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PREFACE

THIS concerns you, readers, as much as myself. The subject of this booklet gave me considerable food for thought about a year ago, because I realized that it concerned the salvation of human liberty, which was, and is, being jeopardized by representatives of certain political theories that do not square up into Islamic conceptions concerning the inalienable rights of man.

It was, then during the past years that I thought it well to write up some of my thoughts, and a record of what I had learned from various authorities to whom I had referred in order to clarify my own understanding of knotty points.

Now I find, on looking over my effort, prior to publication, that there is something to be added, so I have made the additions in the most convenient form by revising certain paragraphs to include the new matter.

Now again, I repeat THIS concerns you vitally and urgently. You cannot omit taking thought on this problem, and you cannot, for your souls sake, and the sakes of those near and dear to you, afford to neglect it.

This short study, I hope, may assist your own efforts to an understanding of your position in relation to the matters with which I have dealt.

Lahore:  

A. W. BATTERSBEY.
FOREWORD

Major A. W. Battersbey is a versatile British Muslim writer and is at present working as Assistant Editor of the Civil & Military Gazette, Lahore, a well known English daily of Pakistan. His life has been a life of diverse phases and activities which has enriched his mind and has given him greater insight into the problems facing the world to-day. A part of his life has been spent in army and police. In this connection he served in France, Germany, Italy, North Africa, Iraq, India, China, etc. The political, cultural and religious life of the Middle East and these other countries is an open book for him and he has played his own part in it.

His literary career too is an interesting study in itself. He has written on a host of subjects and every aspect of life. Upto 1920 he was the senior editor of the United States Foreign Broadcasting Service in Mediterranean area. He was the sponsor of the Sphinx, Cairo and was the literary editor of the Egyptian Gazette and the Egyptian Mail.

His knowledge and mastery of different languages has helped him a lot in understanding the peculiar characteristics of nations he has come into contact with and this makes him quite at home when he comes to discuss about Russian way of living and thinking.
At my request he has handed over this valuable article on *Islam and Communism* for publication. The subject calls for the attention of the whole Muslim World and I hope Major A. W. Battersbey’s contribution will be appreciated by all, and the point that he makes *viz.*, the incompatibility between Communism and Islam will be recognised.

28th July, 1951

S. M. TUFAIL.
The world is in such a state of chaos that it behoves all thinking men to take bearings and set a course towards peace, before they are driven to the abyss of political destruction.

The reactions from the exertions, fears and sufferings of the war years are still with us. Our power of feeling or caring beyond the immediate questions of our own material well-being is temporarily eclipsed. The great events outside our own direct experience and the most dreadful anticipations cannot move us.

Too many people, possessed of inadequate knowledge or wisdom are trying to solve other people’s natural and economic problems and they have no time or inclination to have a care for their own.

The second world war has already faded into a past of 6 years but its effects are still with us like that other world war that is as “a war to end war” and failed to do so. The last world war was to stabilize the earth once the Schikelgruber crowds of Nazis and the Italian Duces, Fascists were overcome. But our troubles are not over because the shadow of the Kremlin still hangs over the world.

We have been moved already beyond endurance, and need rest. Never in the lifetime of men now living has the universal element in the soul of man burnt so dimly.

Let us premise to the following remarks that Islam is the only religion that has ever offered to mankind a real equality. We shall attempt to justify this statement later.
Now, all socialistic criticism, from Karl Marx (Mordechai) onwards, has protested against the inequality of economic power between the different sections of the community. Under the Soviet Communist regime, an attempt is made to face the situation by the abolition of all private property, the national ownership of industry and the communizing of all social activities.

Soviet Communism aims at the removal of all incentive and opportunity for individual and business saving on a competitive basis, and the increased efficiency of industry by its methods over all methods that involve private enterprise.

The first moral objection to Communism, apart from all question of its workability, is its dependence upon force, not only in its inception, but for its maintenance.

Setting out to destroy the Capitalistic Order, it sees no hope of success in any other means than compulsion. The subjugation of the minds and bodies of men to Communist theory and practice.

Revolutions necessarily involve a certain ruthlessness, and the Communist leaders believe that force must be used, it is an inevitable concomitant of their system. They urge that the possessing classes will never voluntarily surrender their privileges.

In answer to the objection that force is not a desirable way by which to achieve their ends, they retort that Force is equally used in the Capitalist system. They can see nothing but hypocrisy in those who use force, as they say, for the maintenance of social inequality and then profess themselves to be horror-
stricken at its use for the maintenance of social equality. But however they may return the tu quoque on us in this matter, all history is a declaration that a foreshortened view of life, with a man-centred and man-determined world, cannot give an abiding social order.

Communism's false ends and false motives, with confining of ideals to this life's span ignoring such things as reverence for human personality can only work out a greater evil than that which it tries to remove.

A large part of our case is that our present troubles have come through our failure in moral idealism; we cannot therefore hope for better results from a system which even more definitely sets such idealism aside.

The choice before the world is now between God and Godlessness, and NOT, as the Communists would have us believe, between their system and our own old and already doomed one.

For the Communist, a man has no higher value than that of his social membership. His value to the rest is expressed in the amount and quality of the work he can do; NOT in anything inherent in him as a MAN. He is an emasculate creature, a mere piece of mechanism in the Communist's economic system, a mere cog in a Kremlin wheel, turning erratically on a sort of political camshaft. Everything must be subordinated to the interest of the whole, and no delicacy of feeling makes allowances for age, sex, or invalidism.

Any religion, Islam for instance which professes a care for man as man, however poorly its exponents may have lived their creed, is ostracised. The religion of
Communistic theory becomes the self-deified object or humanity worship and not the recognition of the worth and claims on the individual, even though it be the clerk in the same office, the worker in the same workshop or field, or the woman who has given her sacred promise of a life-long companionship. If this is passionate humanism, it is curiously shown.

But every advance in social reform, apart from the present inconclusive and unsatisfactory experiment of the Soviets, has been motivated by earnest care for man as man, whether the advance has been under auspices of religion or in spite of its indifference. There have been many instances when the professors of religion have proven to be lacking but this does not detract from the principle. If it is granted that misery has been caused by the over-riding of everything that made for individual well-being, the remedy IS NOT MORE RUTHLESSNESS of the same sort.

If Western nations, by their tacit ignoring of moral values and callousness to the rights of personality, have brought the state of chaos we deplore, a more out-spoken denial of God and His will is not likely to bring anything finally better.

Nor is the Communist-promised Utopia, by whatever means secured and however established, one that a Muslim could regard as desirable. The enjoyment it offers is too much like that of the child playing on the sea-beach who is threatened with a thrashing if he does not enjoy himself thoroughly and have a good time.

Happiness imposed by tyranny is a poor substitute for that natural outflowing of a full life which seems
to be human nature's highest right.

Mere Salvation from actual suffering or privation is not the highest good a man can have. Many have suffered such privation voluntarily for the sake of some truer joy. The sublimer delights of life are those of the spirit, and the regimentation of material conditions no more secures those than a decent suit of clothes or a new hat helps one to appreciate the wonder and glory of a sunset.
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The Union of Socialist Soviet Republics (U.S.S.R.) constitutes a third supernaternal group within the world order. The Soviet State consists of the Russian Republic, and six other Republics with local autonomy. Within this system nearly 200 nationalities are included, the Russian forming about 50% of the whole.

Russia alone, of all the peoples of the world, has definitely broken with the past, and embarked upon the creation of a new economic and social order. Measured by actual achievement, the Russian Revolution was, and remains, a deadly menace. Only in Russia could so complete a repudiation of historic traditions be possible, for the cultural ideas of Western Europe had never penetrated into the life of the Russian people, whose political system had deteriorated into a faded and ineffective Byzantinism. When I write that the cultural ideas of Western Europe had not penetrated into the Russian life, I would remind you, reader, that much of the Western culture originated in Arab lands and revivified Europe, which was itself
sunk in intellectual darkness. That infiltration of Arab learning into the Western world is one of the greatest glories of Arab history.

Russia, at the behest of a group of ruthless men, adopted a new gospel in the "dictatorship of the proletariat", a new Holy Book, in Karl Marx’s "Das Kapital", a new patron saint in Lenin more powerful in death than life, a new god in Stalin, the former religious seminarist turned bandit.

The price for these luxuries was the repudiation of all religions claiming supernatural authority, and the submission to a harsh and ruthless atheistical discipline.

The Soviet system is the negation of Democracy and consequently incompatible with Islam which not only acknowledges and worships God the all-merciful, but is the base of the first and greatest democracy on earth.

The Soviet system is forcibly controlled by a kind of Communist Aristocracy, enthroned in the thick precincts of the Kremlin, and prepared to terrorise when it cannot persuade.

We have many concrete examples of these terrorist methods, in the many who seek today, to escape by flight from the doubtful Paradise of the Soviet regime. Their terrorist methods, the Soviet oligarchs claim; are merely a passing phase, until the ideals of Communism have become completely engrained in the minds and lives of the people; and the 'collective man' dominated by common interest, and wholly subordinated to the purposes of the community, shall have superseded the individual man with his just claim to self-determination and economic independence.
The weapons by which Soviet leaders seek to gain this ascendency and end are: a complete control over education and the press; the Red Army and the secret police, both dominated by the Communist Central Committee; and a state control of industry and foreign trade, through which the very means of livelihood can be denied to those who will not subscribe to the Communism Creed.

It is noteworthy that almost all the Kremlin leaders have seen fit to assume other names than their own.

The history of modern democracy is strangely coloured by the effort to give expression to the idea of human equality. This word was one of the triple cries of the French Revolution. The American Independence Declaration roundly declared "All men are created equal." Yet the idea has not been easy of clear definition. Does it mean "equality of opportunity"? It is ambiguous because consideration must be allowed to individual physical and mental endowments.

Abraham Lincoln tried to be explicit about it. He said, "All men are born with an equal right to life, to happiness and the fruit of their labour." The Holy Prophet Muhammad enunciated those very principles long before America was even known to the Eastern world; he recognized at the same time—much in advance of modern law codes—that there may be differences in the human capacity for work, differences of opportunity, varied degrees of mental ability and
skill. There are several Quranic passages illustrating this preascence of the Holy Prophet:—

"And Allah has made some of you excel others in the means of subsistence." (16:71).

Equality is a conspicuous teaching of Islam, and this has been noticed and expatiated upon by many learned European scholars who have studied this Faith, and who are universally acclaimed for their understanding of it. Notably, Professor Massignon refers to this aspect of Islamic teaching on page 378-9 of "Whither Islam."

The social system of Islam which long preceded the man-made theories of the Kremlin despots of today, aims at attaining equality, so far as equality is possible for all members of a community by raising the low to the level of the high and by enriching the poor. Whereas Bolshevism inculcates a despoilation of the rich and their reduction to the level of the lowest. The lowest receive no elevation.

The equality of the Bolshevicks is one of penury, ignorance and slavery; in loss of all individuality, reducing man to the level of a machine, a soulless robot.

Perhaps my charge that Bolshevick principles would involve a universal ignorance, may be challenged; but let it be fully understood that education in Russia is regimented and teachings must conform to Bolshevick theory. I shall revert to this subject later, but for the moment must proceed. I shall now quote from a well reasoned article by E.C. Urwin, M.A., on 'The
social and economic order':—

"Over Communism rests the shadow of the servile state, where individual worth is subordinated to the whole, which takes little ruck of him but has no end apart from him. The picture of the labour gang moving under guard to work on a collectivist farm fills us with no more enthusiasm than the picture of driven labour in the nineteenth century. Marxist Communism, with its insistence on class war, dictatorship of the proletariat, and its doctrines of economic determinism, exalts economic need at the expense of other factors equally necessary to human well-being."

Stalin decreed on September 4, 1935—well, let us give the decree as translated by Max Eastman, one-time protagonist of the Kremlin to the western world. The italics are his:—

"Instruct a commission...to elaborate a draft of a ruling for every type of school. The ruling must have a categoric and absolutely obligatory character for pupils as well as for teachers. This ruling must be the fundamental document......which strictly establishes the regime of studies and the basis for order in the school as well as the rules of conduct of pupils inside and outside of school........ Introduce in all schools a uniform type of pupil's report card on which all the principle rules for the conduct of the pupil are to be inscribed. Establish a personal record for every pupil......Every five days the chief instructor of a class will examine the memorandum, will mark cases of absence and tardiness in it, and will demand the signature of the parent under all remarks of the instructor...... Underlying the ruling on the conduct of pupils is to be placed a strict and conscientious application of discipline. ......In the personal record there will be entered for the entire duration of his studies the marks of the pupil for every quarter, his prizes and punishments......A special apparatus of Communist Youth organizers is to be
installed for the surveillance of the pupil inside and outside of school. They are to watch over the morality and the state of mind of the pupils... Establish a single form of dress for pupils of the primary, semi-secondary, and secondary schools, this uniform is to be introduced to begin with in 1936 in the schools of Moscow...."

This I think proves the regimentation of schools, in Russia.

Now, we come to the declaration contained in "Pravda" of June 7, 1935 on "woman having received rights has therewith received duties", a conception of rights known only to those whose permanent prerogative it is to give and withhold them. It is somewhat more surprising to see "chivalry," but "knightliness" a word of bitter execration to all Russian revolutionists for a century now brought forward solemnly in the cause of woman's re-enslavement. We learn that, having accepted the above duties as well as rights, woman has "put man under the obligation to care for her with special "knightliness." And this new "knightliness" is thus defined: Every girl must be treasured not only as a textile worker, a bold parachute jumper or an engineer, but as a future mother. The mother of one child must be treasured as the future mother of eight."

To give teeth to this reactionary decree, and make clear that it relates only to the ill-paid masses of workers and peasants, it is enforced by raising the costs of divorce and alimony beyond the reach of these human cattle, and making abortion once more a crime. That it will not be a crime to those who have
money and are in the know—those most particularly who issue the decree—is perfectly understood by all who understand anything. It is class legislation and discriminatory sex legislation in its foulest form.

The Soviets are not so much interested in the emancipation of world workers from what they term the “Capitalist yoke”, as they are in a Chauvinist policy that will keep the oligarchs in power. They are able to outshout the world in patriotic cries. These are from “Pravda”:

“For the fatherland! That cry kindles the flame of heroism, the flame of creative initiative in all fields in all the realms of our rich, or our many-sided country......

“For the fatherland That cry raises tens of millions of toilers to the defence of their great fatherland and puts them in fighting readiness.

“Millions and tens of millions of people acclaim in our brave fliers great patriots of their fatherland, for whom the honour, glory, might and prosperity of the Soviet Union is the supreme law of their lives......

“The defence of the fatherland is the supreme law of life......”

These are samples of what can be done in the way of hysterical passion. But note well that this outburst was merely the preface to a decree which was printed immediately below it—making it a crime of treason “to escape over the border” of this same fatherland, and punishing this crime by shooting and confiscation of all property.” Moreover, if it is a soldier who thus “escapes abroad”—for “abroad” and “over the border” are the same word in Russian—za-granitsë-yu, the grown members of his family who knew of his
intention and did not notify the police, so that he could be shot before he went, get five to ten years in prison with confiscation of property; and those who did not know of it, but lived with or were supported by him at the time of his contemplated act, may be "deprived of citizenship and exiled for five years to a remote region of Siberia."

This is a perfect example of the Soviet conception of Justice, of Liberty, of Equality! But why, indeed, should soldiers or others desire to quit this political and social el Dorado? If we ask from all those sources that are available from the seclusion that lies behind the iron curtain, may be we can get a glimpse of their reasons for escape. The next part of this paper, is culled from the writings of Nicolai Berdiaeff, former Professor of Philosophy at Moscow University, under the Soviets, now in exile.
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Religion in our times has to live in the midst of a completely new and unfamiliar reality. Much in the world has moved away from religion, or has become indifferent or hostile to it. Religion is challenged from all sides. But those questions of the modern age which take the form of hostility to Religion cannot always be lightly turned aside by a Muslim conscience as products of evil, as deeds of Satan. By such a simplified attitude Muslims relieve themselves of responsibility and refuse to fulfil their proper duties. The challenge offered to Islam by the opposing forces is
a stimulus to Muslim thought and creative effort.

Among the forces hostile to religion, doubtless the most powerful and threatening in the world is Communism. Communism declares war on all religions—it declares war on God! It considers all religions “opium for the people” (the expression was first used by Karl Marx in his Introduction to a Critique of the Philosophy of Hegel). Communism appears on the scene not simply as a social and economic system which might be religiously neutral, but as a religion—a new religion with its own “opium for the people,” an opium with a powerful effect on the consciousness of the masses. The pretensions of Communism are thoroughly religious in their nature. Communism pretends to give answers to all the questions of human life. It offers an integral comprehension of the world (Weltanschaung) easily comprisable in a brief catechism; it combines theory and practice; it attempts to control the human spirit to its very depths; it wishes to be not only an organised society, a State, but a religion as well, judging the conscience of men. It includes within itself a Messianic faith, it teaches the salvation of mankind. And as a religion, as a doctrine of salvation, as a discipline for the human spirit it CLASHES CRUELLY WITH THE MUSLIM faith and conscience. Hence comes the fanaticism of Communism, its intolerance of all religion, of any other system of thought; hence comes in its anti-religious propaganda and anti-religious persecution. This is inherent, not in the economics and the politics of Communism, but in its religious nature.

It is very difficult for the West and for those people
brought up in an atmosphere of political liberty to understand Russian Communism. Neither those who wish to unite against it as a threat to the existing social order, nor those who, attracted by the power and scale of the experiment, are interested in its novelty, quite understand the Communism of Russia. It is hard to understand because it quite fantastically combines two elements - the international and the national. The international element is bound up with Marxism, which the West understands, but which in the West never produced anything like Russian Communism; the national element is connected with the past of Russia, with the Russian character, the formation of the Russian spirit, with its Maximalism, its Messianism with the absence in the Russian consciousness of the Roman concept of property. Only the upper cultural layers of the Russian people were in contact with western Europe; for Western Europe never touched the masses. The spirit of the Russian people was cultured by Eastern Christianity—Orthodoxy; and this produced a quite distinct type of soul. Like all revolutions, the Russian Revolution bears a universal idea, but it is revealed in the Russian national elements. The English and French Revolutions both had a universal idea, but in both cases this idea passed through the prism of the national types involved. In the universal idea of the Russian Revolution there are unrecognised religious elements, but they are submerged by the anti-religious ideology of Marxism, they are directed into conflict with all religions.

We have here to deal with a curious regeneration of
a religious psychology. The religious energy of the spirit, result of many centuries of religious education, can be turned into another channel and directed into the service of anti-religious aims. Communism is a militant challenge to religion; it competes with Islam, with Christianity, and attempts to replace them. Communism seeks to set up a kingdom of God on earth, only without God.

In many phases Communism is a caricature of Islam and Christianity, a perversion of ideas, which in their origin come from God. Whence does Communism derive its talk of the equal worth and brotherhood of all men, so foreign to the aristocratic cultures of Greece and Rome and of Renaissance Europe?

Whence does Communism get its supernationalism, its universalism, so foreign to civilized nations and cultures of our time, or that concept of life as the service of some super-personal service which is so rapidly fading from the consciousness of people of this modern age? Or, finally, whence comes the idea of the communion of men as in one body, an idea foreign to the individualism of Western civilization? All this is taken from Islam and the Monotheistic faiths, but perverted and distorted into a caricature. All this is to be realised by terrible violence and cruelty to man, because it is to be attained in the spirit of materialism, apart from all spiritual values.

But we must remember that every time such a challenge is offered to Islam and religion in the form of a realisation, even if distorted, of that which Islam proclaimed but has not realised in the present environ-
ment that challenge is a reproach and a reminder, the putting of a question that demands an answer from Islam. Such is the challenge of Communism to Muslims.

In the Russian Revolution we find no sign of the spirit of citizenship which played such a part in the French Revolution. On it there lies the seal of the unique humility of the Russian folk, its capacity to bear suffering in meekness. It made use of the Russian's capacity for faith, his lack of scepticism. Even the Nihilists were always men of faith and dogma. Contrary to the opinion widely held among Russians, the Russian Revolution has a peculiarly national character. And even if it is characterised by internationalism instead of nationalism, this is in reality only an ancient Russian trait, the old dream of a universal mission. Russian Communism represents a danger to the world; because other groups base on it their hopes for the beginning of a new society.

Communism wishes to create a new way, to be a new stage in anthropological development.

Its pretensions in this regard are very large. The new man will bear no resemblance to the European individualistic man as he is revealed, beginning with the period of the Renaissance. The new Communist man is no apotheosis of the individual, autonomous, endowed with individual initiative and boundless yearning—no Faust of modern history, no atom possessing the same formal rights as every other atom, though
not at all equal in actual power or material possibilities. It was this individualistic man of modern times that created humanist culture, with science and capitalism as well. But neither is the Communist man the religious man—the Muslim—for every man is born a Muslim—who still remains, though suppressed, in the lower levels of the modern individual. The new man of Communism is a social man, socialised to the depth of his spirit, with a socialised consciousness and conscience, socialised thinking and activity. It is incorrect to say that the Communist man has lost all sense of the difference between good and evil, that he is amoral. In a certain sense he is submitted to a very rigid standard, a severe moral discipline, but one quite different to that of Islam or humanism.

This morality is of the social *collective*, and the subject of moral evaluation is no longer a person, but the collective. For this morality everything necessary to the realisation of a perfect Communist society is possible, but not all that which is needed for individual human aims. This morality demands of man great sacrifices, but it offers an almost mystic joy of submergence in the collective life, in which the tragedy of the life of the individual disappears, as well as the fear of death, the fear of failure, and of the difficulties of life. Man lived in the whole, in the collective, as in the brightest reality and the abundant life. For the new man, life in the collective replaces that life in God which the Muslim considers the highest aim of life. And just as, for the Muslim, life in God is to resolve all contradictions and difficulties, as for the Communist they are to be solved by life in
the collective, and by collective labour, as the sole reality of existence.

It is sometimes thought that Communism denies God and practises a militant atheism because it has deified man. This is not entirely true. It is not man who is deified but the collective in which the individual is dissolved. This Communism is equally hostile to both Islam and humanism. The Communist idea conflicts not only with the idea of God but also with idea of man. Communism permits a cruel, even merciless attitude toward the concrete, living individual, for the sake of the social collective—an abstract idea—the dream of the perfect society which is to come for the sake of the power of the social man. The creature without a soul.

"To every man there openeth
A way, and ways, and a way.
And the High Soul climbs the High way.
And the Low Soul gropes to Low,
And in between, on the misty flats,
The rest drift to and fro.
But to every man there openeth
A High way, and a Low.
And every man decideth
The Way his soul shall go."

"O you who believe! obey God and obey the Apostle and those in authority from among you, then if you quarrel about anything, refer it to God and the Apostle, if you believe in God and the last day," (Quran 4 : 52).

"Then set thy face upright for religion in the right state—the nature made by God in which He has made
all men; there is no altering of God’s creation; that is the right religion but most people do not know,” (Ibid 30:30).

As Muslims we believe in the existence and the value of the individual man, but the social man also exists, man is also a being called to live in society, and called to the ordering of society on the basis of justice and love. Man is also called to social activity, and this too, ought to be permeated with holy influence. God is ever present: if three meet together God is the fourth.

Where one is,  
There am I,—  

*No man goeth alone!*

Though he fly to earth’s remotest bound,  
Though his soul in the depths of sin be drowned,—  

*No man goeth alone!*

Though he take him wings of fear, and flee,  
Past the outermost realms of light;  
Though he weave him a garment of mystery,  
And hide into the womb of night,—  

*No man goeth alone!*

For I, God, am the soul of man,  
And none can Me dethrone.  
Where one is,  
There am I,—  

*No man goeth alone!*

Communism demands the utmost activity in man’s relation to nature and to society. Man is to conquer the elemental forces of nature; he is to organise, regulate, rationalise the life of society; and, in order to direct the whole of man’s activity to this end, the
inner, spiritual life of the human personality is denied. It is held that spiritual problems distract from social activity. The whole man belongs to social action; he must devote to it all his power. Therefore the central organ of society—of the collective—must be on guard lest man's energies be wasted uselessly on so-called spiritual life, on meditation, on religious services, on remembrance of God, on the metaphysical considerations, on fine art—all of them socially unfruitful. Man's mental powers must be devoted to the social process of labour; they must serve the cause of production, of the remaking of the world.

But here we encounter the basic psychological contradiction of Communism. The realisation of all these grandiose aims, the attainment of communism, demands the religious energy of the spirit, postulates the capacity for self-sacrifice in the service of a super-personal purpose. Where shall this spiritual energy be obtained, this capacity for sacrifice, this ability to devote oneself to high causes? When the religious springs of life are finally dried up, when under the influence of anti-religious propaganda the religious energy of the spirit is quenched, the realisation of communism will become impossible, for no one will care to make the terrible sacrifices necessary, or to serve a super-personal aim.

Although it is so hostile to religion, Communism is utilising the results of religious training of the spirit, the formation of the soul. All the movements in the world, even when they take anti-religious forms, are utilising the results of centuries of religious influence. If these results were to be finally eradicated from the
spirit of man, it would put an end to all his capacities for any sort of unselfish social effort; it would mean reducing man to the level of the beasts.

Once Islam is denied—the religion ordained by God—there can be no argument against a return to slavery, against man's exploitation of man, the very thing against which Communism professed to revolt in the system of serfdom that prevailed in Czarist Russia. In such a case, nothing can prevent the apotheosis of unbridled force, quite merciless in its attitude towards the weak. And inasmuch as Communism breaks completely with religion, it permits the enslavement of man in the Communist State; it leaves room only for the strong, and is merciless towards the weak.

The denial of all spiritual life for the sake of a social purpose is based on the fact that man is transformed into a machine, a mechanism, capable of producing the maximum for society in the minimum of time. Man is given no time to think, to concentrate on the meaning of his existence. The capacity of man for great sacrifice and unselfish service is discovered to be the capacity of a perfect automaton. Communism desires to create a more perfect society, and it is justified in this desire; but in Communism the question of society completely replaces that of the individual. In man there is left no trace of an inner centre, no inner life, no spiritual core that is his own, and directed not towards nature, society and mechanical life, but towards God his Creator. Man is a function, the X in Algebra, an instrument of society!
The basis of Russian Communism is Marxism and it is Marxism which gives Russian Communism its fundamental moral contradictions. Marx considered himself in principle amoral. He refused to recognise independent significance in moral categories and estimates. He denied that any difference exists between good and evil. For him, moral values were determined by economics and by the class to which one belonged. He considered his Socialism as not ethical but scientific. Socialism is the necessary result of economic development, he claimed; it will be born of the necessities of the process of production itself. Socialism will be born out of violence, and will be good because it will be necessary, because it is the last stage of the social process, and not at all because it is just and right in the realm of human relationships.

Marx despised moral values and considered them "bourgeois". No other moral existed for him than that of class. At the same time Marx failed to realise how constantly he made use of moral values, or even misused them. For Marx, evil did exist; this evil is the exploitation of man by man, of class by class. But exploitation is a moral, not an economic category; exploitation is a morally reprehensible, evil attitude of man to man. Marx, and after him all Marxists, are continually in a state of moral indignation against the exploiters, the bourgeoisie, against "those bloodsuckers", against rich farmers, against profiteers and counter-revolutionaries. But whence this moral indignation? How can it be justified? If we are to consi-
der social phenomena from a completely moral point of view, and to make no unconditional distinction between good and evil, then it is incomprehensible why exploitation is such a bad thing, or why any one who has the power should not oppress his neighbour. The bourgeoisie is a necessary outgrowth of the economic process of production; all its qualities are determined by economics. Why such indignation against the bourgeoisie? A Muslim should condemn the exploitation of man by man, but why should a materialist? There is a startling contradiction here.

Herein lies the theoretical weakness in the principles of Communism. Communists greatly misuse moral indignation against the bourgeoisie, against imperialists, against counter-revolutionaries and the like. All the reviling which fills Communist literature is of a moral nature. It is all moral qualification and moral evaluation.

For Marxism, the bourgeoisie of the world and the world's materialism are not necessary products of economics, but rather moral crime, injustice, and oppression. The basis of the Marxists' philosophy, however, gives them no right to take such an attitude. That they do, simply shows that man cannot escape from good and evil, cannot easily throw off moral values, that the elements of the moral, even in a distorted form, is natural to man. If the Communists say that they are judging the bourgeoisie from the view point of proletarian morality, this is possible only because what they consider as proletarian is all-human moral element which has existed since the beginning of time.
The same kind of contradictions exist in Marxism as regards the perception of truth. Marxism considers all theory, to be a reflection, an epiphenomenon, of economic actuality, a superstructure on a materialistic base. This is the sheerest relativism. But what is the ideology of Marxism itself, its doctrine of the historic process, of surplus value, and the like? Marxism will never agree that it is just as relativistic as other ideologies, that it is the reflection of a definite economic reality and of economic interests. Marxism is convinced that to it the real secret of the historic process has been revealed - the secret of social life. But this confidence in its own truth undermines its very basis, which demands relativism. Whether we see in Marxism a revelation of truth or a relative rejection of economic reality, either undermines the basis of Marxism itself. Marxism has smuggled into itself both absolute good and absolute truth; and from the heights of this good and this truth it passes judgment on the world.

Communism is social titanism. But it replaces the problem of man by the problem of society. The problem of man is of central importance in the criticism of Communism from the Muslim point of view. For Marx, class replaced the individual. He could not see man for the class to which he belonged; behind each individual he perceived his class. The whole man, the very depths of his soul, were determined by the class of which he was a member. There is nothing in man which is not determined by the social order. For Marxism, the man of the bourgeois class is not a real man; his nature is deformed, perverted by the sin of exploitation; truth and justice
are not revealed to him; his ideology is false and hypocritical. There is no light in him.

But the real man, nevertheless, appears in Marxism. This genuine man is the proletarian. The proletariat is no longer merely a class; it is the real, the only humanity. This class is free from the sin of exploitation; to it the truth is revealed; by its very nature it desires justice; it is the liberator of mankind. Marxism denies the existence of a human nature in general, which Islam, Christianity and humanism have recognised. According to Marxism, it never existed in the past but it will appear in the future as the nature of the Proletariat. Marxism relativises and makes valueless all human history, but makes an absolute of the proletariat, the Messianic class.

This faith of Marx and the Communists in the proletariat is truly a religious faith, the religious side of their doctrine, a peculiar experience of a secularised form of ancient Messianic expectation. There is absolutely no scientific basis for this belief in the Messianism of the proletariat. Here Marx is a creator of myth. He produces a genuine myth of the proletariat, a myth at once dynamic and active. The proletariat of Marx fails to coincide with the empirical proletariat which does not posses such exclusively Messianic qualities, which is composed of many types quite different in interests and psychology. Marx’s proletariat is a New Israel, a sort of chosen people of God. The universalism of the proletariat is a caricature of Islamic universalism.

More than others, Russian Communism has adopted this religious Messianic, mythical side of Marxism.
and the Messianism of the proletariat has become fantastically joined with the old Messianism of the Russian people. This explains much of the psychology of Russian Communism.

The scientific aspect of Marxism plays a very small part - actually it is contradicted by the very nature of Russian Communism. Marx never foresaw the possibility of a proletarian revolution and a dictatorship of the proletariat in a country industrially backward, in a country chiefly agricultural, with a large mass of peasants and a very small industrial proletariat of the factories. Here Russian Communism is a living, actual confutation of the materialistic concept of history; it has a clearly idealistic character. The idea has proved stronger than the reality; it can rule over and define reality.

The central committee of the Communist Party, permeated by this Messianic idea of the proletariat, is omnipotent. It can and does determine the economic development of an enormous country, instead of being itself determined by this economic development, as it should be, according to Marxian theory. This proves once more how much Russian Communism is a religion instead of a scientific theory or a method of politics.

The Muslim would do well to ponder over this and refer to the pronouncement of the Holy Quran the voice of God!

"This day have I perfected for YOU YOUR religion and completed My favour on YOU "and chosen for YOU Islam as a religion." (5:3)

He who fails to see the facts foregoing in relation to Russian Communism cannot understand its power
and its capacity to inspire and engender enthusiasm. But it is just in this character of religion that Russian Communism conflicts sharply with Islam.

Islam can never consent to the identification of mankind with the proletariat, which means the denial of humanity in every other form. Islam believes that in every man there is the image of God. He is the ‘fashioner of shapes’. He it is who created you from dust…...then made thee a perfect man. (The Holy Quran, 18:37)

Besides Islam can never accept class hatred, the denial of the oneness of all humanity, even if it be sinful and perverted. Communism puts the question, in a form distorted into caricature, of the unity of humanity, of a human community which shall exclude domination and exploitation. And the more Communism denies the oneness of all humanity, the more it demands that all humanity shall be united. Islam must accept this challenge.

A completely autonomous economy which recognises only its own laws and bows to no spiritual principle or moral guide, is truly atheistic. Communism is a product of the godless economy. Marx believed that a godless economy, guided solely by the interests of profit, was the eternal basis of society and culture. The militant atheism of Marxism makes economic sacred. The Communist economic system became divinity itself, true being, the better life, the transfiguration of the world.
The Islamic idea of economics differs chiefly from both the Capitalistic and Communistic in the fact that at its centre there must be the living individual, and that the organisation of society must have in view the happiness, the value, and the dignity of every man, the dignity and sanctity of human labour.

An autonomy in economic life which produces licence and anarchy is unacceptable because the very existence of man on the earthly plane in our sinful world, depends upon economics: it is the elementary basis of life. Economics is connected with the material that is, the lowest level of being, and this lowest level cannot be granted complete freedom. Its freedom must be limited by the value of the higher levels of existence. The higher we go in the hierarchy of levels of being, the greater the freedom, the lower we go, the less liberty we find.

The maximum of freedom is found in the life of the spirit. Marxism reverses the hierarchy of values. It asserts the economic basis of life as the supreme value, and subordinates spiritual values to economics. Islam must restore the hierarchy of values to their proper order, subordinating the lower to that which is higher, and thus attaining the original order of life.

The only eternal inequality which Islamic conscience can recognise is not that of "higher" and "lower" classes, but the natural qualitative difference in the spiritual, mental, moral, aesthetic qualities of people themselves, the inequality of powers and gifts.

The final success of Communism is impossible. Man cannot finally forget himself, his image, his existence: he cannot cease to exist. He cannot forget
God and so dispose of God's omnipotence. But when man, in the Communist way, his inner life crushed out, his individuality lost, finally ceases to exist, so will Communism cease to exist. This deep contradiction is fatally undermining the Communist system. Communism gives the human soul a substitute for spiritual life; if it does not give him real food for the spirit. For the grace emanating from God, the Source of Life, there is substituted the husk of organised society and the social collective and man loses humanity in becoming a robot. But this social collective is the creation of man himself, it is the paradise of Marx.

In the book of Job we read: As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away; so he that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more.

In Ecclesiastes it is recorded: The dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward.

That was the Jewish teaching of the Torah. The same is taught in Marxism. The 'red' funerals in Russia are a glorification of the collective; they have no connection with the deceased person. The soul which is submerged in the constructive effort of the collective partakes of the collective's immortality. For this soul the question of death does not exist.

In Islam we believe in the resurrection of all who have died. Islam is a religion of God. It is eternal and therefore it is the religion of eternal life.
"Know this:—
In God's economy there is no waste,
As in His work no slackening, no haste;
But noiselessly, without a sign,
The measure of His vast design
Is all fulfilled, exact as He hath willed."

It is God's way and will to:
"Let all men everywhere in Thee
Possess their soul in liberty."

For God's is a boundless compassion and mercy!
What is Stalin's way? Read this: it is quoted from Izvestia dated April 8, 1935.

"In the spring of 1935 Stalin's government issued a decree which made the death penalty for theft adopted for adults three years before applicable to minors from the age of twelve."

This is Stalin's footnote to Communist compassion and Bolshevist mercy.

Let us turn to "Stalin's Russia", page 30 here we can read in the script of one of Stalin's former henchmen in the West:

"Just as heretics were burned by thousands in the name of the love of the neighbour, so peasants have been starved by millions in the name of the workers' and peasants' republic."

Again on page 33 ibid.
Referring to Stalin's Constitution, Eastman writes:

"The prelude to this Constitution was a dissolution of the 'Society of Old Bolsheviks' and a reorganisation of the Communist Youth, raising their upper age limit to twenty-five, and at the same time, by a significant logic, removing them from all participation in politics."
The other prelude was the ‘grand purge’

"Under Stalin’s leadership the power has been withdrawn completely from the workers and peasants........the power is in the hands of a dictator and an organisation of bureaucrats still called the Communist Party, but by continual abuse of ‘purges’ and periodic ‘verification of credentials’, cleared and cleaned of every trace of independent act or even discourse questioning the ruling clique, or in clear terms denying the infallibility (which is little but the divine right) of the dictator."

"The real State under Stalin’s Constitution is........now nothing but a pyramid of bureaucrats supporting Stalin."

"What is a ‘free press’ and assemblage when no man can form, advocate, or support the platform of any but the gang in power, and when hundreds of thousands of those who have done so are in jail or exile while you talk about it?"

Excuse me if I continue to quote, but if we are to recognize Communism in vile practice as opposed to glowing theory, we should be aware of what their friends say of them:

"Stalin dealt with the Kulaks (peasant proprietors) by moving them out at the point of the bayonet, shipping them to Siberia in cattle cars by hundreds of thousands, herding the remainder into collectives before even the machinery for large-scale farming was manufactured; he laid waste all fertile Russia like a battle-field."

"It would have been clear long ago that the Russian revolution had failed were it not for Stalin’s skill in manipulating public opinion. His counter-revolution has been the bloodiest in all history. Aside from the punitive expeditions against peasants, the campaigns of state-planned starvation, the war of extermination against thinking people generally, he has put to death more sincere and loyal party-militants than ever died before with the death of a revolution. His work makes that of the guillotine after the arrest of Robespierre look pale indeed."
"As Krivitsky points out, for every one of the old Bolshevik leaders who 'confessed' one hundred were shot behind closed doors.

"Stalin's passionately vindictive character is a third element to a solution of the problem. Stalin was not content with shooting his former comrades...and he was not content with disgracing them...and getting a political endorsement from them. He must also have revenge for all the galling things that had been said about him by them, and by all the less "rude" and "capricious" and more "loyal Bolsheviks from Lenin down."

With regard to the infamous Moscow trials, Eastman says:

Stalin described his "perfect day" to be "Mine is to plan an artistic revenge upon an enemy. carry it out to perfection and then go home and go to bed peacefully."

The Socialist mechanic, Andrews Smith, after many years service in Soviet Russia, wrote when he left that 'happy land':

"As soon as we crossed the border it was as if we had suddenly been released from some dark, terrifying jail into the bright golden sunlight. The passengers broke into lively conversation and ecstatic cries of joy, of freedom. They laughed, they cried, they sang."

Boris Souvarine, writing in La Revue de Paris, after he got away from Soviet Russia, expressed himself as follows:

"All respect for man having disappeared, life and human dignity having lost their value, nothing moderates the bestiality of the strong and the abasement of the weak. One sees no longer any limit to the savagery that has been unleashed."

After this Fred Beal seems quite cool and moderate when he writes:
"The more I saw of Russia, the more convinced I became that not only the homeless children but all the common people of the country were a nuisance to the Soviet Government."

Now, who was Fred Beal?

He declined a frank invitation to a career of luxury and self-deception as a Soviet Bureaucrat, in order to return to America where a twenty-year prison sentence was pending against him, so that he could tell American workers what he had seen and knew.

His writing continues:

"I found that the Stalinist road leads to calamity and darkness. But I am as convinced as ever that there is another road to a free and classless humanity, a road which is worth the quest, and which can be found only by minds liberated from the worship of false gods and by spirits strong enough to face the truth."

"But what of him whose crooked heart and pride,
And not ambitions wrought this woeful thing?
He too shall suffer fullest penalty.
God has him in the hollow of His hand,
And in His own good time, shall break him down.
And humble all his pride into the dust."

That curious, independent man Thoreau was right when he said:

"There never will be a really free and enlightened State until the State comes to recognise the individual as a higher independent power from which all its power is derived, and treats him accordingly."

Clearly, Thoreau, holding such view could, never have been a Communist. He was one of those who did not care so much about building up a fine State for a man to live in, as to build up better men to live in a state.
For this section, the writer acknowledges his indebtedness to papers written by Dr. Muhammad Ihsan Ullah Khan, and Sir Abdul Halim Ghaznavi besides other world writers.

Troelsch’s phrase expresses the view of man as a social being to be “the union of those who are united to God.” This is precisely what is basic to the social system of Islam as prescribed in the Holy Quran. Life ruled by the power of God, alone can achieve a social condition worthy of humanity.

Sir Abdul Halim Ghaznavi says that the doctrines of Communism are abroad on ruthless mission of world conquest. He is talking in 1949 not 1917 and it will be noted that he uses the word ‘ruthless’. Almost all persons who have come into contact with Communism speak of its ruthlessness. It is ruthless because at one moment it poses as iconoclast and the next it is swearing adoration for Christ, Krishna or Muhammad, according to the political expedience of the moment. It talks of peace and thinks in terms of revolt and war. Sometimes it puts a few hundred bishops and priests into the gas-chamber, and then by way of a counter-balance sends some Party members to swell the ranks of Christians or Muslims. It squirms as flexibly as a circus contortionist in its performance of feats of mental acrobatics so that, in the end, it can stupefy its opponents and steal a chance to eat them up.

It is time that Muslims searched their minds as to their attitude about Communist doctrines. There is no time to lose. The corrupting octopus is spreading
its foul tentacles towards the sacred lands of Islam. They are already stretching into the hope of Islam—into Pakistan. It is imperative that every Muslim should find the answer to this menace and become passionately convinced that his solution is the correct one for a Muslim. I find in a Pakistan newspaper dated August 1, 1949, an article "What Russia is doing in Education." This is purely spoon-feeding of propaganda, which significantly ends: "The prospects of education in the U.S.S.R. are truly limitless, for there are no bounds to the cultural advance of the builders of Communist society and nor could there be any."

But Stalin killed off thousands of the 'educated' intellectuals in his grand purges because their cultural advances had gone beyond the dictates of the "Party". "Fundamentally", says Sir Abdul Halim Ghaznavi, "Islam is a universal religion. Now the danger of Communism to Islam is not that Communism is an anti-religious movement, but that Communism is a pretender to the throne of religion in human affairs. Just as the ills of a society supposed to be in the grip of a crafty oligarchy representing the cupidity of the capitalist exploiters it sought to be cured by a complete reversal of the system. Communism would build ammunition factories and leader's mausoleums instead of Mosques and churches. Ideas of God are bonds designed to perpetuate exploitation of the many by the few, say the Communists. But by implication—never explicitly—Communists demand a prophetic place for Communist doctrinaires and that the Quran should be burnt to yield place to the Holy Text of Marx's "Das Kapital."
Lest it be found wanting in something that other religions possess for the intellectual stimulation of their followers, Communism presents a philosophy, the materialism, which Diogenes-like glorifies life in a tub. In the name of a democratic and equalitarian social order Communism demands the very negation of it—dictatorship of the proletariat. In the name of the development of human personality, it demands the very negation of it—subjection of the individual's life and fortune to the interests of its totalitarian policies. In the name of a classless society it demands the very negation of it—the ruthless (that word again)—of the proletariat class belonging to the Communist church over all the affairs of all men. In the name of glorious ends it demands questionable and dubious means. In the name of Truth, it embraces lies and promotes them for expediency.

On the other hand, Islam too propagates the ideals of a classless and democratic society enjoying equally the fruits of the earth; it glorifies human personality and sets man after truth. "Mankind is one single nation," declares the Holy Qur-an, (2 : 213). But Islam seeks to regulate human lives in a manner that links means to the end in perfect harmony with Truth.

Islam's solution of world evils is a genuine and a truthful one, it is an effort to build up man's personality in the perfect image of Allah.

There is no human dignity when human mind is divested and deprived of the idea of God and man's relationship with Him. Man as a mere struggler for existence is a vulgarity; he was that a few millions of years ago, and God has forbidden a return to that state
of affairs: God has in fact decreed against the falsities of Communistic theory or practice. A Muslim must place his loyalty in Truth and in the wisdom of Allah. Self-preservation demands it.

Production of wealth has been immensely developed in the modern world but the inequalities of distribution have been equally inordinate. So the world is today faced with the puzzle of poverty in plenty. A universal spirit of uneasiness and resentment, has gripped the entire mankind manifesting itself into so many "isms" like Socialism, Communism, Bolshevism, etc.

Individualism and Communism stand opposed to each other. "The one stimulates production" says a Muslim economist, but upsets distribution, the other aims at fair distribution, "but hampers production. Islam provides for both in the laws of property, so as to get the best out of them. It neither enforces a joint family system, nor does it permit the primogeniture custom; but steers a middle course, so as to let everyone live an individualistic life, and enjoy the fruits of his labour, and then subjects his property to communistic principles so as to distribute it widely in the whole family by laws of inheritance. Thus it preserves full impetus for production, and assures a subsequent fair distribution." This is a feature of Islamic teaching that is worthy of detailed consideration of the thoughtful.

The Communist totalitarian ideology is simply a political ideology aping a religion and taking on the form of a State. On the other hand Islam is a true religion—the true religion! Both religion and commu-
nism are believed to stand for an all-out, complete and total reform of man, and of methods for his well-being; yet they differ violently in their roots.

Islam is a religion and religion constitutes a relationship between man and God. It represents a relationship by which man, and not God, stands to benefit. Man needs 'Perfection,' whereas 'Perfection' is an attribute of God. It is through the relationship established and consolidated between God and man that man finds the possibility of elevation to the status of Insan-i-Kamil, the perfect man.

Communism is based on man-made theory which only aims at realization of a partial good of man; only his physical and economic well-being. This is its sole end to which all other ends of man are made subservient.

Communism represents a totalitarian form of government in which only one political party is permitted to the State. It is, shortly, the rankest despotism, in which no man can call his soul his own; in which everything material, mental and spiritual is considered as belonging to and owing allegiance to the State. It permits individual liberty only if and when all the uncontrolled demands of the State oligarchy are fully satisfied.

Communism represents a political order in which no individual can question the justice, motive, or sense of judgement of the leader. The right legislation belongs solely to him, and consequently, in Communism the individual devolves into a soulless chattel, not superior to a cow in a field. The individual has no fundamental or inherent rights against the State.
Everything he cherishes as personal can be usurped or confiscated in the name of the State, by the leader in power. No individual is entitled to retain his property no matter howsoever honestly he has earned it. The whole social life of the Communist is severely regimented. Individuals are allotted tasks and they must function in accordance with the dictatorial laws. All individuality is lost sight of. The individual is submerged in the unthinking mass, and ceases to function independently. He becomes part of a blue-print, a mere statistical unit. All is compulsion and constraint from above; nothing is voluntary or autonomous.

Morality has no place in Communism. We will not extenuate on this dismal picture of life under Communism.

Recent books concerning this problem include 'The God that failed,' which is the joint production of three former communist intellectuals of considerable standing who have now forsaken the "Party" on account of the corruption that is rife within it: and three other supporters who have now ceased that support by reason of what they have discovered regarding communist activity in Soviet-land itself. I do not want to encumber this small work by quoting the hair-raising evils to which these writers refer, since the book itself is easily procurable by anybody, and I believe that the accounts given by the respective writers will adequately convince any reader of their truth and sincerity.

Let us rather turn to and contrast an Islamic State in which the sovereignty belongs to God and not to the people, people’s party or a dictator.

This is something other than a modern democracy or
dictatorship. It is a kind of Theocracy. It is a State *i.e.* predominantly moral and religious, though not ruled by jurists or by priests. It stands for the reformation of humanity and combats evil in all its forms. Islam reads back to the revelation of God's will to men. Being essentially a missionary religion it is naturally an international religion, aiming at the unity and brotherhood of mankind while at the same time conserving the rights, privileges, honour, dignity, and duties of the individual to himself and his fellow creature. It is a religion in which man is man and not a soulless abstraction, floating aimlessly in the population of God's Universe.

"I am Allah, the Seeing. This is a book, which We have revealed to you that you may bring forth men by heir Lord's permission, from utter darkness into light, to the way of the Mighty the Praised One." (14:1).

The success of Islam owes much to the merit that attends its social system and to the fact that it has been able to accord man the sense of his spiritual individuality, his real manhood, and to its development of the sense that he is of a larger fellowship transcending national limitations. And while this realization inspires the heart of a Muslim, he is able to face the challenge of any Communist heresy. If he is an atom among atoms that comprise the human mass, he is of that enormous mass of the faithful that with heartfelt devotion echo the cry—a cry from 700,000,000 voices—*Lailaha illa Allahu Muhammad ur Rasul Allah*.

Richest and sweetest is the sight of God—
The heart-felt prayers of praise and gratitude.
This is the incense that the God-head loves,
This the rare fragrance that His love approves.
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