prove to be the greatest exploiters of unsophisticated labour. It is a case of double exploitation and as such a greater fraud than that of Capitalism. Thus, the enemies of God, which the Communists proclaim themselves to be, are circulating in the world nothing but "varnished falsehood," as the Qur'an rightly characterises these propaganda to be, when they say that they have succeeded in abolishing "all exploitation" and eliminated "every kind of exploiter and enslaver." The fact is just the reverse. Never has the proletariat been so completely at the mercy of the exploiting classes, the guarantee for a pittance notwithstanding.

It is worthwhile to remember that the protest against the Capitalistic order was not solely a bread-securing movement, it was a protest of human dignity against the insults of the Capitalists heaped on manual labour. The movement accordingly had a moral basis and it continues to do so even now in spite of the attempted direction of the Dialectic Materialism of Karl Marx. It is quite plain that those who fought the battles of this Revolution, braved death and destruction and cheerfully gave their lives in the attempt, were not materialists in any sense of the word, but fanatical idealists and zealots, the very opposite of what Karl Marx and his philosophy wants to make man of. The October Revolution, therefore, was a kind of misguided public fury aimed at the establishment of
social justice in economics and human honour in social morals. But the method adopted to bring this about, the dictatorial nature of the government in particular, has unfortunately taken the bottom out of the whole movement and the elimination of private capital has carried the matter to a point of despiration.

COMMUNISM AND SEX-MORALITY

"Then set thy face upright for religion in the right state—the nature made by Allah in which He has made men; there is no altering of Allah's creation; that is the right religion, but most people do not know." (The Holy Qur'an, 30:30).

"And whoever desires a religion other than Islam, it shall not be accepted from him, and in the hereafter he shall be one of the losers." (Ibid. 3:84.)

Propaganda papers of Soviet Russia reaching this country in recent years would have us believe that the sanctity of family life is as jealously guarded there under the present regime as at any time before and anywhere else in the world and that it is a malicious propaganda of the enemies that family ties are in any way ridiculed by the Communists. No one will be more happy than ourselves if it is so. Islam's is the first culture in the world that inculcated a spirit of an out-and-out internationalism and wonderfully succeeded in creating a society that actually demonstrated this spirit in history, in sharp contrast to all other societies with similar ambitions. And yet perhaps
no other culture is so insistent on the solidarity of family life and the sanctity of relations arising out of it. The reason is not far to seek. Any wider social life, if it is to be real, must be rooted in family affections as ordained by nature. Although as Muslims we believe in the spiritual basis of human social life, we also believe that the physical aspect of our life has much to do with its abstract and emotional sides. Blood and matrimonial relations are one of those physical aspects which cannot be ignored in the correct development of our social consciousness. We are convinced that the suppression of the social instinct in the family circle will spell disaster to all growth of wider social consciousness in man.

We are, therefore, happy to see even Soviet Russia avowing this principle of sanctity of family life, which Islam so strongly advocates. It is really immaterial under what name a particular social system passes so long as that system cares to obey the natural laws of life. So even if under the Soviet regime, the sanctity of family relations is regarded as inviolable, the social solidarity of the Russian people can be expected to be more or less intact, despite its violation of other laws of civilised existence. As Muslims we see in this belated Communist wisdom a confirmation of a Quranic principle.

With all this appreciation of the Soviet attitude towards the question, we are anxious to find out the true position of Russian Communism in this particular regard. If the Communist Manifesto is to be regarded as holding the same
position in the Communist Church as the Athanasian Creed does in Christianity, one is naturally reminded of the following passage in that famous document:

"Abolition of the family! Even the most radical flare-up at this infamous proposal of the Communists."

Whatever criticism the Communists may offer to the bourgeois family life, the Manifesto does not give us any picture of the kind of family life with which they intend to replace it. We are given the destructive side of the picture but nothing has been said anywhere about the constructive side. On the contrary Karl Marx's sole collaborator in the preparation of this document, Frederick Engels, wrote a whole book on this subject, entitled *The origin of the family; private property and the state*, in the year 1884 C.E., full twelve years after the publication of the Manifesto, in which he tried to belittle, as much as he could, the emotional aspect of family life and divest sex life of its religious halo. He seems to be the happiest when he presents the case of group-marriage which is explained by him as, "the right of sexual intercourse between a number of men and a number of women." The whole tenor of this book is to emphasise the flexibility of sex-relationship in a particular society. He does not mince matters:

"According to the materialistic conception, the decisive factor in history is, in the last resort, the production and the reproduction of immediate life. But this itself is of a two-fold character. On the one hand, the production of the means of subsistence, of food, clothing and shelter and the tools requisite thereto; on the other, the production of human
beings themselves, the propagation of the species. The social institution under which men of a definite historical epoch and of a definite country live, are determined by both kinds of production: by the stage of development of labour on the one hand and of the family on the other. The less the development of labour, the more limited its volume of production, and, therefore, the wealth of society, the more preponderatingly does the social order appear to be dominated by ties of sex. However, within this structure of society based on ties of sex, the productivity of labour develops more and more, and with it, private property and exchange, differences in wealth, the possibility of utilising labour power of others and thereby the basis of class antagonism......The old society based on ties of sex bursts asunder in the collision of the newly developed social classes; in its place a new society appears, constituted in a state, the units of which are no longer sex groups but territorial groups, a society in which the family system is entirely dominated by the property system.”

It is not a casual feature of the book under discussion that it ends with an appendix entitled, “A newly-discovered case of group marriage.” Indeed, the reader will search in vain throughout the whole book for any statement that encourages a feeling of reverence for sex-relations or a sense of sexual purity as distinguished from promiscuity of sex connections. We have purposely underlined a certain expression in the foregoing quotation and this just to show the trend of the author’s thoughts.

In face of this it is surprising that an author of Mr. Maurice Hindus’ standing should characterise, as a legend, the story of the nationalisation of women in Soviet Russia that “swept the world” in the years immediately following the Revolution. He wants to convince his readers of the correctness
of his view by quoting the following words from an American correspondent in Russia:

“The longer I stay here the more impressed I am with the stabilisation of morals and family in this country.”

As we have said, we are glad to learn that sex morality and family life persists in Russia even to this day. It is all the more pleasing to learn that the Communist Government of Russia refers to this as a happy trend of their history. What, however, we cannot understand is how to connect this feature of Soviet social life with the Communist regime and how to reconcile this with the trend of Communist thought at its highest sources. Mr. Hindus, however, gives us an insight into the real spirit of Russian revolution when he makes the following observation in his book Mother Russia from which we have just quoted:

“Russian youth, or rather certain groups of it, rose in clamorous, almost hilarious, revolt against the sex morality of Czarist times. The peasant youth was not a participant in this rebellion, though the old morals had suffered visible set-backs even in the countryside. Chiefly it was the student youth that championed the new age of liberation from all the restraints and compulsions of the old days. This youth grew riotously lax and often stupefied itself with sex orgies. A vast literature grew out of and around this new emancipation.”

Mr. Hindus seeks an extenuation for this on behalf of Communist Russia in the following words:

“Those were tense, irresponsible, exciting times and the emancipated youth made the most of it.”
And he proceeds to tell us:

"With no little scorn and sarcasm, Lenin denounced its care-free behaviour. To him undisciplined sex indulgence was no more edifying than 'drinking from a mud puddle'. Other party leaders like-wise raised their voices in protest against laxity and dissipation."

But the author also tells us that

"The campaign was essentially of a verbal nature. Meanwhile the policy of official Laissez-faire in sex led now and then to sensational forms of hooliganism. In Leningrad for example a crowd of boys collectively raped a girl."

It is clear from this that freedom from sex restraints was understood by the youth of revolution to be a part of the movement, and official connivance confirmed this idea in the minds of these enthusiasts.

For ourselves, we do not blame either these youths or the authorities which adopted the policy of laissez-faire in the matter. As we have noticed there is enough material in the thoughts of the founders of modern Communism to lead the later champions of this cult to this attitude towards sex-life. From our experiences of current politics in this sub-continent we know how a word of indignation uttered by a Hindu leader towards Pakistan leads to murderous assaults by his followers on the innocent Muslims of India. It is a well-known fact of psychology that the faintest idea in the leader assumes the size of a gigantic movement in the followers. This is particularly the case with the baser passions of the human mind.
The restraints that the collective will of a people imposes upon individuals are undoubtedly irksome to the generality of people who are everywhere guided more by impulses than by insight and wisdom. If, therefore, any one with a reputation for leadership in thought drops a hint as to the possibility of a state in which such restraints will be more or less slackened or even altogether removed, such a person is sure to be hailed always as a hero by the more passionate sections of humanity. This is what actually happened in the case of Communism. The fathers of this cult, in their fury against all conventions and their passionate zeal for equality of opportunity, had unconsciously landed themselves in a mood wherein the marriage bond appeared to be as much a shackle as the economic disabilities of capitalistic labour. This is evident from the tone of the Communist Manifesto and the trend or Engel's thoughts on the subject. The chaos in sexual life that prevailed in Russia after the Revolution was undoubtedly inspired by these authorities. It is no wonder, therefore, that, as Mr. Hindus says:

"There were voices of denunciation, loud and fierce, which pointed to the family as the embodiment of the worst evils of Capitalism and deserving annihilation."

It is quite another thing that

"With the end of the civil war the family, wherever it was broken or mangled, started, plant-like, to mend itself—attacks on it continued, now wildly, now vehemently, but again without official sanction and receiving support neither in law nor in the utterance of the men holding power."
But then there was no need for such a sanction; there was enough of it in the literature of the highest authority. If the leaders maintained silence in the matter it was because they realised that discretion was the better part of valour. They found out that Utopian dreams do not accord well with the hard realities of social life. They found out that after all, civilized human traditions and religious codes, were not wholly wrong when they imposed certain restrictions on human volition. It was this experience that made them wiser than the founders of their cult. The laws promulgated in June 26 1936 to regulate sexual relationships were thus:

"So drastic a departure from established and formerly sanctioned, almost sanctified, usage that it shocked the outside liberal world and multitudes of Russians. Abortion were banned completely for the healthy woman birth control remained legal, but the literature on the subject suddenly disappeared from news-stands and bookshops. Divorce was tightened. The post-card system of notifying a divorced husband or wife of the separation was out-lawed. the fee was boosted to fifty roubles for the first divorce, hundred and fifty roubles for the second, three hundred roubles for the third presumably there was to be no fourth divorce."

All this is decidedly a return to sanity and to Islamic standard; the conception of divorce, in particular, will appear to all readers of the Quran, an echo of the Quranic regulation on the subject.

So it boils down to this. Whatever the feelings of impulsive reformers, they are not given the
correct knowledge of human nature. Nor can they set aside the laws of nature in their attempts to mould human nature on new foundations of their own. And even if they try to do so they will be defied and repudiated in practice by their own followers, if these latter happen to be true patriots of their nations. And who knows Marshall Stalin is a patriot of this type!

---

CAPITAL AND CAPITALISM

Christian emotionalism has been responsible for a succession of extremist views on various aspects of life and creation. Any idea that occurs to a brilliant western mind on any such subject is regarded as the last word on the matter concerned and assumes the force of a whirlwind that sweeps everything before it. The latest of these trumpeted truths is the Marxist conception of capital, or to be more precise, of private capital. Thanks to the frightening volume of Karl Marx's *Capital*, a large number of educated men to-day would rather face death than acknowledge any sympathy with private ownership of capital. Any association with the idea of Private Capital is an anathema to these modern minds in the East as well in the West. Because it is believed to be a proven fact that Private Capital is another name for fraudulent robbing of the labourers. The capital, according to Karl Marx, swells and concentrates through what he calls 'surplus value', that is the amount of profit that
should have legitimately gone to labour, but has actually gone to the pocket of the bourgeois Capitalist:

"Our friend Money bags...must buy his commodities at their value, must sell them at their value, and yet at the end of the process must withdraw more value from circulation than he threw into it at starting. These are the conditions of the problem. *Hic Rhodus! hic Salta!* (Capital)

"By turning his money into commodities that seem as the material elements of a new product, and as factors in the labour process, by incorporating living labour with their dead substance, the capitalist at the same time converts value—i.e. past, materialized, and dead labour into Capital value big with value, a live monster that is fruitful and multiplies." (Ibid.)

And yet this fraud and robbery as Karl Marx would call this process is a stage in the evolution of the socio-economic life of humanity:

"We see, therefore, how the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange."

"The bourgeoisie, historically, has played a most revolutionary part."

(Communist Manifesto)

However strange the logic may seem to an unsophisticated man, this fraudulent system of exploitation of labour has been productive of immense good for humanity.

"Modern industry has established the World Market, for which the discovery of America paved the way.
This market has given an immense development to commerce, to navigation, to communication by land."

_{Communist Manifesto._}

"It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian Pyramids, Roman aqueducts and Gothic cathedral; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former exoduses of nations and crusades." {Ibid.}

We take this opportunity of telling the Marxists of the world that while we do not regard Private Capital as such an evil, we Muslims nevertheless consider the present Capitalistic Civilization as a huge deception played on humanity. Thirteen hundred years ago our Holy Prophet saw this age in his vision and was shocked to perceive the evil forces that it was to let loose on the world and warned his followers against these evils. In the language of our Prophet, this whole civilization with all its outward brilliance, deceptions and ugly inside was Dajjal (Anti-Christ). He has described it with a wealth of details that cannot but set any man thinking. We invite all sceptics to see if they are not true to picture. There is, therefore, a world of difference between our appraise-ment of the bourgeois civilization, as Karl Marx would call it and that of Karl Marx himself. Whereas according to him this civilization is a natural development of human history and highly-beneficial to mankind, from the Muslim point of view it is a calamitous event in the history of our species, the marvellous inventions of the physical sciences notwithstanding.

It is remarkable that inspite of his grim, cold,
scientific analysis and theorisings and his ‘scientific,’ appreciation of the achievements of the current Capitalistic economy, the human heart within him has felt the ugliness in the moral and social aspects of this civilization, as is evident from his invectives against the present system, contained in a passage in the Communist Manifesto—an inexplicable departure from his general attitude and tone:

"The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations; it has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors" and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous "Cash Payment." It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasy of religious fervour, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistic calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single unescionable freedom—Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct brutal exploitation."

"The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up to with reverent awe, it has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science into its paid wage-labourers.

"The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation."

Of course, Karl Marx and his comrades and followers can be no authority on previous wages because it is not possible for them to examine the feelings and actual human relationships of people of those times but what they say about the condition of things in their own age can be taken as
and is in fact, correct. The veiled indignation of Karl Marx at the state of affairs he has described, cannot be missed by an intelligent reader. The predominance of money relationship obscuring all other and higher human relations, is not a very desirable state of affairs even in the eyes of the man in Karl Marx. And yet he bases his whole philosophy and economic system on this relationship and has misguided the greater part of the world into thinking that this is a natural order of things and hence the only true order. If it has been done out of vengeance it is all the more deplorable. To play with the actual lives of men and their mutual relationship is neither wise nor humane.

As a matter of fact, the present state of affairs is the result of Christian materialism—a natural reactions to the Christian teachings on extreme other-worldliness. It was really a worldliness with a vengeance and as such rightly regarded by Islam as a calamity for humanity, because Christians being the predominant people they have infected the whole world with their own moral disease. Muslim proposal for the eradication of current evils are accordingly neither fantastic nor subversive of the natural order of society. Muslims still believe that the man who has been endowed by nature with a special gift for the Production of Wealth is also potentially equipped with the moral virtues of nobility and fellow-feeling. It is true that in actual experience we do not find it so, but that is because such men are not provided with the proper culture that
can bring out what is best in them. In any case we do not despair of the natural goodness in human mind and can fully trust the people who are clever at producing wealth for the nation. Of course, we know they are not angles and in the absence of proper guidance they may go wrong socially and morally. But with a proper appeal to their higher consciousness and a suitable guidance for their practical life, these men should be expected to act in a manner beneficial to themselves, to their own nation and to humanity at large. After all, if we cannot agree to believe in a living God, we can at least agree to believe in the wisdom of nature. If nature has picked up certain individuals and bestowed on them the special gift of producing and distributing wealth it does not be seem us to distrust them because of these gifts and to appoint other people arbitrarily to do the job or to make the gifted people slaves of other's views and caprices. Islam, at any rate, cannot think of man as such a despicable creature and nature's selection as so full of mischief. Muslims have a profound faith in nature's wisdom and its order. They, nevertheless, believe in certain guiding principles of action to avoid pitfalls, but this without upsetting the order of nature. They believe that the social and moral evils that attend the present Capitalistic Economic order are due to the non-observance of these principles and rules and that their observance alone are enough to put things right. They do not believe that private capital must necessarily degenerate into an instrument of exploitation and oppression. They believe than even in the
hands of private owners, capital can discharge its expected humanitarian functions, provided, of course, capital is owned by proper men. We mean by men who have real gifts for such ownership and these owners in their turn are guided by principles and rules whose observance is keenly watched by a wakeful society. They also believe that the present system that goes by the name of Capitalistic System is not a natural growth but a lapse and a perversion and that private capital need not and should not have led to it. It is further their conviction that a peaceful self-evolving economic order is that in which private capital is not only allowed but even acknowledged as the foundation of the social order with the proviso that the order is guided and controlled by the Islamic Sharia, which, among other things, categorically bans interest in all forms and insists on a division of such capital at the death of the proprietors among their natural heirs, and which requires the state, a really democratic body, to see to the enforcement of its economic injunctions and to establish economic justice in the society, scrupulously and vigilantly.

It is true, Judaism and Christianity have failed to save the ‘have-nots’ against the exploitations of the ‘haves.’ But that does not mean that Islam should also fail if it is given a chance. In fact, to repudiate the basic economic rules of Islam on the one hand and to assume on the other that all religions have failed to manage the situation, is most unfair to say the least of it.
Muslims, in any case, do not, for a moment, hink that the situation is so hopelessly out of control as to necessitate the abolition of all private ownership of capital, the emergence of large-scale industries notwithstanding. They, on the contrary, feel that private capital and private enterprise are among the best safeguards for individual freedom against the inherent tendency of the state powers towards absolutism.

Capital, in the sense of private capital, therefore instead of becoming a curse for humanity, as it has been at the hands of spiritually bankrupt Jews and Christians, can prove a blessing for it, if properly guided and controlled— that is the Muslim belief and we are looking forward to a time when tired of their vagrancies, the Jewish-Christian block of humanity will also come to see the wisdom of this principle.

But whatever measure of freedom we may allow to private capital, we shall see to it, as we have always done when we controlled the world affairs, that it is never permitted to dominate our politics, national or international.

THE POINT AT ISSUE.
It is an open secret now that while the Western democracies has been able to guarantee their respective peoples freedom of thought, of initiative and of expression, they have not so far been able
to give them an equal guarantee of economic justice and security. It is also becoming more and more evident every day that Soviet Socialism while it has guaranteed to the people under its sway economic security to a large measure, it has miserably failed to assure them freedom of thought and occupation. For this failure of the latter, one need not be in a hurry to condemn its intentions. The very responsibilities which the Soviet type of socialism has taken upon itself is bound to force its hands to acts of violence which appear so odious to us who happen to live outside its zones. Perhaps coercion to the extent of forced labour and concentration camps for unwilling workers, was not so clear in the minds of the early exponents of the Marxist doctrines. These unpleasant developments, however, were bound to take place by the very nature of things. Karl Marx and his fellow-travellers might have meant well with the suffering workers of the world, but it was not given to them to rightly comprehended the manifold workings of the human mind and its essential needs. They failed to see that to relieve a common man of all responsibilities for economic existence would eventually mean encouraging him in indolence.

As the earliest economists had very rightly pointed out, any work that involves the earning of livelihood is distasteful to human nature, because of its monotonous and compulsory nature. Most unfortunately this wisdom of the early economists was lost upon the Marxist thinkers, who in their extravagance of emotionalism thought that
freedom from the anxieties of economic existence would make every man altruistic and idealistic. Hard facts of life have believed this dreamy assumption. Experiences have shown that the spirit of selfishness in man, with all its attending evils, is the only guarantee of efficient and progressive economic efforts. Leave a man to his own resources and he will be found to exert himself to the utmost to make his two ends meet, in the same manner as a man thrown into water will automatically begin to swim or attempt to swim. Props, economic or physical, take away from man the incentive to Struggle. So far as this aspect of the question is concerned, capitalism has got some solid ground under its feet. It rightly believes in the personal responsibilities of every man for his own economic condition and carries this principle further by acknowledging the utility of the spirit of competition in economic efforts. Its error does not lie so much in principle as in its application. Alongside its belief in this principle, if it could just postulate the necessity of some kind of regulation for individual economic efforts and economic competition, it would have been more or less on the right track. The theory of LAISSEZ FAIRE, however, conceived under a wrong emotion, vitiates the whole atmosphere of capitalistic economy.

The idea of absolute freedom which was condemned in every other department of life was, most unfortunately, regarded to be a sound principle for action in the economic field. Most of the ills, social or economic, from which the west-
ern democracies and their satellites have been suffering, are traceable to this ill-conceived theory of absolute freedom of the individual in the economic field. It is really ridiculous that while the users of public roads have some rules to follow, there should be no rules to guide the interminable flow of economic efforts proceeding from millions of men in the same country. It is here that the ship of capitalistic economy has floundered.

But apart from the economic aspect of the question there is also the moral aspect. Laissez faire postulates total absence of responsibility on the part of the rich for the poor. The rigid idea of supply and demand and of exhausting all responsibilities with the payment of wages to the labourers, has been responsible, among other things for the social chaos which has provided the communists with their pet slogans.

Prejudice dies hard, and so does the obstinacy of social opinion. Opinions once formed and acted upon assume the appearance of infallible truths, whatever the troubles and miseries they may bring in their train. It is not always selfishness that blurs the human vision in this way. More often than not, self-interest would advise a different course of action. In the case under consideration, if among other things, capitalistic economy, both social and political, would just, acknowledge its human obligation to the poor, over and above those dictated by the law of supply and demand in the field of labour, it would very easily cut the ground from under
the feet of communism. It is, indeed, a sad commentary on our religious faith and liberal democratic thought, that we should not be prepared to consider our less talented fellow-human beings as more than mere factors of production and distribution and that a grossly materialistic philosophy armed with dangerous political powers, should have to give us a lesson in fellow feeling at this late hour of the day. It is better late, however, than never.

Communism will feed, clothe and house every man and woman at the cost of his or her freedom, in view of its thoughtless undertaking and the constitution of human mind being what it is, it could not do otherwise. But can we, believers in private capital, decently look after our poor people while maintaining them in their freedom of occupation and though? That is the real issue before civilized humanity to-day.

After the experience of labour concentration camps in Russia, we think the idea of charity, in its original higher sense, will not appear so nauseating to our proletariat as it used to do before the Soviet experiments. Yes, an appeal to our sense of human obligations and a suitable response to it, can even now set things right. In a free race of economic life, however well-regulated, there must be accidents, some of them even disastrous. A section of people may be left without resources, either for their own faults or for some body else's faults or for no fault of any one. Individually and collectively, we owe a human
duty to this section. They are our own flesh and blood, and since we believe in soul, they must be possessing the same soul as ours. And for all we know out of these may appear persons who will one day prove our temporal and spiritual leaders. So, far from leaving them to starve in their helplessness, we should do our utmost to enable them to stand on their own legs in their full human honour and dignity.

This, of course, presupposes an active religious emotion. And if Christian emotion has not proved quite so active in this regard, religious emotion as such should not be regarded as having failed. There is still the Islamic religious emotion to be tried. Indeed, the balanced principles, the elaborate economic regulations and the past achievements of this religion—all suggest its possibility of success when all other systems have failed. What strikes a student of this religion, however, at first sight, is that it wonderfully combines individualism with collectivism, freedom with discipline, economic motive with a sense of moral obligations, in its code of life, and that its history is the only one, wherein economic classes have never been so scandalously exclusive and so hopelessly at war with one another.

The question for a Muslim, therefore, is not which of the two western economic systems to applaud. They both stand condemned at the bar of Muslim opinion. The one may be more dangerously wrong than the other but neither of them promises any solution to the present problems. Freedom of thought and action is the fundamental
spiritual right of a human being. But living in this world of matter, as we do, security of our economic existence is equally important. Can they both go together? Both the western systems have given in practice as well as in theory, a negative answer to this question. Islam, its prophet and its past history, however, reply it in the affirmative. Will the contending parties in the present world give them a chance to prove the truth of their assertion?

MORAL—NOT ECONOMIC

He must have been an extremely shallow-thinking and self-conceited man who claimed that “social science is knowable,” meaning that he himself was able to find out through his own intelligence and observation of relevant facts, the law governing social psychology and behaviour. He was too superficial an observer to realise that human social action is mostly inspired and influenced by emotions, of which the laws are too subtle to be discovered by man through the dim light of his empirical knowledge. A sounder thinking would have made him realise that it needs a super-mind and a higher light than empirical reasoning, to ascertain the correct laws that govern social psychology and human social actions.

The presumptuous attempt to find out these laws by unaided human reasoning has resulted in our day in the much-vaunted theory advertised
In the world as dialectical materialism. The gist of the theory is that the social history of man is but a history of continuous struggle between the economic classes and that with this material fact as foundation there have grown up from time to time different cultural systems at different periods of history. The underlying suggestion is that the people of lower economic grades are at perpetual war with the people of higher economic grades. The implication of this theory is that people with lesser amenities of life must in the very nature of things bear an undying hatred towards those with better amenities. Apparently, it is quite a plausible theory, but a closer scrutiny will expose its hollowness. But before we proceed to the philosophical aspects of its untenability we may be excused for showing its absurdity in actual practice.

Communism, acquiring political power in Soviet Russia, proposed to do away, consistently with this theory, with all inequalities of economic resources. After thirty years, however we find these interesting enthusiasts turning round and telling the world that the existence in Russia of multimillionaires is an evidence of Soviet anxiety to give every man his due. In a plainer language a man is entitled to a greater or less amount of the means of material existence according as he is endowed by nature by a greater or a smaller capacity for earning them.

It is very interesting to note that these believers in a perpetual war between economic classes have developed within this short period the wis-
dom of acknowledging the endowments of nature. And here collapses like a house of cards, the whole theory of class-war. Because once you admit nature's endowments as the basis of your judgment of people's deserts, you indirectly challenge the correctness of the theory of class-hatred and class-war. Because, the implication of this theory is that the inequalities of material possessions is contrary to the law of nature and hatred or war is only a reaction to this unnatural order of things. Once you admit, however, that the wealth acquisitive power is different in different men by the very nature of things, you cannot in the same breath avow your faith in the theory that the acquisition by different men of different measure of wealth is not in accordance with the scheme of nature.

Evidently, the present position taken up by Soviet Russia in this regard, is a return to sanity and is undoubtedly a reversal of the whole idea underlying its slogan of class-war. It is really not difficult to understand that the best that man can do to bring about a peaceful and happy order of society is to follow the design of nature. It does not lie in the power of man to create a scheme of his own. When nature has gifted different men and women with different kinds of genius in different measures for the acquisition of wealth, all we need to do is to give a free scope to these gifts of nature for unhindered expression. Unfortunately this is not generally done. By artificial means man wants to perpetuate his own affluence or of his family or of his clan or of his nation. Here originates the trouble which has been wrongly
diagnosed by Karl Marx and his followers as economic class-war. In reality the hatred of one class against another shows itself and assumes a destructive form only when the classes cease to be natural ones and are supported by immoral and artificial props. It is only when social structure is so reared on fraudulent measures, and devices and not before that that one economic class begins to hate the other. The basis of hatred therefore is not economic as suggested by Karl Marx but moral.

Where Karl Marx seems to have stumbled is when he fails to see the distinction between natural economic grades and the unnatural ones. He also seems to have failed to see that the difference of economic possessions is as varied as the number of men in the world. In other words, no two men are alike in such possession. Should therefore each man be at war with the other? This is absurd on the very face of it. The fact is that each man, while he may feel uneasy to see another man possessing a thing which he does not, is more or less satisfied with what comes to his share as the full measure of what he is entitled to by his gifted powers and capacity for work. Such uneasiness as he may experience when he compares his own lot with those of others is of an ephemeral type and is incapable of creating that organised struggle which ends in the replacement of one class of people by another in the rulership of a country.

The truth of this assertion of ours may be verified by a reference to corresponding facts in other
aspects of our existence. We never find, for example, a league of ugly people united against the handsome ones. Even the ugliest man or woman finds some sort of beauty in his or her own self. Again, for all we know, people with ugly faces and features may very well be expected to enjoy the sight of handsome faces and shapely figures. This clearly shows that there is always to be found in the human mind a substantial satisfaction with the allotments of nature and no perceptible heartburning is to be expected on that account in any quarter. And man’s economic existence should be no exception to this rule.

The flames of class-hatred which have been sedulously fanned by Karl Marx and his disciples must, therefore, have their origin not in the economic inequalities arising out of nature’s allotments but in something else. And we assert with all the emphasis at our command that this something is of a moral nature.

STATE AND NATIONAL ECONOMY.

The conclusion created the economic world by the intensive and extensive communist propaganda has brought the question of state responsibility for National economy to the forefront every where in the world. The Muslim world unfortunately is no exception. And it will be no exaggeration to say that inspite of the most rational code in their hands in the form of the Qur’an and the most tried social system in which they live,
our Muslim political thinkers, even some best of them, are found to-day to be more or less nervous on this question. The practical surrender of Christianity before the onslaughts of communist philosophy is to a great extent responsible for this unsettled condition of Muslim economic thought. It is undeniable that the Muslim Press, reflecting as it does the leading minds, has been showing a more or less defeatist attitude on the question of Communism. Some of our best newspapers are decidedly in favour of that pernicious cult. In view of this general nervousness it is not a little heartening to see a widely read English daily of Lahore to conclude its editorial on the Jagirdari System with the following remark:

"While making every provision for the maintenance of a decent standard of living for the common man and for the removal of ignorance, poverty and disease, Islam does not put any limit on man's wealth acquisitive capacity."—C. & M. Gazette.

This statement is very courageous indeed and breathes a faith in the soundness of Islamic social principles, which unfortunately has become very rare in these days. It is a timely reminder to the Muslims that they should have that conviction about their tried and rational principles which the Communists have in their own ram-shackle and illusive creed and system.

With all its merits as an affirmation of the right Muslim attitude towards this most burning question of our day, the statement quoted needs certain clarifications to avoid possible misunder
standings. It is true that Islam puts no limit to the quantity of wealth a man may acquire through his own ability and efforts. But it is equally true that Islam has a large number of restrictions imposed upon the manner of acquiring such wealth. It has as many don’ts as do’s in its instructions for earning. The do’s are called Halal in Islam, and don’ts, are known as Haram. A Muslim accordingly has to decide at every opportunity for earning wealth, whether the method presenting itself is Halal or Haram. And as every Muslim knows, the Haram methods are practically as numerous as the Halal ones. To start with, any earning that comes through interest and usury is unlawful in Islam. Then one is forbidden to trade in forbidden things and the number of these is quite large. Further, it is forbidden to adopt unfair means in trade or to trade in a manner that is harmful to the nation or to humanity at large, such as adulteration, dumping and under-selling in competition. It may be said that Non-Musiim societies as well regard certain methods of earnings as improper and impose legal restrictions on them. We must not forget, however, that in societies not Islamic such legal restrictions have no religious sanction behind them, or even if there is some sort of sanction it is rather vague and of a general nature. In Islam the case is quite different. While the Qur’an lays down principles of general behaviour in every department of life, including trade and commerce, the Holy Prophet gives the details of their application by his actions and rulings. It may be further objected that even if such rules do exist in Islam, their value should be of a spiritual and moral
nature and should not constitute any basis for legislation or police action. Herein is a misunderstanding which must be removed to make the Muslim attitude towards national economy definite and clear. Islam, unlike Christianity, can never countenance *laissez-faire* policy either in the production or in the distribution of wealth. It is true that in the days of the Prophet no punishment was awarded on economic crimes. But it is a well-known fact that the Prophet stopped every such improper conduct on the spot. In his own time the Prophet’s word was enough to stop any action, private or public. The prohibition of wine, for example did not need any promulgation of law or any executive action. In later times, however, a whole legal system had to be devised and a whole executive was employed to see the enforcement of Islamic prohibitions. Take the case of a domestic dispute. A husband keeps his wife in suspension. In the Prophet’s time, his asking the man to release the woman was enough to settle the question. In our days, the woman, for all we know, may have to go through an elaborate legal proceeding and may even need police help to secure an honourable release and exit from her husband’s house. What applies to these other kinds of misbehaviour must of necessity apply to economic crimes.

Economic acts that are condemned by God and His Prophet must form an important basis for Islamic legislation, due regard being paid to the peculiar needs of a particular time. The economic crimes must be taken cognizance of in the same way as other crimes against individuals and the
society. Indeed, one fails to understand why a black-marketeer, a profiteer, a callous hoarder, a tyrannically exacting landlord, a man running a gambling house, a Muslim brewer, if such there be, and a maker of counterfeit coins and a forger of documents should not be treated as equally liable in the eyes of the Islamic law.

And what applies to the earning of money should also apply to its disposal. The Book of God and the rulings of the Prophet lay down quite a large number of restrictions on the rights of the individual to the disposal of the money earned and these can very well serve as a basis for relevant legislation. For example, a man of substance squandering his wealth on a dancing girl or some demoralising art or on luxury dogs and horses, should be liable to be punished in the same way as a man offering bribe to a government servant or committing similar acts calculated to disturb the orderliness of society.

It is high time Muslims had realised that there is a world of difference between the basic Christian approach to the question of National Economy and that of the Muslims. While our Christian friends can think only of two extreme views of the question viz., absolute freedom of individuals in matters of production and distribution, otherwise known as laissez-faire or the ownership of the same vested entirely in the government, otherwise known as nationalisation of production and distribution, Muslims can think of a via media in this depart-
ment of life as in any other. Muslims are neither for absolute freedom in the matter of production and distribution, otherwise known as laissez-faire or the ownership of the same vested entirely in the government, otherwise known as nationalisation of production and distribution. They are neither for absolute freedom in the matter of production and distribution nor for the total abolition of private ownership in such matters. The Christian mind unused to legal restrictions because of the very nature of its religious creed, seems incapable of thinking of restricted freedom and of state responsibility for private conduct, even if it has a bearing on the collective life of the society. Discarding law as a curse at the very beginning of its religious history, Christianity has always had a dread for restrictions on individual actions. The laissez-faire policy was a natural corollary of this Christian outlook on life. Those, however, who could break the bonds of religious thinking and had courage enough to take stock of solid facts of existence were forced again by their Christian tradition to go to the other extreme of advocating state ownership of all property. A classical example of this peculiar trend of Christian thought is to be found in the following statement of the great English thinker and writer John Stuart Mill, at one time a great advocate of laissez-faire:

"If, therefore, the choice were to be made between Communism with all its chances and the present state of society with all its sufferings and injustices; if the institution of private property necessarily carried with it as a consequence that the produce of labour should be apportioned as we now
see it, almost in an inverse ratio, the largest portions to those who have never worked at all, the next largest to those whose work is nominal, and so in a descending scale, the remuneration dwindling as the work grows harder and more disagreeable, until the most fatiguing and exhausting bodily labour cannot count with certainty on being able to earn even the necessaries of life; if this or Communism were the alternative, all the difficulties, great or small, of Communism, would be but as dust in the balance."

(Mill’s *Principle*, B. II, Ch. 53.)

An attitude typical of Christian culture and herein lies the tragedy of Christian Economic history. No believer in any forbidden food and drink or any religious law of social behaviour, a Christian is temperamentally unfit to believe in any forbidden method of producing wealth. He is either for recklessly adopting any method of earning that comes handy or leave the whole question of production of wealth to be handled by the State in any manner it likes. The Muslim attitude towards this question is entirely different. He knows that freedom of production and distribution, in the manner in which it has been permitted to work, has brought into being a horrible state of affairs in the world. But he is also aware that this is due to some serious defects in the Christian social conscience and in the Christian view of State responsibilities. No believer in State ownership of the means of production, a Muslim still holds the State ultimately responsible for all economic maladjustments and consequent iniquities, just as it holds it responsible for all other irregulari-
ties of social relationships. The State, according to the Islamic conception of it, should prevent and cure all economic diseases that may make their appearance from time to time, and this without robbing the private man of all freedom of private enterprise. There may be any amount of supervision, guidance and control in the field of economic production and distribution, but no abolition of the system of private enterprise. Economic crimes may be punished with any amount of severity as the exigency of the time may dictate, but the right of private enterprise as such should be left untouched.

The State in Islam, therefore, has a dual responsibility—the regulation and maintenance of peace in the field of economic relationships and safeguarding the right of the individual citizen of freedom of economic enterprise.

It is high time Muslims had shaken their minds free of all nervousness in this regard and courageously proclaimed their own independent economic ideology to a world, dazed and excited over this very question.

---

A STUDY IN COMPARISON

Marxism presents not only a scheme for the production and distribution of national wealth as is generally supposed but also offers a whole system of life together with its philosophy. As such it very much resembles a religious code of life. Hence it is that it is determined to overthrow all
other religious systems existing in the world. Its creed is accepted as dogmatically by its adherents as a religious creed is believed unquestioningly by its followers. It is a Godless religion, one may say, possessing all the features of a religion minus the God idea and spiritual life. All men of religion, therefore, justly regard it as a menace to the religious faith of humanity.

There are two parts of this movement that stand quite distinct from one another. One is its appeal in the name of suffering humanity together with an analysis of the present ills of human social life; and the other is its philosophy of life and formulation of rules for the social conduct of man. So far as the former is concerned it receives almost universal response from all right thinking men and from the masses of suffering humanity of our time. But like every other man-made creed and scheme of false prophets its diagnosis of and prescription for these evils, is not only erroneous but even fatal to the social existence of man. We propose here to take Marx's philosophy of life and the principles of social existence, he enunciates, one by one and test them on the crucible of facts and rules of sound thinking.

It goes without saying that although Karl Marx denies the existence of God and spiritual life, he attributes to the earth and what man makes out of its products, certain powers which have throughout been attributed by men of religion to the spiritual God in heaven. For example he says:

"In the social production which men carry on
(i.e., in the production of the material values necessary to the life of men) they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material forces of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society—the real foundation on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness.” (Critique of Political Economy).

Evidently Karl Marx credits the material forces of production with an evolution and self-unfoldment, which, to him, is the creator of the evolving legal, political, cultural and moral sense in man. In a way, the self-developing material forces of production may be regarded in the light of Karl Marx’s theory as the demi-gods of man and his destiny if not his actual creator. How far this conception of the mother earth differs from the heathen conception of the goddess earth it is difficult to ascertain. But more of it later on.

It is, however, not only in this that Karl Marx’s creed approximates religion—allbeit a perverted religion—but in some other doctrines of his pseudo-religion also which he offers to the world as scientific truths, he has only borrowed from recognised religious sources. For instance, he believes along with Hegel that history is no mere jumble of isolated facts, but a series of systematised inter-connected phenomena produced by a set of immutable laws. While believing and preaching this idea of history
the Marxists forget that they are preaching an idea distinctly Qur'anic in origin, because before the revelation of this book no one ever conceived of history in this way. It is a recurring burden of the Holy Qur'an that the rise and fall of nations and civilisations are caused by certain laws which are as immutable in their operation as the laws of physical nature.

Next comes the idea of evolution in the social life of man. This also is a Qur'anic idea that never occurred to the mind of man before the revelation of this book. It is implied in the master attribute of God in the Qur'an, viz., Rabbul Alamîn, i.e., Evolver of the Nations.

It is suggested by another verse of the Holy Qur'an which speaks of God replacing one of His signs by another like it or better than it. (The Holy Qur'an Chapter 2 v. 196).

The word Ayat or sign, as used by the Holy Qur'an in this verse, means not only a scripture or a phenomenon of nature but also a turning point, a phase or a decisive event history. So the idea underlying is that there is a systematic evolution and no regression in the social history of man. Thus, directly or indirectly this idea of social evolution of man as propounded by western philosophers is evidently borrowed from the Qur'an. But here we must guard against a common error. There are phases in this history which apparently go against this doctrine and seem to encourage a contrary view. For example, the present state of affairs in the
world would make one feel as if humanity is going back to its primitive barbarism wherein each man’s hand was against all. The fact, however, is that just as in the case of the physical body of man, in the social evolution of mankind there are occasional jerks and set-backs, in the same way as there are accidents and illnesses in the case of human body. Just as at the onslaught of a serious illness a man may appear as almost dead and yet on recovery he quietly and invariably proceeds to the next stage of his evolutionary journey, similarly the human society at times looks as if it has finished its course of life and is going down to annihilation but after every such tribulation it starts afresh for an advanced stage in its evolutionary course. The present state of humanity with all its gloomy prospects is a temporary set-back of this nature preceding a fresh march towards the destination. The Qur’an likens such periods to the dry season of the physical nature which precedes the rainy season and which sees the end of all life in the vegetable world. Such like suggestions of the Holy Qur’an may even to-day widen the vision and add to the knowledge of a Marxist philosopher.

The next rung in the ladder of Marxist system of philosophy is the idea of dialectics in history. Following Hegel, Karl Marx believes that everywhere a new situation or phenomenon appears as a result of the struggle between two opposites or contradictions—in other words all evolutions come as a kind of reconciliation between two opposing forces, ideas or systems. One of these forces is called thesis, in the terminology of this philosophy, the
other one, i.e., the opposing one is termed *antithesis*, and a third one which appears as a reconciliation between the two previous ones and brings into being a new condition of things has been given the name of *synthesis*. Here also no Muslim will find anything contrary to the spirit and teachings of Islam. The idea of opposites working together at the basis of all life, existence and progress is the recurring burden of the Holy Qur'an. The book repeatedly draws on our attention to the alternation of the day and the night, to the successive changes of season, and to the struggle between life and death—and all this to bring the corresponding laws of social humanity within the grasp of our understanding. So this high sounding law of dialectics is also no peculiar discovery of Marx and accordingly no Muslim has anything to quarrel with him on this score.

We may say before we proceed further that it is because of these elements of religious truths embodied in the Marxist/philosophy and not because of the errors it contains that it has appealed so strongly to a very big section of thinking humanity. But now we come to the parting of the ways.

We are afraid neither in his idea of evolution nor in what he calls dialectics, can one find any support for his doctrine of revolution or class-war, because evolution necessarily implies a gradual and peaceful advancement with the continuity of identity, and the dialectic process also as observed in nature, i.e., the law of struggle between two opposites ending in a reconciliatory
third phenomenon, is no revolutionary or cataclysmic process as our Marxist friends would have us believe. Here Karl Marx seems to be a victim of that psychological confusion expressed in the proverb, “wish is the father of thought.” Opposites do struggle in nature to produce ever newer phenomena but without any violent out-burst of any kind. So while approving his theories of evolution and dialectics, we Muslims strongly disapprove of Karl Marx’s doctrine of class-war and violent revolutions since it is not only unscientific but also runs counter to his two other theories. Ths most that can be said of such occasional outbursts in human history is that these are an indication of a serious ailment or abnormal state in the social health of humanity. They are what a cyclone or an earthquake is to the physical nature. As Muslims or followers of the religion of peace we are rather concerned with the normal and peaceful laws of nature than with these extraordinary out-bursts.

Reverting to Marxian dialectics we are tempted to ask our Marxist friends a question—viz. How are we to apply this principle to the present conflict of social ideologies? The existing order viz., Capitalism is evidently a thesis of their terminology. Now what position are we to allocate to Communism? Are we or are we not to regard it as anti-thesis? Obviously it is this ideology which constitutes the opposing force and is the very negation of Capitalism. If this is not Anti-thesis what then is the Anti-thesis of the Capitalistic ideology? We have, moreover, yet to find out the third item of the trio, viz., synthesis. Evidently Communism
can not be both the Anti-thesis and the Synthesis. We Muslims rightly believe therefore that Islam is the synthesis between Capitalism and Communism. But let a third party be called to witness. Professor Gibb the author of Whither Islam says:—

"Within the Western world Islam still maintains the balance between exaggerated opposites. Opposed equally to the anarchy of European materialism and the regimentation of Russian Communism, it has not yet succumbed to that obsession with the economic side of life which is characteristic of present-day Europe and present-day Russia alike." (Whither Islam?).

Then he quotes Professor Massignon of Paris University, a Roman Catholic by faith, as saying:—

"Islam is hostile to unrestricted exchange, to banking capital, to state loans, to indirect taxes on objects of prime necessity; but it holds to the rights of the father and the husband, to private property, and to commercial capital. Here again it occupies an intermediate position between the doctrines of bourgeois Capitalism and Bolshevik Communism."

We need hardly add anything to this observation. The synthesis is noticed even by outside observers.

Let us now proceed no examine Karl Marx's peculiar doctrine of the materialistic interpretation of history to which we have already referred in passing. According to him the foundation of human social life is not to be found in the emotions and
idealism of man but in his economic urges. In plain words, the structure of society is based first and last on the economic needs of man. Of course, in a very doleful tone he speaks of this as a peculiar evil of modern times and holds the capitalistic system responsible for it. We find for example the follow-passage in the Communist Manifesto, a joint work of Marx and his friend Engels:

"It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious enthusiasm, of phylestine sentimentalism, in the icy cold water of egotistical calculation."

But unfortunately with all this apparent solicitude for these values of life, instead of attempting to redeem them Karl Marx has proceeded to regulate and systematise this process to make it a permanent feature of human social life. Believing as he does in the economic urge of life as the basic social urge he could not do otherwise. It is interesting, however, as we have seen, that Karl Marx does not stop here. He attributes evolution not to the mind of man but to the economic conditions of living, which to him is a self-unfolding primal force. And here he exposes the error of his judgment. He forgets there are nations still existing in the world, like the Hindus, the Jews and the Chinese, who after having attained a sufficiently high level of this economic evolution, have gone back to the primitive stages and have been staying there for centuries without any attempt to move forward. So this theory of a steady evolution supposed to be inherent in the economic conditions of living or mode of production, as Marx likes to call
it, falls to the ground. Had Marx been given a deeper insight into the social history of man, he would have found that there are other and higher laws at work than his much-vaunted economic laws to determine the course of this history. The Quran points to these laws when it repeatedly says:

"Then travel in the land and see what has been the end of those who have given the lie to the truth."

In other words it is the rejection or acceptance of the moral and spiritual values of life that retards or accelerates the social progress of a nation. And the whole force of the argument of facts would seem to lie on the side of the Quran and none whatsoever on that of Marx.

A similar analysis would reveal the true nature of the other pet theory of Marx, viz., class struggle producing social evolution. We agree there is a kind of class struggle involved in this process but it is not a struggle between the economic classes of Marx but between a degenerate class of rulers and those who are fitted by nature to supplant them. There is absolute democracy in the providence of God in the disposal of rulership as in His other gifts. By the very nature of things no particular class ever holds monopoly of this honour. All classes are given a chance by rotation. As the Qur'an would put it:

"These days We bring by rotation to different classes of people."
It is the operation of this rule of moral and intellectual fitness to rule that brought about the present regime in Russia. As all students of Marxism know Karl Marx's theory of social evolution has been disproved by the Russian Revolution. According to this theory every nation must pass, step by step, through the various stages of economic evolution as defined by him—viz., serfdom, feudalism, capitalism and lastly socialism. According to this schedule and Marx's prophecy, Great Britain and America having attained a very high degree of Capitalistic order should have, among all nations, been the first to experience the Socialistic revolution in their systems. Russia on the other hand, being still at the feudal stage at the end of the first world war should have headed for Capitalism before it could have been fit for such a revolution. But belying all these expectations of Marx while Great Britain and America continued to be the foremost capitalistic countries, Russia all of a sudden jumped overhead to the socialistic stage. The Marxists are ill at ease to explain this startling aberration of their law. The fact is that it was the extreme unworthiness and corruption of the administrators and priests and the extreme backwardness of political life in Russia, in the midst of progressive administrative machineries and advanced political consciousness of the surrounding nations, that caused this startling change in the Russian political life.

It was the working of moral and social impulses in man, and not that of the economic factors of life as Marx would have us believe, that was at the back
of this revolution. The political situation in Russia in relation to world conditions demanded a change of rulers and in the method of administration and this took place irrespective of the economic conditions of living and the course of evolution supposed to be inherent in it. And by a strange irony of fate, duped by the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat as forged by Karl Marx, the Russian revolutionaries have fastened on the neck of their nation the same chains of autocracy as was its lot to bear in the hated Tsarist regime. This deceptive theory needs a little analysis in passing. Dictatorship of the proletariat is an anomalous nomenclature. Since by its very nature, dictatorship requires one man's will to dominate the whole population. The whole mass of people can not possibly wield the power of dictatorship. There must of necessity be two parties in a dictatorship—the one is to dictate and the other to be dictated. Obviously the dictatorship has to be vested in one person supposed to be representing the mass of the proletariat, who in their turn are to receive the dictation. It is necessary to remember in this connection that all autocracies have their rise in this formula. The first autocrats in every state are supposed to represent the popular will. So by their very constitution the Communists are laying the foundation of an absolute despotism and this coupled with their own peculiar scheme of state production and distribution of national wealth, sets the stage, as we shall presently see, for a return of the society to the stage of unredeemed serfdom.

It is a well-known fact that Karl Marx is for
the total abolition of private enterprise and private capital, which include not only money used for this purpose but also instruments of production. It is really strange that while the founder of Communism sees the root of all freedom in the economic freedom of man, he places the individual man in abject dependence on the State in the matter of production, so much so that his very livelihood is in a way to be doled out by it. This combined with the fact that a Communist state is to be a dictatorship makes the position of the individual man exactly the same as it was the case in the age of serfdom and even worse in some respects. Because under the latter system the serf had not only his right to his own consumer’s goods but was also guaranteed his inalienable attachment to the tract of land the cultivated.

In order to justify his proposed abolition of private capital from the world, Karl Marx had to propound his famous theory of surplus value by which he designates all profits accruing from commercial capital. This latter again is buttressed by another theory of his invention known as the labour theory of value, which in a nut-shell means that the entire value of a thing demanded and supplied in the market, is in reality meant for the economic maintenance of that amount of human labour which has been consumed by the commodity upto the point of its final disposal and that the part of the value which is carried away by the manufacturer or the tradesman as profit should have in justice gone to the labourers concerned and this profit-making business is thus at bottom an act of mis-appropriation or exploitation on the part of the said
manufacturer or tradesman. If, however, one analyses the labour theory itself one will find that in propounding it Karl Marx has only taken the supply side of the question into consideration and has ignored the demand side altogether. Obviously there are cases where an extraordinary demand alone creates the value of a thing because the supply involves no labour whatsoever. The case of antiques is one in point.

We Muslims, are, therefore, neither for absolute freedom of trade nor for the total abolition of private capital and this in the interest of both the economic and political freedom of the individual man. The State may and should enact laws to maintain this via-media and the code of Islam has many suggestions for it, but it should never shirk the responsibility of a guardian for each and all living under its sway, nor should it assume the rule of God in this matter.

In speaking of the rule of God we are reminded of the Communist claim in the beginning to give, “To each according to his needs,” which had later to be modified and reduced to the less arrogant slogan, “To each according to his work.” Experience taught the early enthusiasts how utterly impossible it was to ascertain the real needs of each individual person in their endless multiplicity and variety. We hope some more experience will make them realise before long that to decide the exact share of wealth due to every worker is equally impossible, humanly speaking and that one has to leave a big margin for the invisible forces of nature to adjust things in the economic life of man
—forces which Karl Marx would perhaps ascribe to the material factors of life but which people of religion would ascribe to a being who is above both matter and mind and who in their view is responsible for the creation of both and whom they call God. Speaking from the intellectual plane one may say that much has to be left to the cultivated good sense of man and the free play of natural human instincts, which should not be condemned as is done in Christianity and impliedly in Marxism as the source of nothing but evil for the social welfare of man.

We may state in passing that while offering Islam to our Marxist friends as a fulfilment of Marxism we are asking them to consider a proposition that is not in any way contrary to their own view of historical evolution. Because they also believe in humanity recovering an ideal state, *viz.* primitive communism, which is supposed to have existed in the distant past and which was lost by some unknown catastrophe. If challenged by anyone that this return to the past runs counter to the theory of evolution the Marxists’ only possible reply would be that the future Communistic State would differ from the past one in colour and complexion. We Muslims would say the same thing in regard to revived Islam. As a matter of fact, our position in this respect is far stronger than that of the Marxists, because the first age of Islam is a broad day light fact of history which takes one only thirteen hundred years back, whereas primitive Communism, if it, actually existed, has practically passed into a legend.

One word more and we have finished. Inspite of Karl Marx’s view that mind is the creation of
matter it was his mind that produced the communist system. But have our Marxist friends ever considered that although the mind of man is capable of discovering the laws working in the world of matter for the discovery of its own laws it needs a higher and superior consciousness? After all, it is not for nothing that all hitherto known societies ascribe their respective origins to some sort of revealed code. Revelation in fact is the working of the supermind, detecting the laws of human mind, that determine the course of social history of man inspite of all that Karl Marx may say to the contrary. Thus while Marxism is a product of human mind, Islam is the product of revelation. And it is remarkable that while the one has all the marks of bitterness and confusion characteristic of a struggling human mind and is a creed of naked violence, the other carries with it the peace and serenity of a supermind approaching the subject of life with a calm confidence, a perfect clarity of vision and love for the ignorant and the erring. It is worthwhile to recall here in passing that the Christian West had wrongly and unjustly accused the sinless prophet of Islam of violence. The sin of this blasphemy seems to have recoiled on it in the form of Communism which is avowedly a creed of ruthless violence. Let the Christians take heed of this irony and let the Marxist also ponder. And if a Marxist has any misgiving as to the reality of the very phenomenon of revelation he should do well to devote some time to the study of the life and work of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad—the founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam and a contemporary and highly intellectual witness of this phenomenon.