

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

MUSLIM INDIA
AND
ISLAMIC REVIEW

VOL. I.]

DECEMBER 1913.

[No. 11.]

MUSLIM PEER.

WHAT IS ISLAM?

"MOHAMMADAN PEER" is the echo of the day in the West. The embracement of Islam by Lord Headley and Baron Allanson-Winn has created a unique interest, which has travelled from London into the four corners of the world. We are highly gratified to note that "the rare event," as *Pall Mall Gazette* styles it, has been received here in good spirit, and the Press comment is also not unfair. But it has also advertised a terrible ignorance of Islam. That a Mohammadan cannot be a true Muslim without subscribing to the spirit of what was taught by Christ Himself, is a Quranic truth; but it was a hard pill for the people here to swallow when they heard from the Mohammadan Peer that through his Islam he has become simply a better Christian. The Rt. Honourable Lord only culled in one word what he read in the Quran in the following words:—

And who forsakes the religion of Abraham but he who is weak of judgment, and surely we have chosen him in this world, and in the life to come, he is no doubt of the righteous ones.

When his Lord said to him: "*Resign* yourselves to Me,*" he said, "*I resign myself to the Lord of the Worlds.*"

* The italics in all these verses are ours; they give a clear conception of Islam, which literally means "resignation to God." The concluding portion of the above quotation also gives the Muslim belief as to the message of the other prophets. We, however, don't believe what is now ascribed to and added to the teachings of Jesus and Moses.

And the same did Abraham enjoin on his sons and on Jacob: "O, my sons, ALLAH has chosen for you (this) faith, therefore let not death come to you *unless you are resigned.*" Were you witnesses when death visited Jacob, when he said to his sons: "What will you serve after me?" they said, "We will serve your God and the God of your fathers, Abraham and Ishmael and Ishaq (Isaac), *one God only, and to Him we resign ourselves.*"

This is a people that has passed away, they had what they earned, and you shall have what you earn, *and you shall not be questioned as to what they did.*

And they say, "Become Jews or Christians, you shall be the followers of the right way," say Nay, but (follow) the *religion of Abraham*, the sincere one, and he was not one of the polytheists. Say: "*We believe in ALLAH and in that which has been sent down to us, and that which was sent down to Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob, and his children, and that which was given to Moses and Jesus, and that which was given to the prophets from their Lord; and do not make any distinction between any of them, and to Him do we resign ourselves.*"

The Quran—Ch. 2 : 130, 136.

This is the gist of Islam, a self-evident truth ; yet it appears an anomaly to many. It only betrays wrong conception of religion in Western mind. With him religion, perhaps, is belief in dogmas, though they may demand mutilation of rationality. In fact, if human salvation depends upon our belief in the peculiar aspect of a certain memorable event in the life of some particular man—say crucifixion of Christ—it is no religion but a school of thought, and must lead to diversity of opinion and difference of belief. But if religion can rightly be identified with good beliefs and actions—because beliefs are the fountain-head of human actions—revealed to man by God from time to time in order to work out his salvation and bring him to that stage of spirituality where he becomes at one with God—there can be one and only one religion of God—the blessed gospel of complete submission to the Will of God and implicit obedience to all His Commandments, and this literally means Islam. This religion of obedience was taught to Adam when "the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it." The same religion of commandment and submission found its manifestation at the Mount of Sinai. Jesus came simply to deliver the same message of Islam when He said to His disciples:—

"My doctrine is not mine but His that sent me."

—St. John vii. 16.

"I can of my own self do nothing: as I hear I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father

which hath sent me. If I bear witness of myself,
my witness is not true."—St. John v. 30.

In the same spirit Lord Mohamad exclaimed when he said, "Follow words of God, and do not follow my words if you find them at variance with the former."

It is "Divine Commandments and their obedience" which is religion of God; it is their doing and teaching which in the words of Jesus makes one great in the Kingdom of Heaven. Did not Moses receive revelation, improving upon what was already in human possession? Did not his successors for generation after generation receive more Divine light after the revelation of Ten Commandments? Christ also did "not come to destroy but to fulfil the law." He never branded it as a curse, as promulgated by the Church built upon Pauline superstructure. Human mind had not sufficiently developed even at the advent of Jesus to receive the law in its 'full-fledged shape,' a fact admitted by the Holy Founder of Christianity Himself. Its full evolution demanded elapsing of a few more centuries. It was for Mohammad, as prophesied by Jesus, to receive the law in its perfection. Even in ordinary human life we find gradual growth. Till a certain period of life we grow physically, morally and intellectually; we are then in need of constant change. But when a certain age is reached, our ways and habits become settled for good. Our diet and our raiments assume some sort of permanency; our knowledge may increase, but we need no change otherwise. Human race reached its age of discretion and majority when Mohammad came. He received perfect law from God, and based his religion on rational basis. It was the same old religion taught by generations of prophets, with Jesus amongst them, but in a rationalised form with necessary additions.

Our Muslim readers in the East will naturally be anxious to know something of their new Muslim brother, who is sure to receive heartiest welcome from his co-religionists in the whole world. We cannot do better than make* some selections from what appeared in the week following the announcement of this noble addition to the ranks of the faithful in more than eighty dailies and weeklies of the United Kingdom and Ireland:—

EMISSARY OF ISLAM.

MORE CONVERSIONS IN HIGH PLACES.

CONQUEST OF ENGLAND.

A MEANS OF SCOTCHING THE UNREST IN INDIA.

Following the announcement of Lord Headley's conversion to Islam we may expect very soon to hear even more sensational news of con-

* See page 405.

versions in high places, according to Mr. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, B.A., LL.B., who is the man best in a position to know.

Mr. Kamal-ud-Din landed in England thirteen months ago to convert as many Englishmen as he can to his faith. He is a remarkable personality. After a successful and lucrative career in India as a lawyer, he has constituted himself the emissary of Islam in these islands, has come here at his own expense, started a monthly review, and with three friends has taken charge of the Moslem Mosque at Woking.

Since he came he has frequently met and corresponded with Lord Headley, who contributes an article to the current number of his review, *Muslim India*.

During the past few months he has delivered several lectures, including an address to "the heretics of Cambridge" on the comparative merits of Islamic and Christian principles, and an address to the ladies of the Lyceum Club on the position of woman from Judaism to Islam, in the course of which he elaborated the thesis that "the Lord Mohammed is the only vindicator of female rights."

Mosque and house are on the outskirts of Woking, buried away in a strange old corner of parkland that is dark with conifers. Here, in a large bare room, Mr. Kamal-ud-Din received me and explained his hopes for the religious conquest of these islands.

A few more conversions in the House of Lords and the House of Commons, he contended, would be the best thing for our rule in India that could possibly happen.

"Lord Headley is now our brother," he said. "He can come to Mecca. He would be welcomed there. If he went to India he could do more for you by one visit than ten Viceroys could do in all their lives. All who embrace Islam are our brothers. Races, boundaries, nationalities do not count.

"If you had some more Mohammedans in the Lords and in the Commons there would be no more unrest among the Moslem population of India. They would say, 'There are Moslems in that Parliament. It is our Parliament.' In about fifteen days you will see. When the news of Lord Headley's conversion reaches India there will be a great outburst of feeling, good feeling, for England. You could hold India without any difficulty at all if you would only take pains to understand Islam, and if a few more of you would embrace that faith.

"All the unrest among the Moslem population has been due to religious and not to political causes. It has been agitation not against your rule, but against some offence to our religious feelings, done doubtless through misunderstanding.

"No good Moslem can have anything to do with sedition. What is the part of India where Christianity has gained the strongest footing? Bengal. What is the part of India where sedition is greatest? Bengal."

Mohammedanism, Mr. Kamal-ud-Din holds, is the religion of the future. He hinted at the remarkable developments shortly to come which I have mentioned.

He complained that his faith has been bitterly misrepresented in the matter of polygamy. "If it goes on this suffragist sex war will be the ruin of your country," he declared. "We do not have anything like that. Islam allows polygamy, but only in special circumstances as a remedial measure for things that would cause much trouble if steps were not taken. In India, you will find not one case in a thousand of a man with more than one wife."

Mr. Kamal-ud-Din spoke of our own missionary efforts in India and of the condition of things in England with the most scrupulous courtesy, but it was evident that he was not profoundly impressed with the state of our religious faith. He has made a few converts, but he explained his business is simply to lay a true, plain, unvarnished account of Islam before the people, and to leave their own hearts and consciences to do the rest.

(405)

"But do not fall into the mistake of thinking we are hostile to Christianity," he urged. "Our faith includes belief in the teachings of Christ."

—*Manchester Dispatch*, November 18, 1913,

* * * * *

ENGLISH PRESS ON THE MOHAMMADAN PEER.

PEER OF 58 CONVERTED TO MOHAMMADANISM.

After a career which has included amateur boxing, civil engineering, the editing of a local newspaper, and expert advice on coast erosion, Lord Headley, an Irish Peer, aged 58, became a convert to Mohammedanism.

The conversion was announced at a meeting of the Islamic Society, held at Frascati's, Oxford Street, by the Rev. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, who is attached to the Mohammedan Mosque at Woking.

"Those who know me will believe I am perfectly sincere in my belief," wrote Lord Headley in a letter read at the meeting.

Lord Headley may be described as a muscular Mussulman, for when at Cambridge he won both the middle-weight and heavy-weight boxing championships. He has written more than one book on the noble art of self-defence. He writes very well, by the way, and has done a good deal of journalistic work in his time. For a couple of years he was Editor of the *Salisbury Journal*.

He has also done a lot of civil engineering in recent years. He superintended some coast defence works at Youghal and similar works on the coast to the north of Bray Harbour. He also did some coast defence works at Glenbeigh, his place in one of the wildest parts of Kerry.

The problem of coast erosion has particularly interested him. At Dover in 1899 he read a paper before the British Association on the history of the reclamation of Romney Marsh.

Lord Headley is a grey-moustached, handsome man, with a fine intellectual forehead and good features, while his habit of smiling when he talks gives him a happy appearance. Some time ago he had rather a serious illness.

He has been married fourteen years, and has several children. His wife is a daughter of the late Mr. W. H. Johnson, who was Governor of Leh and Jumoo. Lord Headley was at one time working as a civil engineer in India. It was only in January of this year that he succeeded his cousin in this Irish peerage, which was created in 1797. The family has estates in Yorkshire, as well as in Ireland. They must be pretty extensive, for the late peer owned over 16,000 acres.

Lord Headley is not the first British peer to be converted to Islam, for the late Lord Stanley of Alderley was a devout adherent, having been fascinated by its teachings while serving in the diplomatic service in the East. Another conversion which caused some stir a few years ago was that of Mr. Quilliam, a Liverpool solicitor, who had imbibed the faith of Mohammedanism while in Morocco, and eventually became Sheikh of the British Isles.

The chief centres of Mohammedanism are in London, Manchester, and Liverpool. In the last city there is a Mohammedan community of about 200, but they are most unostentatious people, and hold their meetings very quietly. At one time there was a Mosque in Liverpool, but that has now been done away with.

The religion, of course, recognises no form of priesthood, believing in direct communication with the Deity. Mohammedanism was practically first introduced into England by a prominent Liverpool citizen, and its members include prominent Society people and not a few

University men. Physically the members of the Mohammedan religion are an extremely fine race, due to the strict laws of teetotalism and the strict hygienic methods which govern their course of life.

Polygamy is allowed by creed, but no member is allowed to have more than four wives. In England there are very few members of the religion with more than one wife.

—*Daily Sketch*, November 17, 1913.

* * * * *

HAPPINESS IN ISLAM.

LORD HEADLEY'S EXPERIENCE OF MOHAMMADANISM.

A SIMPLE CREED.

Lord Headley, whose adhesion to the faith of Islam is announced to-day, has long been in sympathy with Islamic teaching, and he would like to see it adopted in the Western world. "There is," he says, "comfort and freedom from bigotry and intolerance in Islam which is, to my mind, the religion of gratitude, faith, and love, the religion of charity and peace."

These thoughts his lordship has expressed in two articles in *Muslim India & Islamic Review*, of which we have received a copy. The spirit of praise, he writes, is the essence of the Muslim creed—the main supplication is for Divine direction and guidance. Though my gratitude for God's favours and loving care has been profound from my earliest youth, I cannot help observing that within the past few years, since the pure and convincing faith of the Muslims has become a reality in my heart and mind, I have found happiness and security never approached before. Freedom from the weird dogmas of the various branches of Christian Churches came to me like a breath of pure sea air, and on realising the simplicity, as well as the illuminating splendour, of Islam, I was as a man emerging from a cloudy tunnel into the light of day.

"Bigotry and fanaticism," he goes on to say, "have wrought havoc in the contending Christian Churches, but this cannot be said of Mohammedanism, which is an united Church, save only for some minor disputes as to the descendants of Mahomet.

"How much better, then, would it be if we in the West made up our minds to abandon the complicated forms of religion at present obtaining, and to adopt Islam?"

"Islam is the religion of grand simplicity; it satisfies the noblest longings of the soul, and in no way contravenes the teachings of Moses or Christ."

Lord Headley points out that the Christian religion had its origin in the East, and asks: How is it that we do not complain about the nationality of Christ, Who we must believe was a swarthy Asiatic? His mother, the Virgin Mary, was an Asiatic, and Moses and nearly all the inspired prophets were Easterners. The Holy Prophet Mahomet was, like the others, an Eastern, and was given his instruction from on high; the Holy Koran contains the Word of God like the Bible and other inspired works, and confirms the Bible and previous revelations. The Koran gives additional teachings, emphasizing the importance of those teachings, and *above all* insists on the abandonment of all that savours of idolatry; the SPIRIT of the revelation being that no other name should be even mentioned along with the holy name of Allah our All-Mighty Father—the All-Seeing, the All-Merciful.

He declares that the spirit of Islam soars far above petty jealousies and the racial distractions of East and West, and if Eastern Christianity led by the great Prophet of Nazareth has gone so far towards enlightening mankind, there seems to be no valid reason why the more extended

(407)

and simpler Islamic faith expounded by the great Prophet of Arabia should not continue the good work. There is a great similarity between the characters of the leaders, as anyone will find out on inquiring into Mahomet's life. Also a study of the Koran will reveal the fact that there is nothing antagonistic to previous revelations—Mahomet's instructions, as laid down in the book, completely back up the Bible's teachings, extending them to suit the requirements of the time.

Lord Headley, it may be added, is the fifth baron, having succeeded his cousin in January of this year. He was born in 1855, and is an engineer by profession.

—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

* * * * *

While, in view of the large Oriental interests of the Empire, there is a certain fitness in having the Faith of Islam represented in the House of Lords, the actual conversion of a peer to the Mohammedan religion is an event rare enough to cause remark; and so Lord Headley is likely, for the next few days, to be a much-interviewed man. It says something for his broad-mindedness that he does not propose to sever his connection with the English Church. There are many in this country who have no room in their lives for one religion. The man who can find room for two is to be congratulated, both on his largeness of view and his adaptability to varying requirements.

—*Pall Mall Gazette*, November 18, 1913.

* * * * *

THE FAITH OF ISLAM.

Sir,—In your issue of to-day's date you have quite correctly and succinctly stated my views on the subject of the Muslim faith, but I observe that, under the heading "Notes of the Day," the writer speaks of having the "Faith of Islam represented in the House of Lords." Considering that more than half of his Majesty's subjects are Mahomedans, this would, perhaps, be desirable, but I must point out that I am not a member of the House of Lords, and am not likely ever to seek election, so that the honour of championing the cause must be left to some other peer who will, I sincerely hope, come forward and admit that he has been touched by the simplicity and charity of Islam.

Your writer is also a little mistaken in supposing that I have two religions. I have only one—surrender and submission to God, and beneficence to all His creatures—for this is the meaning of the word "Islam." It seems to me that Christ also taught this, which explains why it is impossible to be a good Mahomedan without also being a good Christian.—Faithfully yours,

HEADLEY.

St. Margaret's, Twickenham, November 17.

—*Pall Mall Gazette*, November 19, 1913.

* * * * *

WHAT IS CHRISTIAN?

Sir,—Lord Headley, in his letter published in to-day's issue of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, in which he further explains the process of thought which has led him to adopt the Mohammedan religion, has fallen into an error which, though palpable, has, nevertheless, been the cause of much oblique thinking on the subject of Christianity. He says, in concluding his remarks on the duty of surrender and submission to God and beneficence to all His creatures, "It seems to me that Christ also taught this, which explains why it is impossible to be a good Mohammedan without also being a good Christian."

If Lord Headley will pardon my saying so, far from explaining anything of the kind, it only goes to prove that he has not yet grasped the elementary fact of what essentially constitutes a Christian. A Christian

is not necessarily a man who does his duty to God, or man, nor need he necessarily be kind, beneficent, or even socially moral. Though he lacks all these virtues he is yet "more of a Christian" than the best Mohammedan who ever lived.

A good Christian of necessity possesses these virtues, but his being a Christian depends neither upon the possession or admiration of them any more than his religion is made perfect by them alone. The Christian religion stands for far more than the mere possession of virtues.

A man, whether he be good or bad, *is only a Christian if he has been "born again," that is to say, if he has been through the Sacrament of Baptism, and no amount of kindness or other attribute which must contribute to the making of a good Christian can ever make a man one (good, bad, or indifferent) who has not been baptised. He is simply not a Christian at all.*

I hope you will find a space for this in your valuable columns, as it touches on a common view of Christianity which is both erroneous and dangerous.—Faithfully yours,

(Rev.) BERNARD HENRY BERLYN.

St. Alban the Martyr, Fulham, November 18.

—*Pall Mall Gazette*, November 21, 1913.

* * * * *

WHAT IS CHRISTIAN?

Sir,—The rev. gentleman who writes under this heading in your yesterday's issue rather misses my point. He holds that it is impossible to be a Christian unless you have been baptised. I affirm that you can be a most excellent follower of Christ's teaching and obey it in the spirit without ever having heard of baptism or the Lord's Supper, and without believing in the Divinity of Christ or the Trinity. Surely, it is far more important to carry out in your life those divine precepts enjoined by Christ than to rely on a mere form like baptism for salvation? The one is the spirit, the other the letter. Again, I must point out that all good Muslims must be followers of Moses, Christ, and Mahomet—the Prophets of God. I hold that any good and earnest follower of Christ is to all intents and purposes a good Christian, even though he may not have been baptised. I know many Mohammedans who carry out Christ's teachings with a fidelity that would astonish many a baptised Christian. Accident of birth is alone responsible for the omission of the baptismal ceremony, but, as Muslims, they are true to Christ's teaching though baptism has not taken place.

Take my own case. I happen to have been baptised, and being at the time an infant of tender years, my opinion was not asked, and I had to submit much as, some eighteen years later on, I submitted to confirmation, simply and solely to please my father, who wished me to be confirmed. As to believing that the baptism, the confirmation, the belief in the Divinity of Christ or the Lord's Supper are necessary to my salvation, or that if I cannot "think of the Trinity" as did St. Athanasius I shall be everlastingly damned by the God of Mercy—I simply don't believe it, and never did, and, what is more, I feel sure that half the people who outwardly profess these opinions merely do so for appearance sake. A well-educated man told me not long ago that, without believing in any of the dogmas, he always went to church every Sunday, and took the Communion once a fortnight. He was a nominal Christian, having been baptised, yet he found no difficulty in acting a lie every Sunday and a worse lie once a fortnight!

To my mind the real Christian is the man who tries to show it in his life by obedience and submission to God and endeavouring to do his duty to his neighbours, and by avoiding anything of the nature of a lie. But I fear that the rev. gentleman and myself are not quite on the same

platform, so that we cannot well join issue, and it will, therefore, be best to gracefully disagree and leave it to your readers to say which of us is right. I have taken the liberty of sending a short article on this subject to the *Observer* next Sunday, the 23rd inst., and hope it may throw some light on one or two points.—Faithfully yours,

HEADLEY.

* * * * *

WHY I BECAME A MOSLEM.

Lord Headley in an interview with the *Daily Mail* representative said the following:—

“It is the intolerance of those professing the Christian religion which more than anything else is responsible for my secession. You never hear Mahomedans speak concerning those of other religions as you hear Christians talk of one another. They may feel very sorry that other persons do not hold the Mahomedan faith, but they don't condemn them to everlasting damnation because of a differing belief.

“The purity and simplicity of the Mahomedan religion, its freedom from dogma and sacerdotalism, and the obvious truth of it make a special appeal to me. The earnestness and the sincerity of Mahomedans, too, is greater than anything I have seen on the part of Christians. The ordinary Christian man puts on religion on Sunday as a respectable habit. When Sunday is over his religion is discarded for the rest of the week. With the Mahomedan, on the contrary, there is no distinction between Sunday and any other day. He is always thinking of what he can do in God's service.

—*Daily Mail*, November 17, 1913.

* * * * *

MANY CONVERTS.

The announcement of the conversion of Lord Headley from Christianity to Islam has caused a slight stir in certain circles, doubtless by reason of the position which he holds, but those who are well informed as to the progress which the religion of the Prophet is making among Britishers, not only in Mahometan countries but here in the British Isles, and in London particularly, know that conversions from Christianity to Islam are of almost daily occurrence. They are not given the publicity which attends generally upon conversions from Protestantism to Roman Catholicism or from non-Christian religions to a Christian faith, but they nevertheless occur, and that frequently. The late Lord Stanley of Alderley, whose brother was an ecclesiastic of the Roman Catholic Church, is the only previous Mahometan convert from the peerage, but in all the professions and walks of London life there are to be found numerous converts. At present there are two mosques in England—one at Liverpool and the other at Woking, the latter being provided with an excellent Oriental library—but for many years past a movement has been on foot to erect a mosque in a central part of the West End of London.

—*Belfast Northern Whig*, November 19, 1913.

* * * * *

PEER'S CONVERSION.

Lord Headley, in an interview, explained that in publicly identifying himself with the Mahomedan faith he was not departing in any way from the beliefs he had held for the last twenty years. “When the Islamic Society asked me,” I said, “to their dinner the other night I was only too pleased to be able to go and to tell them how deep was my attachment to their religion. . . . It is the intolerance of those professing the Christian religion which more than anything else is responsible for my secession. I was reared in the strict and narrow forms of the Low Church party. Later I lived in many Roman Catholic

countries, including Ireland. The intolerance of one sect of Christians towards other sects holding some different form of the same faith, of which I witnessed many instances, disgusted me. You never hear Mahomedans speak concerning those of other religions as you hear Christians talk of one another. They may feel very sorry that other persons do not hold the Mahomedan faith, but they don't condemn them to everlasting damnation because of a differing belief.

"The purity and simplicity of the Mahomedan religion, its freedom from dogma and sacerdotalism, and the obvious truth of it make a special appeal to me. The earnestness and the sincerity of Mahomedans, too, are greater than anything I have seen on the part of Christians. The ordinary Christian man puts on religion on Sunday as a respectable habit because he thinks it is right, and possibly because his father and his grandfather before him always honoured Sunday with the same observance. When Sunday is over his religion is discarded for the rest of the week. With the Mahomedan, on the contrary, there is no distinction between Sunday and any other day. He is always thinking of what he can do in God's service.

—*Liverpool Evening Express*, November 17, 1913.

* * * * *

We have no doubt that many a prayer for Lord Headley will go up from humble Christian hearts that he may return to the way of truth; and unquestionably that is the proper attitude of mind towards a profoundly regrettable incident. We need not characterise it in severer terms. For various reasons we are no longer in the old ferocious mood of belief which so early crept into the Church—despite the emphatic warning of the Master—and wrought such lasting and terrible mischief. So, even when a Christian turns Mussulman, we do not care to hurl at him the sort of names which would have come naturally to our fathers. Perhaps, too, in days when the spirit of indifference is felt to be the deadliest enemy of faith, we incline to think that any serious consideration of religious questions, even when it leads to lamentable error, has value of a kind.

—*Guardian*, November 21, 1913.

* * * * *

MOHAMMADAN MOSQUES IN ENGLAND.

The recent conversion of an English peer to Mohammedanism is a reminder that the Mohammedans in this country are sufficiently numerous and influential to support several places of worship. Three splendid mosques are in existence in England. Those at Liverpool and Woking have long been noted for their exquisite appointments. Of more recent date is the one situated in Bayswater. The doors are gilded in a similar way to those of the world-famous Taj Mahal at Agra, built by Shah-Jehan. In the East End there is a sacred temple of Al Ahmed, where the faithful meet once a year to go through a curious ceremony in honour of the Prophet.

—*Westminster Gazette*, November 21, 1913.

* * * * *

A CHANCE THAT HAS BEEN MISSED.

We have missed a chance of a really fine spectacle in London, all through being two or three hundred years too late in time. I have been looking up the authorities to see what would have been done to Lord Headley by our fiercer and certainly more Christian forefathers. Lord Headley, you may have noticed, has become a convert to the Moslem faith, though he declares that he is still a Christian just the same. Opinions amongst the learned seem to differ as to whether his lordship ought to be burned alive at the stake, hanged, drawn and quartered, or

merely beheaded. Whatever the penalty, it would, of course, have been paid in public. What a magnificent show that would have been! A real live peer on his way to be executed in public! Seats would have sold for a fortune, and Mr. Larkin, whose arrival in London would have been just in time, would have had the treat of his life.

—*Leeds Mercury*, November 20, 1913.

* * * * *

THE EMPIRE OF MANY CREEDS.

But, as one paper truly points out, there is, in view of the large Oriental interests of the Empire, a certain fitness in having the Faith of Islam represented in the House of Lords. For ourselves, we only wish it were well and strongly represented in the House of Commons too. There is a very widespread tendency in these "tight little islands"—as the Aliens Act and the spirit which inspired it prove—to forget that England is not the British Empire, and that while the home population is comparatively homogeneous in race and creed this does not apply to the Empire at large. The British Empire is a conglomerate of many faiths and peoples; and if the presence of Mussulman peers in Parliament keeps that fact before some of our insularly-minded fellow-countrymen it will be a point gained.

—*Jewish World*, November 19, 1913.

* * * * *

A PEER'S CONVERSION TO MOHAMMADANISM.

Lord Headley's conversion may give an impetus to the movement for the establishment in London of a worthy Mohammedan place of worship. At present the services of the large Islamic community have been held in restaurants, and the need for a mosque has been intensified of late by the continued influx of Mohammedans, principally young Indians, who come to London to study.

Mussulmans of the British Empire are numbered by the million, and hundreds of Englishmen worship under the banner of the Prophet. Yet there is no place in the capital of the British Empire where proper facilities are provided for Muslims to observe the duties of their religion.

—*Manchester Dispatch*, November 17, 1913.

* * * * *

ENGLISH MOHAMMADANS.

Lord Headley's conversion to Mahomedanism recalls the fact that there are already two mosques in England—one in Liverpool and the other at Woking. The former is, perhaps, the better known. For some years past there has been a scheme on foot, which may eventually materialise, for the erection of a third in Central London. It would appear that converts in the British Isles are more numerous than is generally known, and they are to be found in all walks in life.

—*Globe*, November 18, 1913.

* * * * *

MOSLEM MISSIONARIES.

A gathering of Indian Mahometans, arranged by the Islamic Society, was held yesterday afternoon at Frascati's Restaurant, to induce the two or three hundred young Moslems resident in London to continue the ceremonial observance of their religion, and to refuse to drink wine. Most of those who attended were, of course, Indians, but there was a sprinkling of Egyptians and one or two Turks. The event of the afternoon was the announcement of the conversion of Lord Headley, an Irish peer. Mr. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, a barrister, who is understood to have left a lucrative practice at Lahore to act as an Islamic missionary in this

country, complained that his work was greatly hindered by the slackness of his professing co-religionists, and upon the proposition of Mr. Shel-drake, a young English convert, the tables and chairs were cleared away, handkerchiefs were spread on the floor instead of praying mats, and Mr. ud-Din led the assembly in the Jumma, or evening prayer. Mr. Zafar Ali Khan, the host, was prevented from being present owing to a sudden chill, but it was announced on his behalf that he would make himself financially responsible for rooms wherein all Moslems should be invited to meet every Friday for prayers, and it was hoped that this would be the beginning of a mosque for London. It was also announced that the establishment of a London Mahometan weekly paper was under consideration.

—*Manchester Guardian*, November 17, 1913.

* * * * *

TIDAL WAVE OF MOHAMMADANISM.

Lord Headley's conversion to Mohammedanism reminds one that there are quite a surprising number of English Moslems. Other famous English converts have been the late Lord Stanley of Alderley and the late Sir Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, but there is a Moslem rank and file with mosques at Liverpool and Woking. A movement is on foot to put up a great mosque in London. The Liverpool mosque is the best known, and has, or used to have, an English sheikh who was the religious representative of the Sultan in this country. Lord Headley points out that his Mohammedanism is not inconsistent with his Christianity. Mohammedans recognise the teaching of Christ and Judaism as earlier dispensations in much the same way that Christians look upon Judaism. Mohammedanism, however, is losing ground in Europe. In Africa and Asia it is carrying everything before it. A generation or so ago the Sahara desert was the southern limit of African Mohammedanism. Now it has penetrated throughout the Soudan and into Central Africa, and is advancing rapidly southwards. In Asia it has swept through Turkestan into Western Mongolia. Mr. Carruthers, in his book just published, "Unknown Mongolia," bears testimony to the amazing success of the Mohammedan propaganda. In the Western Provinces of China, which are largely Moslem, the religion is also gaining ground.

—*Yorkshire Observer*, November 19, 1913.

* * * * *

ISLAM IN ENGLAND.

There can be no question that the cult of Islam in England will receive a small impetus by the conversion of Lord Headley. The last peer to join the Moslem faith, the late Lord Stanley of Alderley, was regarded as a great capture, but Lord Headley's long association with India, where sixty million British subjects call upon Mohammed's name daily, will cause his conversion to be regarded with unusual sympathy by Indian and, indeed, all Asiatic Moslems.

The fact is that Islam is at present in the midst of a great missionary and propaganda work. The "faithful" are increasing at the rate of a million a year. It is the only serious rival Christianity has to face. The two faiths are contending with each other for the mastery of nearly a quarter of the globe, and the measure of Islam's earnestness in the work may be shown by this sentence—that for every Christian missionary sent by Europe into Africa nearly a score of Moslem preachers are sent thither from the schools and colleges of Cairo and Stamboul.

I used to attend at intervals the Moslem mosque in Liverpool, where a Manx solicitor had changed himself into the Sheik Abdullah, and was working like a Salvation Army captain to spread the faith. What interested me most was not the attitude of the converted Liverpool people

—and they were not a few—but that of the educated Moslems from India and Persia and Cairo who came to Liverpool on business.

It was very nice to have a mosque in the heart of a Christian land, and they appreciated the peace and quietude in which they could make their prostrations, turn their faces towards Mecca, and say their daily prayers to Allah.

Not one single nation that ever adopted Mohammedanism has renounced it! There is no parallel to this in the world's history. And still the tide of conquest flowed—through Spain to the walls of Vienna, through the Balkans, and even into France, and if it had not been for the battle of Tours we might have been a race of British Moslems, and our pulpits been occupied with mullahs expounding the words of the Prophet.

They are proud of their success in Africa, and as even a bad Moslem nigger is better than a so-called Christian who has failed to catch the spiritual, but has imbibed the spirituous, they have no cause to be ashamed of the results of their teaching.

Just one word as to Islam itself. It is not an ideal religion, though it has many good points. Even bishops and peers may misunderstand it. The Bishop of London recently said that the faith of Mohammed was antagonistic to Christ. Does he not know that Moslems speak of Jesus Christ as "Sidna Issa," or "Our Lord Jesus," and that in one sacred mosque, where Mohammed lies buried at Medina, there is a vacant tomb to await the day when Christ shall end His second coming? No, Moslemism is not antagonistic to Christ, though it rejects Him as Diety and places Him only among the great prophets.

—*Daily Dispatch* (Manchester), November 20, 1913.

* * * * *

GROWTH OF MODERN CHRISTIANITY, BY LORD HEADLEY.

Without the slightest desire to attack any particular branch of the Christian religion—and there are many such branches—one may safely point to the beauty and simplicity of the Moslem faith by way of contrast. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that the religion of St. Paul is not quite the original religion as laid down by Christ. Sacredotal influences have been brought to bear upon Christianity at every turn, and bids for the temporal power have been apparent on all sides.

There can be but little doubt that much of the religion of the West is the outcome of the superstitions of mediæval times—a relic, indeed, of the Dark Ages, and not much in sympathy with the teachings of Moses or Christ.

In those cloudy and troublesome times—say between the third and fifth centuries and later—when Europe was the vast arena over which hordes of wild and warlike races vied with each other and spread terror and desolation on all sides, the great rulers of States, like the warlike barons or lords in England, were often men more conspicuous for their prowess with sword or battle-axe, wielded in defence of their estates, their hearths and homes, than they were for any book learning and culture. In order to keep things going at home they had to employ clerks or clerics who were able, by means of their superior learning, to maintain a sort of stewardship over the establishments, to keep records of current events, &c., &c.

These clerics in time became necessary adjuncts to large establishments, and exercised great power, and had great influence. Opportunities then often occurred for increasing this influence by using the mysteries of the unknown as a fulcrum against which to place those astonishingly long levers—dread of hell and terrors of future punishment. Skilful handling of these terrors produced in the minds of the credulous a feeling not far removed from panic, which was, however, soothed and smoothed down by the assurance that, on embracing a cer-

tain form of religion and swallowing some craftily evolved dogmas, salvation might be gained. But it was somehow contrived that absolute security as regards a safe and high place in the next world could not be obtained unless by very handsome gifts to "the Church," and these gifts took the form of large grants of land, palaces, cathedrals, and rich endowments. Here we saw the birth of sacerdotalism, and the determined bids for temporal authority have been very noticeable ever since, and right up to the present date.

The advent of Mahomet, some six hundred years after Christ, exposed the unreality of all such ideas as atonements, priestly interventions, supplications to the saints, and those other cumbersome and involved methods of approaching the Almighty. However grand the Mosaic laws, however beautiful the gentle and forgiving precepts of the Holy Prophet of Nazareth, it must be admitted that the Mahomedan teaching contained the most sublime message, overriding by its very simplicity all obstacles in the way of the believer on his path to God.

In Chapter IX. of the Koran lines occur which leave no doubt as to their meaning and applicability to all who are under sacerdotal influence and insist on taking human beings for their guides:—

"They take their priests and their monks for their lords, besides God, and Christ the Son of Mary, although they are commanded to worship one God only; there is no God but He; far be that from Him which they associate with Him." . . . "O true believers, verily many of the priests and monks *devour the substance of men in vanity, and obstruct the way of God.*" [The italic is the writer's.]

There is, in fact, not much uniformity in so-called Christianity, but we find in Islam that which should satisfy the longings of the created to be at one with and return to the Creator—the ever-present and omnipotent protector of all creatures, and according to Islam there is only one God we may worship and follow. He is before all, above all, and no other, however holy and pure, may be named in the same breath. Indeed, "it is surprising that human beings with brains and intelligence should have been so foolish as to allow dogmas and the tricks of sacerdotalism to obscure their view of Heaven and their Almighty Father, who is always approachable by each one of His creatures, whether human or saintly (i.e., Divinely inspired).

"The key to Heaven is always there, and can be turned by the humblest or most miserable human being without any help from prophet, priest, or king. It is like the blessed air we breath, free to all God's creatures, and those who try to make mankind think otherwise are probably guided by interested motives—e.g., salaries and stipends—which keep professions going, or some other worldly advantages."

Only the other day I received two letters, both from devout Christians. One writer, whilst complaining of my leaning towards Islam, pointed out that the Mahomedanism was the religion of sensuality, and that Mahomet had a great many wives! The other letter informed me in emphatic terms that if I did not believe in the Divinity of Christ I could not be saved.

In England we pride ourselves on our love of fair play, and it does seem to me as unfair to condemn the tenets of any particular religion without knowing anything about them as it would be to condemn an accused man without hearing his defence.

There is a story told of a young and inexperienced Eastern ruler before whom an alleged criminal was being tried for his life. The evidence against the man seemed very strong; so, immediately at its conclusion, the youthful potentate said, "All right, take him away and hang him."

"But, your majesty," said the defending counsel, "will you be pleased to hear the witnesses for the defence?"

"Not I!" said the young ruler; "I might change my mind; take him away and hang him."

I wrote and explained to the first-named writer that Islam was not a religion of sensuality, but one of submission to God and beneficence to all His creatures, and that Mahomet's life was singularly blameless, and that his numerous wives were really married in order to provide them with homes, as they were the widows of those of his supporters who were slain in battle. I pointed out to the second writer that the Divinity of Christ never worried me one way or the other, and that the important point was whether Christ delivered God's messages to mankind.

Having shaken off the shackles of bigotry and superstition I feel myself like a man emerging from a tunnel, charged with mephitic and sulphurous gases, into the fresh clean air, and, to conclude this article, which has, I fear, exceeded its limits, I will quote from a little book I wrote a year or so ago—the same work previously quoted from: "The dogmas of the Christian Church—I care not whether Roman Catholic or Protestant—have repelled me ever since earliest childhood, and I do not know whether my boyish distrust of the Creed as laid down by St. Athanasius was less strong than is my contempt to-day for the man who lays down the law from a pulpit and consigns millions of his fellow men to everlasting perdition because they do not agree with him. It has always seemed to me very remarkable that educated gentlemen should be found who, in order to get into the Church, will cheerfully subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles and that horrible Creed, well knowing in their hearts that they do not and cannot believe one-half they put their names to. After forty years of thought and prayerful effort to arrive at a correct view, the dominant idea in my mind is that the whole fabric of so-called religion is of man and not of God. I must also confess that visits to the East have filled me with a very deep respect for the simple faith of the Mahommedans, who really do worship God all the time, and not only on Sunday, like so many Christians."

Islam is the religion of grand simplicity; it satisfies the noblest longings of the soul, and in no way contravenes the teachings of Moses or Christ.

I hope on a future occasion to be able to give your readers an extension of this article.

HEADLEY.

—*London Budget.*

WHY I BECAME A MOHAMMEDAN.

THE FAITH OF ISLAM.

By LORD HEADLEY.

IN several newspapers notices have appeared commenting on my religious belief, and it is highly gratifying to me to find that so far all criticism has been of a most kindly nature. It is not to be expected that any decided step can be taken out of the beaten track of every-day custom without attracting attention.

I am very glad that such is the case. I am fond of my profession, and certain forms of athletics and sport have ever been my hobbies, but there has never been any desire for notoriety or publicity on my part; but in this case, if my action is the means of making people tolerant and broad-minded, I am quite prepared to put up with every kind of ridicule and abuse.

The other day a letter reached me from a devout Christian, informing me that the Mohammedan religion was one of sensuality, and that the Prophet had a great many wives! What an idea of Islam! But it is the idea in the mind of ninety-nine out of one hundred Britishers, who will not take the trouble to inquire into the plain facts as to the religious beliefs of over 100 million of their fellow-subjects. The Holy Prophet of Arabia was particularly self-restrained and chaste. He was true to his one wife Khadijah, who was fifteen years older than himself. She was the first to believe in the Divine messages. After her death he married Ayesha. He also married a great many of the widows of those of his adherents who had fallen in battle, not because he had the slightest desire for them, but in order to provide them with a home and give them a position they could not otherwise enjoy. This was quite in keeping with his unselfish and noble life. He gave away so much of his worldly belongings that he hardly ever had quite enough to live on.

We Britishers are wont to pride ourselves on our love for fair play and justice, yet what can be more unfair than condemning, as so many of us do, the Mohammedan faith without first attempting to find out even so much as an outline of its tenets or the meaning of the word Islam?

It is possible that some of my friends may imagine that I have been influenced by Mohammedans; but this is not the case, for my present convictions are solely the outcome of many years of thought. My actual conversations with educated Muslims on the subject of religion only commenced a few weeks ago, and need I say that I am overjoyed to find that all my theories and conclusions are entirely in accord with Islam? Even my friend, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, has never tried to influence me in the slightest degree. He has been a veritable living concordance, and has patiently explained and translated portions of the Koran which did not appear quite clear to me, and in this respect he showed the true spirit of the Muslim missionary, which is never to force or even persuade. Conversion, according to the Koran, should come out of free choice and spontaneous judgment, and never be attained by means of compulsion. Jesus meant the same thing when He said to His disciples: "And whosoever shall not receive you nor hear you, when ye depart thence. . . ." (St. Mark vi. 2.)

I have known very many instances of zealous Protestants who have thought it their duty to visit Roman Catholic homes in order to make "converts" of the inmates. Such irritating and unneighbourly conduct is, of course, very obnoxious, and has invariably led to much illfeeling—stirring up strife and tending to bring religion into contempt. I am sorry to think that Christian missionaries have also tried these methods with their Muslim brethren, though why they should try to convert those who are already better Christians than they are themselves

I am at a loss to conceive. I say "better Christians" advisedly, because the charity, tolerance and broad-mindedness in the Muslim faith come nearer to what Christ Himself taught than do the somewhat narrow tenets of the various Christian churches. To take one example of this narrowness—the Athanasian Creed, which treats of the Trinity in a very confusing manner. In this Creed, which is very important and deals conclusively with one of the fundamental tenets of the "Churches," it is laid down most clearly that it represents the Catholic faith, and that if we do not believe it we shall perish everlastingly; then we are told that we *must thus think of the Trinity* if we want to be saved—in other words, that a God we in one breath hail as merciful and almighty in the next breath we accuse of injustice and cruelty which we would not attribute to the most bloodthirsty human tyrant. As if God, Who is before all and above all, would be in any way influenced by what a poor mortal "thinks of the Trinity." I have never thought very much about the Trinity, as it is so confusing and does no good, but the other day an idea did flash into my mind, and I thought a little. It seems possible that St. Athanasias composed the most involved and puzzling Creed he could think of, and so arranged the wording that no layman could possibly unravel its tangles without applying to himself or some priest for the solution. I do not advance this idea very seriously, and there is probably nothing in it—it was merely a fugitive thought, which I was just quick enough to catch before it vanished. Here is another instance of want of charity. I received a letter—it was apropos of my leaning towards Islam—in which the writer told me that if I did not believe in the Divinity of Christ I *could not be saved*. The question of the Divinity of Christ never seemed to me nearly so important as that other question: Did He give God's message to mankind? Now, if I had any doubt about this latter point it would worry me a great deal; but, thank God, I have no doubt, and I hope that my faith in Christ and His inspired teachings is as firm as that of any other Muslim or Christian. As I have often said before, Islam and Christianity *as taught by Christ Himself* are sister religions, only held apart by dogmas and technicalities which might very well be dispensed with.

In the present day men are prone to become atheists when asked to subscribe to dogmatic and intolerant beliefs, and there is doubtless a craving for a religion appealing to the intelligence as well as the sentiments. Who ever heard of a Muslim turning atheist? There may have been cases, but I very much doubt it. There are thousands of men—and women too, I believe—who are at heart Muslims, but convention, fear of adverse comments and a desire to avoid any worry or change conspire to keep them from openly admitting the fact. I have taken the step, though I am quite aware that many friends and relations now look upon me as a lost soul and past praying for. And yet I

am just the same in my beliefs as I was twenty years ago ; it is the outspoken utterance which has lost me their good opinion. Fear is responsible for a vast amount of misery and crime in this world ; if people would be more outspoken there would be less misunderstanding and far more respect. Borrowing Mr. Balfour's aphorism, " There is but one counsellor worse than panic, and that counsellor is despair," I would say in this case there is an adviser worse and more dangerous than either doubt or disbelief, and that adviser is fear. Having briefly given some of my reasons for adopting the teachings of Islam, and having explained that I consider myself by that very act a far better Christian than I was before, I can only hope that others will follow the example—which I honestly believe is a good one—which will bring happiness to anyone looking upon the step as one in advance rather than one in any way hostile to true Christianity.—*The Observer* (London), November 23, 1913.

To the Editor "MUSLIM INDIA."

DEAR SIR,—Interest in *Muslim India* is largely attributable to the intellectual perception and expression of its writers, and to the accuracy with which they refer to leaders of philosophic and religious thought. Shaikh Feroz-ud-Din Khan, when dealing with "The Lords of the East and the West"—see issue for October 1913—has unhappily allowed himself to fall into an error which, equally unhappily, has been too often adopted by other literary folk. He has torn two lines of Rudyard Kipling's from the verse to which they belong and used those lines as a text to show that the author's desire was to "pamper selfishness" and "deceive their fellow-beings," teaching the latter to differentiate "the Eastern from the so-called Western nations." The poem was intended to convey an exactly opposite meaning, and the extraction and employment of the two lines only results in extracting the very soul and beauty of the poem, since those two lines refer alone to the geographical position as generally understood :—

" For East is East and West is West,
And never the twain may meet ;
But there's neither East nor West
Border, nor breed, nor birth,
When two strong men stand face to face,
Though they come from the ends of the earth."

In other words, Shaikh Feroz-ud-Din Khan and Mr. Kipling stand on the same fine platform. "The East and the West are only the illusions of short-sighted eyes." Has the former, for a little time, been affected by short-sight.—Believe me, dear Sir,
very faithfully yours,

ERIC HAMMOND.

30 Park Road, Wimbledon, S.W.,
November 4, 1913.