



FANATICISM

INTOLERANCE

AND

Islam

BY

KHURSHID AHMAD

M.A., LL.B.



ISLAMIC PUBLICATIONS LTD.

KARACHI - LAHORE - DACCA

FANATICISM, INTOLERANCE AND ISLAM

by
KHURSHID AHMAD

ISLAMIC PUBLICATIONS LTD.

13-E, Shahalam Market, LAHORE (W. Pakistan)

Branch : 16, Baitul Mukarram (1st Floor), DACCA (E. Pakistan)

(All Rights Reserved)

Copyright by
ISLAMIC PUBLICATIONS LTD., LAHORE

| | | |
|--------------------------|-----|------|
| First Edition | ... | 1957 |
| Second Edition (Reprint) | | 1960 |
| Third Edition (..) | | 1967 |

Price Re. 1.50

Printed by M. NASEER BAIG,
Jadeed Urdu Type Press
39, Chamberlain Road, Lahore (West Pakistan)

Published by AKHLAQ HUSAIN,
Director, Islamic Publications Ltd.
13-E, Shahalam Market, Lahore (West Pakistan)

PREFACE

On countless occasions, I have to face the poser : *Islam is intolerant and fanatic*. In discussions and speeches I have tried to refute the allegation. With the publication of the 'Punjab Disturbances Court of Inquiry Report' in 1954, the critics of Islam started a vituperative campaign against this religion. They tried to "prove" that if Pakistan was made an Islamic State, it would become an arena of competing fanaticisms. In my introduction to "*An Analysis of the Munir Report*" I offered a detailed refutation of this allegation and exposed its fallacious reasoning. On the suggestion of some friends, this part of the introduction was developed into an essay on 'Fanaticism, Intolerance and Islam'. The first part of the original article was entirely rewritten, a new section was added on 'Tolerance and Islam' and thorough revisions were made throughout the text. The brochure was published in 1957 under the title 'Fanaticism, Intolerance and Islam'. I am grateful to note that it was given a good reception and encouraged by the welcome awarded to it, I have now revised the essay thoroughly and have tried to make it more comprehensive. But I have taken pains to keep the essay brief so that it may remain easy reading.

I have taken due care to present the facts after

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|---|--------|
| PREFACE | ... iv |
| 1. The Problem | ... 1 |
| 2. The Bogey of Intolerance | ... 5 |
| 3. Secularism and Intolerance | ... 8 |
| 4. "Tolerance" in Europe and America | ... 11 |
| 5. Western Intolerance Towards Other Cultures | ... 19 |
| 6. Islam and Secular Intolerance | ... 23 |
| 7. Science and "Tolerance" | ... 25 |
| 8. Liberty in the Modern World | ... 33 |
| 9. Tolerance and Islam | ... 42 |
| —Islam, the Religion of Equality | ... 44 |
| —Sanctity of Human Life | ... 47 |
| —Justice and the Rule of Law | ... 49 |
| —There is No Compulsion in Religion | ... 53 |
| —Ends do not Justify Means | ... 59 |

must be studied, pondered and appreciated. In this essay, as I am addressing those people who are out-doing even the Westerners in their 'admiration' for modern civilization and as I am confining myself to a rational and historical inquiry into the problem of intolerance and fanaticism, I have presented only those facts which are relevant to my inquiry and have not embarked upon a study of the pros and cons of the modern West. As to my attitude to the West, I can do no better than borrow the words of that great Muslim philosopher whose thinking has become a part and parcel of the air we breathe—Dr. Muhammad Iqbal, who in his *Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam* says: "*The only course open to us is to approach modern knowledge with a respectful but INDEPENDENT attitude*", lest, "*the dazzling exterior of the European culture may arrest our movement*". This is what I believe and this is what I uphold.

To the critics I would say that instead of accusing me of being 'unbalanced'—which because of the nature of my inquiry the essay is—they should try to see whether my statements are *correct* and my data are *authentic*? And if they are correct and authentic—which they are—then they should, instead of dragging in any red-herring, honestly give thought to them and the conclusions which flow from them and thus realise the true worth of an allegation so commonly showered. After all, the myth of Goebbles is to be exploded one day and mere repetition of a lie *ad*

proper verification. All the material is taken from authentic books and I have given necessary references in the footnotes. I have given a large number of quotations so that I may not be accused of innovation or misrepresentation. And as the essay is meant for those sections of our intelligentsia which are badly under the spell of the West, I have relied on the western authorities only. I have presented that side of the picture before them which is commonly kept veiled. Now it is for them to ponder over these glaring facts and decide about the real worth of these allegations which are hurled in a vein of fanatic frenzy.

Nevertheless, I feel I must clarify one thing at the very outset. In this essay I have to present that side of the modern civilization which is ugly and affronting to every instinct of justice. This was essential to place the facts in their proper perspective. But it does not mean that the modern civilization has nothing to its credit. In several fields it has won spectacular achievements and they are a common legacy of mankind—every country and every people should be benefited by them. I am an admirer of the achievements of the modern science and fully acknowledge its services to humanity. But this must not mean that because of some rosy achievements, the other side of the picture should be just ignored and connived at. I believe that both the blessings and the miseries engendered by modern civilization

“One of the commonest charges brought against Islam historically, and as a religion, by Western writers is that it is intolerant. This is turning the tables with a vengeance when one remembers various facts : One remembers that not a Muslim is left alive in Spain or Sicily or Apulia. One remembers that not a Muslim was left alive and not a mosque left standing in Greece after the great rebellion in 1821. One remembers how the Muslims of Balkan peninsula, once the majority, have been systematically reduced with the approval of the whole of Europe, how the Christians under Muslim rule have in recent times been urged on to rebel and massacre the Muslims, and how reprisals by the latter have been condemned as quite uncalled-for. One remembers how the Jews were persecuted throughout Europe in the Middle Ages, what they suffered in Spain after the expulsion of the Moors and what they suffered in Czarist Russia and Poland even in our own day, while in the Muslim Empire Christians and Jews had liberty of conscience and full self-government in all internal affairs of their communities.”

—MUHAMMAD MARMADUKE PICKTHALL
in *“Islamic Culture,”* Lahore : p. 81.

infinitum is not going to make it an embodiment of truth.

I take this opportunity to thank all those respectable friends who helped me in the preparation of this essay. I particularly owe a great debt to Syed Abul A'la Maududi and Maulana Zafar Ahmad Ansari who were kind enough to give me some valuable suggestions. I have to thank Khwaja Abdul Wahid, Prof. Abdul Hamid Siddiqui, Mr. Zafar Ishaq Ansari and Chaudhry Ghulam Muhammad for their unstinted help and ungrudging assistance. I hardly need add that none of these learned friends is responsible for the views expressed and the mistakes that might have crept in.

1, New Queens Road
Karachi.

KHURSHID AHMAD

1st October, 1960.

“You can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time.”

—Abraham Lincoln.

CHAPTER I

The Problem

CRITICS, during the last five hundred years, have been very 'kind' towards religion. They have showered over it objections and allegations of every hue and colour. They have laboured hard to paint it in the vilest and the darkest colours and thus present a harrowing picture of it. And, as the modern western civilization was a revolt against the corrupt church of Europe, the pioneers of this civilization made it an article of their faith to abuse and ridicule religion and by the end of the last century secularism, materialism and scienticism had firmly entrenched themselves in the western lands. It was in this period of history that western education began to be spread in the Muslim world and instill in the minds of the Muslim intelligentsia an attitude of scepticism towards religion—here in this subcontinent, towards their own religion, Islam.

Criticisms that have been levelled against religion are a legion. But one of the most commonly proffered allegations is that religion breeds intolerance.

It is a relic of man's barbaric past. Fanaticism and religion have gone hand in hand. Human blood has been spilled in religious wars. Political liberty has been whittled by religious authorities. Intellectual freedom has no place in a religious state (which they very kindly Christen as "theocracy"). Science and religion have always been at daggers drawn with each other and you can adhere to anyone of them and not to both—for, religion is always antagonistic towards science. In short, religion is out and out fanatic, blood-thirsty and intolerant and in the modern enlightened and civilized age there is no place for religion which is red in hand and claw.

Originally the allegation was made against Christianity which perpetrated atrocities over its Jewish minorities and robbed the people of freedom of thought and action. The conflict of Science and Christianity was a bloody one and countless people were sent to the gallows for the crime of non-conformity with the Church'. In this conflict Christianity lost the battle and the victorious forces of secularism tried their level best to condemn Christianity with bell, book and candle.

1. John William Draper, in his book *A History of the Intellectual Development of Europe*, Vol. 1 (London 1891) claims that "by the Inquisition, from 1481 to 1808, 3,40,000 persons had been punished, and of these nearly 32,000 burnt". Kenneth Walker gives a more horrible account about the earlier centuries. He says: "During the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries, 3,00,000 people were put to death for heresy in the city of Madrid alone" (Kenneth Walker, *Diagnosis of Man* (Jonathan Cape), p. 210.

Western thinkers and publicists both mistook *that certain form of Christianity* (to be more exact, *Christianity*) as the *true religious type* and derived the conclusion that religion is nothing but intolerance. Furthermore they pleaded that religion—*any and every religion of course!*—always engenders intolerance and fanaticism and, as such, it should have no place in the civilized world. Whenever any attempt towards religious revival was made, it was dubbed as 'fanatic'. And even now this is the practice with many.

Western critics of Islam and the secularists and communists of our own country try to lay this criticism at the doors of Islam too. During the last so many years they have been very vehement. Whenever there is any academic discussion on the nature and the merits of Islamic ideology and the Islamic state, instead of discussing the real problem, they at once introduce the red-herring of 'religious intolerance'. This compels us to make an inquiry into the contents and the merits of the criticism. In the present essay an attempt is being made to study the problem in its proper perspective.

I believe that this contention that religion necessarily and essentially generates intolerance, is false and baseless. Had religion been the sole cause of intolerance, with the advent of secularism and communism intolerance would have been banished. This is not the case. No body can overlook the large-scale intolerance and fanaticism which reign in our

own century—this great century of enlightenment and civilization! He cannot isolate the crimes of the Church of the bygone from the facts of the contemporary situation. It would not only be dishonest but also fallacious and absurd².

I further believe that the record of all religions in this respect is not similar. Islamic history bears glaring contrast to the history of the Western Church. Even in the West the attitude of the orthodox Church was much different from that of the Roman Church³.

And I further claim that every attempt to resort to force or every departure from *certain prevalent traditions* of democracy are not necessarily outbursts of intolerance. The problem calls for deep thinking and sober reflection.

These are the basic arguments of my essay and I have tried to present a fully authenticated account of what I hold.

2. Dr. Will Durant, in the fourth volume of his monumental "*Story of Civilization*" (*The Age of Faith*) claims that the present age of Western domination "has killed more people in war, and snuffed out more innocent lives without due process of law, than all the wars and persecutions between Caesar and Napoleon". "We must rank (he concludes) the Inquisition along with the wars and persecutions of our time, as among the darkest blots on the records of mankind, revealing a ferocity unknown in any beast."

3. For details see: Joseph Needham, "Science, Religion and Socialism" *Christianity and Social Revolution*; H. H. Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*; and A. P. Stanley, *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church*.

CHAPTER II

The Bogey of Intolerance

THE criticism about religious intolerance is based on flimsy grounds. First of all it must be clearly understood that tolerance has its limits. Had tolerance been without any limits, 'intolerance' too must have been tolerated without any scruple. But that is not the case. Tolerance is a cultural virtue ; but it is not an absolute value. If the life of an individual is threatened, he can't tolerate that. If the very existence of a community is endangered, it cannot tolerate that. If the honour of the sovereign is threatened with high treason in a state, that cannot be tolerated. Even BERTRAND RUSSELL has said that a democracy cannot tolerate the victory of Communism by a democratic vote. He writes :

"We profess to favour democracy, and at the same time we say that we cannot tolerate a recently elected Parliament which has a communist majority, because we are apprehensive of future irregularities. On the face of it this is an inconsistency, but the problem is not a new one.

"What is an upholder of democracy to do when a majority votes against democracy? I think the answer is that democracy involves legal opportunities for changes of opinion, and *that it is anti-democratic to allow a momentarily popular clique to secure itself in power indefinitely . . .*"⁴

This discussion touches a very important point about the limits of liberty and tolerance. Mr. Nathaniel Micklem, in a talk from the B.B.C., says:

"But there are, there must be, limits to this freedom. For instance, could we permit Communist schools within the national educational system? My answer quite clearly would be

4. Bertrand Russell, in a letter to the '*Manchester Guardian*' published on Oct. 13, 1953 (Emphasis mine). Peregrine Worsthorne of the *Daily Telegraph* in an important article on "Democracy vs. Liberty" published in the leading British magazine *Encounter* (Jan. 1956) makes a similar plea. He writes:

"We assume that the Communist Party is allowed to campaign for power in this country because of our own innate belief in democracy. *The truth is that we grant this right because the Communists have no chance of winning. If they did have a chance of winning, political instinct would very quickly suggest that our democratic assumptions needed re-examination.* It would then be discovered that Communist participation in the electoral process fulfils none of the conditions—practical, historical or ethical—on which the Anglo-American tradition depends. Communism so debauches the basic conditions of the Anglo-American tradition *that to accept Communist electoral victory as 'democratic' would be base apostasy*" (*Encounter*, London, January 1956, p. 13).

It is interesting to note that *The New York Times*, refused to review senator McCarthy's own book *McCarthyism* on the ground that it might spread his ideas (*Vide*: Marry McCarthy, "The Menace of Free Journalism in America", *The Listener Weekly*, London, May 14, 1953). Without disputing the right or the prudence of '*The New York Times*' refusal it may be inferred that one cannot be asked to tolerate everything merely on the pretext of democracy and tolerance!

'No'—on these grounds, that it is the duty of the Government to maintain national unity and to see that education produces good citizens to take their place in the traditional life of the nation. Communist schools would be bound to educate children to be bad, even seditious, from the point of view of the kind of national life we desire to have. At that point plainly we must say 'No'. *The difference between us and the authoritarian states, then, is not absolute ; it is that they will tolerate diversionism at no stage, and we are prepared to take action only with great reluctance and as a last resort.*⁵

Thus we are bound to conclude that tolerance has certain limits and a community or a state cannot tolerate everything, for instance a threat to its very unity, integrity or existence. And those who indiscriminately hurl the charge of intolerance must know that they stand on flimsy grounds.

5. Nathaniel Micklem "Freedom Is Not So Simple". *The Listener Weekly*. London, September 9, 1954.

CHAPTER III

Secularism and Intolerance!

THE allegation that religion breeds intolerance is unfounded and baseless. A critical study of human history does reveal that religion intolerance was perpetrated by the narrow-minded leaders of the Christian Church and through Inquisition an unholy attempt was made to put fetters to human thought. But, it is illogical to conclude from this that *religion engenders fanaticism and intolerance*. History shows that with the separation of state and religion and the advent of secularism intolerance has increased manifold and as such religion cannot be held responsible for it. If intolerance was rampant in a lesser degree under a *certain* religious regime and if it has increased manifold in the age of secularism and materialism and has even multiplied beyond comprehension under atheistic and anti-religious Communism, only a trick of jugglery—and not sound logic—can “prove” that religion (all religions of course !) and intolerance are the inseparable twins ! And that there exists a causal-relationship between the two !

It is said that this is what history tells us !

SECULARISM IN THE MUSLIM WORLD

In the Muslim world the fact is that *secularisation of politics and political intolerance have gone hand in hand*. Mustafa Kamal of Turkey and Raza Shih Pehlvi of Iran were the pioneers of the secularist movement in the Muslim world. And their regimes were most despotic, intolerant of opposition and fanatical in their approach and outlook.

Mustafa Kamal inaugurated his regime by launching a vituperative campaign against religion and the religious leaders. It was out-and-out fanatic and a masterpiece of frenzy. *Azan* in Arabic was banned. Arabic was banished and Turkish was revived. The Arabic script was changed at the point of dagger and the whip (March 25, 1926) and people were forced to adopt the Latin script (Nov. 3, 1928). Use of fez was stopped by law (Nov. 25, 1925) and the English headgear was officially introduced. Later on the entire Western dress was adopted. The word 'Islam' was scratched off the Constitution of Turkey and so beastly and fanatic was the wrath of this secular regime against the religion of submission to Allah that even mosques were forcibly closed down—for instance two most famous mosques of Istanbul *Aya Sophia* and *Fatih Mosque* were closed and changed into museum and depot respectively⁶. This was the

6. See: *The Middle East*, Europa Publications, London, 1957; S. A. Morrison, *The Middle East Survey: the Political*.

secularists' *tolerance* towards religion! Now, something about the political parties: All political parties were dissolved and a dictatorial regime was established. Ataturk could admit of no opposition and his *intolerance* was so great that even those without whom he would have never achieved the revolution could not escape the gallows or the exile (All his sermons on tolerance and his tirade against religious intolerance apart!) To what extent his intolerance reached can be imagined from this instance:

"In 1926, following a not very professional attempt on his life he HANGED *what amounted to the entire leadership of the opposition*. Among those he allowed to be sentenced to death and executed were Col. Arif who had been his comrade-at-arms in the Greek campaign and Djavid Bay, the best financial mind in Turkey. Kamal had a champagne party in his lonely farmhouse at Chankeya near Ankara to celebrate the occasion and invited all the diplomats. Returning home at dawn, they saw the corpses hanging in the town square."⁷

This is the way 'tolerance' has worked in the secularist regimes of the Middle East. The story of Iran is a true replica of it. And Egypt is also witnessing similar 'tolerance' at the hands of its secularist rulers!

Social and Religious Problems, London, 1954; Uruel Heyd, *Foundations of Turkish: Nationalism*, London, 1950; Barbara Ward, *Turkey*, Oxford, 192; and Dankwart A. Rustow, "Politics and Islam in Turkey," 1920—1950, *Islam and the West*, Ed. Richard N. Frye, The Hague, 1957.

7. John Gunther, *Inside Europe* (Emphasis mine).

CHAPTER IV

“Tolerance” in Europe and America

IN the modern West too secularism and atheism failed to implant real tolerance. Separation of state and religion was firmly established in Europe after the bitter mediaeval wars of religion came to an end. These were fought between the two sects of Christianity and caused great bloodshed and destruction and left behind a long trail of frustration and embittered feelings against religion. But the era of secularism that dawned in 1648, failed to light the horizon. War and intolerance could not be eradicated. If a few years passed in calmness, it was not because of any respect for man and for the beliefs of others. Nay, it was a mere 'tolerance of exhaustion'. Soon the hostilities were resumed. The last two centuries have witnessed an unending series of *wars of nationalism* and every inch of the European soil was soaked with the blood of innocent human beings who were slaughtered at the altar of the goddess of Nationalism. These wars have been unprecedentedly

devastating and horror-spelling. Not only has there been an enormous increase in the loss of life, money and material, the interval between respective wars has continued to shorten. "The interval between the Napoleonic and Franco-Prussian wars was 53 years, the interval between Franco-Prussian wars and World War I was 43 years, and the interval between World War I and World War II was 21 years—and this at a time when man has all the MATERIAL conditions necessary for his happiness".⁸ Secularism has not been successful in abolishing war and in inaugurating an era of peace and prosperity and tolerance.

Today intolerance and antagonism reign in every sphere of Western life. Secularism successfully cut asunder all the ties of brotherhood and affection which were forged by religion. Thus shorn of all moral scruples, man became a leviathan and a brute—class antagonism became rampant,⁹ colour discrimination¹⁰ raised its monstrous head and local and na-

8. Fulton J. Sheen. *Communism and the Conscience of West*, p. 17.

9. Marx's description of class antagonism in *Das Kapital* (Vol. I) has since become a classic. Later studies by Sidney and Beatrice Webb, J. L. and Barbara Hammonds, and Prof. G. D. H. Cole provide authentic information about the real nature and volume of the problem. A recent work of Prof. Pauline Gragg: '*A Social and Economic History of Britain (1760—1950)*' is also an illuminating treatise on this subject. Dr. Cyril Garbett's book '*In an Age of Revolution*' (1952) also furnishes important information from reliable sources.

10. The inquisitive reader would do well to read at least

(Contd.;

tional discords assumed menacing proportions. Spiritual values dwindled into naught. The eminent historian *Arnold J. Toynbee* clearly points this out when he writes :

"Our own Western post-Christian secular civilization might at best be a superfluous repetition of the pre-Christian Greco-Roman one, and at worst a pernicious back-sliding from the path of spiritual progress. In our Western world of today, the worship of leviathan—the self-worship of the tribe—is a religion to which all of us pay some measure of allegiance, and this tribal religion is of course sheer idolatry".¹¹

The race worship of Germany, the class-worship of Russia, the colour-worship of America and Africa and the 'nation-state-worship' of all of them are a bitter commentary on the cure-all-claims of secularism. In the reign of secularism, intolerance, cruelty, fanaticism and violence are grossly rampant. This is the evidence :

the following to understand the gravity of this Problem: *New York Times*—Eight-page survey of the situation in the South (Summary in International Edition March 18, 1956): *The Manchester Guardian Weekly* - "Ordeal of the South" by Alistair Cooke (7 instalments from May 10, 1956 to June 21, 1956); "The Colour Problem" by Anthony H. Richmond; "The Disenfranchisement of The Negroes" by Ralph J. Bunche, "Discrimination against Coloured People" by Mary Yeats and "The Negro Year Books". See also "Colour Bar in Britain" by Andrew Roth in *The Times of India*, August 31, 1952.

11. *Arnold J. Toynbee, A Study of History*. It may also be noted that according to Toynbee: "Thus state-worship was the spiritual disease that Hellenism died of". *Essays in Honour of Prof. Gilbert Murray* (1936), p. 308.

Prof. E. F. M. Durbin says : "We are becoming hardened to horrors. Over a large area of Europe torture has been resorted to as a normal instrument of government. In Russia, man and woman are made to stand packed together in specially heated rooms, with lice crawling over them for days at a time until they die or go mad or confess to anything with which they are charged. Or they are kept without sleep for weeks in tiny cells with blinding lights suffering from incessant noise until their will is broken and their personality destroyed. In Germany men are beaten with thin steel rods until they die. They are kicked to death without charges being preferred against them."¹² Conditions in England too are not totally different. According to Durbin, "Even in this quiet country our hands are not wholly clean."¹³ In Germany, the ruthlessness reached

12. E. F. M. Durbin. *The Politics of Democratic Socialism*. London, 1948. pp. 24-25 (Emphasis mine).

13. E. F. M. Durbin. *The Politics of Democratic Socialism*, p. 25. In their evidence before the Royal Commission on the laws of Mental Health, Miss Elizabeth Allen, General Secretary of the National Council for Civil Liberties, and Mr. F. Haskell, a council official, arrayed a plethora of facts that are inhuman and shocking. They said that patients in mental hospitals in England are detained even when they should have been released because of their value as cheap labour. The members and officers of National Council gave ample instances of inhuman punishments even in hospitals. A girl who was a high-grade defective, was founded by her mother in a bed in a ward surrounded by aged imbeciles as a punitive measure. Another patient was locked away in a dark room for 16 days as a punishment. Instances of those detained merely for cheap labour were also given. A memorandum submitted by the Council stated : "In general the institution is so dependent on patient-labour that even if the medical superinten-

(Contd.)

its limits when after assassinating the political deviationists, even their bodies were not spared. Soap was made out of their fats.¹⁴

In the past, it has been alleged that people were tortured and put to death for heresy or religious rebellion. Today they are being subjected to greater torture for mere difference of opinion, non-conformity, political opposition or the Himalayan 'crime' that they belong to a certain class (Russia) or race (former Germany) or colour (America and Africa and even Europe) or even political group (U. S. A.). It is calculated that in Russia nearly 4,000,000 wretched 'kulaks' were driven out of their homes and occupations to die of starvation or to work in prison-camps.¹⁵ Estimates about the number of people in concentration camps in Russia vary from 15,000,000 to 30,000,000.¹⁶ The conditions in these camps are indescribable and the rate of mortality astoundingly high.

In the pre-war Germany, although the number of the persecuted in proportion to the population was

dent believed that a large number of high-grade patients were qualified for release it would be impossible for release to be granted without bringing the institution to a standstill"—And the poor patients, even after recovery, are kept in the hospitals merely for the purpose of extortion of cheap labour.

14. An account of the harrowing conditions of Germany can be found in Lord Russell of Liverpool, *The Scourge of the Swastika*. London, large Edition, 1959.

15. See : Calvin Hoover, *Economic Life of Soviet Russia*.

16. See : David Dallin, *Forced Labour in Soviet Russia*.

less, nevertheless, between 30,000 and 70,000 persons were in concentration camps and the community of Jews numbering half a million was slowly squeezed to death or exiled. Today in East Germany the situation is no better. Every conceivable torture is being committed upon the non-conformist.¹⁷ Other Western countries, including America, Britain and France present no better a picture. Although different in degree, the nature of the problem is the same.

These and other facts have made the enlightened intelligentsia cry. Prof. Durbin declares :

"SUCH LARGE-SCALE BRUTALITY HAS RARELY BEEN WITNESSED, I AM THANKFUL TO SAY, IN THE PREVIOUS HISTORY OF THE WORLD".¹⁸

Dr. Albert Einstein writes in an autobiographical essay : "In Europe to the east of the Rhine free exercise of intellect exists no longer. the population is terrorised by systematic lies *Nothing of all that*

17. See the fully documented book "*Injustice the Regime*" published by the Federal Ministry of All German Affairs. Only one instance is quoted here. Gunter Herting was arrested on Dec. 28, 1948. He says : "When I insisted on my innocence and refused to sign a statement put before me, I had to kneel on a chair and was whipped on the bare soles of my feet with a whip of several throngs. After the whipping I was punched in the face and knocked several times in a dark cellar where I had to stand in ice-cold water above the knees a Russian entered the room, I had to put one foot on a chair and he burnt it with a red hot iron When I still would not give in he did the same to my other foot. In my cell I screamed with pain and could move only on all fours".

(*Injustice the Regime*, p. 43)

18. Durbin, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

will remain but a few pitiful pages in the history books, briefly picturing to the youth of future generations, the follies of its ancestors."¹⁹

Montaigne in an essay on *Cannibalism* declares :

"There is more barbarism in eating men alive, than to feed upon them being dead; to mangle by torture and torments a body full of lively sense than to roast and eat him after dead."²⁰

Bertrand Russell comparing the Greek and the Western civilizations declares :

"Many of the unpleasant features of the age existed among the Greeks. They had fascism, nationalism, militarism, communism, bosses and corrupt politicians ; they had pugnacious vulgarity and some religious persecutions. They had good individuals, but so have we ; then, so now a considerable percentage of the best individuals suffered exile, imprisonment or death. Greek civilization had, it is true one very real superiority over ours, *namely the inefficiency of the police, which enabled a large proportion of decent people to escape . . . Now the white races are reverting to the theological bigotry which the Christians took over from the Jews . . . I am afraid Europe, however intelligent has always been rather horrid, except in the brief period between 1848 and 1914. Now, unfortunately*

19. Albert Einstein, *I Believe : The Personal Philosophies of Twenty Three Eminent Men and Women of Our Time*. London, 1947, 74-75.

20. Quoted by Dr. Cyril Garbett, *In an Age of Revolution*, London, p. 94.

Europeans are reverting to type."²¹

This is the inhuman record of Europe and its secular regimes. In the face of them, how can it be claimed that it is religion which breeds intolerance — for here we witness greater and unprecedented intolerance in the *absence of religion as a political force*?

21. Bertrand Russell, "Western Civilization". *In Praise of Idleness*, London, 1948, p. 173-75. Russell thinks that European persecution is the result of its "type" and the religious persecution of Christians was also a manifestation of that very *European type*. From this one may infer that the charge of persecutions, so commonly levelled against religion has been laid at the *wrong door*. European type and not religion was, perhaps, responsible for the Inquisition of the Middle Ages. It seems hollow to indulge in prattle against religion on this count too.

CHAPTER V

Western Intolerance Towards Other Cultures

THE intolerant attitude of the modern secular civilization of the West towards other cultures and civilizations is most harrowing, baneful and shocking.

It is an irony that the age of democracy has also been the age of Imperialism. When Paris was ringing with the revolutionary slogans of 'liberty, fraternity and equality', the French Forces were crushing the independent states of Africa and South-East Asia and were harnessing them under their Imperialist yoke. While new *democracy* was being experimented in England—China and India were being subjugated and enslaved: these countries were ruthlessly enchained and their cultures were destroyed most inhumanly. The Indian industries were strangled to death only to give a lease of life to the Lancashire Industry. China was impoverished only to enrich Britain. The Great Shanghai Library was burnt to ashes only to quench the Imperialist thirst for domi-

nation. Africans were and are being poisoned to death for the crime that they want to preserve their culture and independence.²² Death is being rained over Algeria, because it wants 'liberty'. Nyasaland is being subjected to heinous afflictions because it demands self-determination. What happened in Latin America is an open book now. Western Imperialism has tried its level best to crush other cultures and civilizations and establish the domination of its own civilization—and this has been christened as the "great civilizing mission of the West!"—Throughout Asia and Africa every endeavour has been made to eliminate the local culture. In the minds of the new generations seeds of revolt against their own civilization have been meticulously sowed, and through the medium of education an assassination of their mind and thought has been accomplished.²³ Their culture and civilization are not tolerated and the system of the West has been superimposed upon them. The Russians were

22. See the recent study on Africa by Father Trevor Huddleston: "*Naught for your Comfort*" (Collins, London). This book narates the shocking realities of Imperialist intolerance. He quotes the Minister of Native Affairs Dr. Werwoerd as openly saying, "There is no place for natives in European society above the level of certain forms of employment." On the part colour plays in it, Mr. Huddleston says: "It is not merely a contrast between wealth and poverty that he sees—it is a contrast based upon the accident of colour. Wealth is white poverty is black."—One may ask: of what value is the westerner's sermon on tolerance when this is his own record?

23. Lord Macaulay in his treatise on Education (India) said that they wanted to produce a generation of young men who should be Indian by birth and Englishmen by thought.

invaded by Western armies in 1610, 1709, 1812, 1915 and 1931. The peoples of Africa and Asia were subjected to successive waves of Imperialist aggressions—in the forms of western missionaries,²⁴ traders and adventurers and finally the Western forces, ever since the 15th century. During this very period, the West occupied the last vacant lands in America, Australia, New Zealand, and South and East Africa. Africans were “enslaved and deported across the Atlantic in order to serve the European colonizers of the Americans as living tools to minister to their Western masters’ greed for wealth.” The Eastern countries have suffered badly at the hands of these pioneers of tolerance. Arnold Toynbee admits :

“In the encounter between the world and the West that has been going on by now for four or five hundred years, the world, not the West,

24. About the role of missionaries, G. B. Shaw's following description is instructive :

“Every Englishman is born with a certain miraculous power that makes him the master of world when he wants a thing, he never says to himself that he wants it. He waits patiently until there comes into his mind, no one knows how, a burning conviction that it is his moral and religious duty to conquer those who possess the things he wants. Then he becomes irresistible . . . He is never at a loss for an effective moral attitude. As the great champion of freedom and national independence he conquers and annexes half the world and calls it colonization. When he wants a new market for adulterated Manchester goods, he sends a missionary to teach the natives the Gospel of Peace. The natives kill the missionary : he flies arms in defence of Christianity : fights for it, conquers for it : and takes the market as a reward from heavens . . .” Quoted by Christopher Lloyd, *Democracy and its Rivals*, London, 1947, p. 31.

is the party that, up to now, has had the significant experience. It has not been the West that has been hit by the world ; it is the world that has been hit—and hit hard—by the West . . . *The West (the world will say—K. A.) has been the arch-aggressor of modern times . . . And certainly the world's judgment on the West does seem to be justified over a period of about four and a half centuries ending in 1950.*"²⁵

25. Arnold Toynbee, *The World and the West*, Oxford, 1953, pp. 1-4. It may not be out of place to mention that ancient civilizations have been eliminated from the surface of the earth only for some paltry economic gain or mere adventure. One of such inhuman calamities befell Canada's 'People of the Deer'. They were deprived of their only source of livelihood and their community has been slowly vanishing. In 1952 only 30 persons were left. There was no woman survival. It is thought that this would be the last of their generations. They have reached the 'Journey's end'. See, Michael Joseph, *People of the Deer*.

Islam and Secular Intolerance

THE Western 'tolerance' of Islam and the Muslims has been most significant. A systematic endeavour was made to twist the teachings of Islam, besmirch its system of life and implant a bitter prejudice against Islam in the minds of the learned and the unlettered alike. William Draper exposes the conspiracy of black-out and blackmail in his "*History of the Intellectual Development of Europe*". He writes: "I have to deplore the systematic manner in which the literature of Europe has contrived to put out of sight our scientific obligations to the Mohammadans. Injustice founded on religious rancour and national conceit cannot be perpetuated for ever." Robert Briffault, Robert L. Guluck (Jr.) and a host of other historians complain of the same calculated attempt at the twisting and the suppressing of Islamic teachings. Most of the Western writers are not even prepared to call Islam as *Islam*. They always baptize it as "Mohammadanism" which obviously is a misnomer.²⁶

26. See : Khurshid Ahmad, *Islam and the West*, Lahore, 1957.

This was on the intellectual front. The cultural and political side of this *anti-religious frenzy* is more gnawing. In Greece the entire population of *Mouria* was squeezed to death—even women, children and old men were not spared. Nearly three hundred people were swept out of existence. In Spain and Sicily Muslims were eliminated like anything and not a single Muslim was left alive or unexiled. In the Baltic states Muslims who were in majority were reduced into a minority by hook or crook and terror and persecution. In Greece all the mosques were destroyed or closed down. In Palestine an alien community was illegally smuggled into the country and was given a "homeland" by rendering the Muslims homeless. The Palestine refugees are still living a life of misery and tribulation. The Imperialist dagger of 'Israel' has been driven in its back and the Muslim world cannot easily forget the anti-Muslim fanaticism displayed by the West.

What is happening to Muslims in the Soviet Russia is only too well-known. Secular West and atheistic Russia both are one in this respect. Their fanaticism and intolerance have been shocking. If this is the 'tolerance' which separation of religion and politics has engendered, we wonder what else is intolerance!

CHAPTER VII

Science and "Tolerance"

THE most attractive myth is that with the elimination of the authority of religion the era of toleration has dawned in the realm of science and learning. Religion is always antagonistic towards freedom, science and free intellectual pursuit, while in the words of Westermark "the concealment of truth is the only indecorum known to science." It is claimed that science has established its moral supremacy by inculcating in the men of learning the true spirit of tolerance. Now there are no fetters to free thinking.

Expression of one's mind is everybody's basic inalienable right. There is no inquisition, persecution or discrimination for holding different or opposing views. Differences with the current climate of opinion are not rebuked—they are welcomed. This is the merit of science and secularism as against religion.

These are beautiful claims. But, unfortunately, facts do not support them, rather, they point to the contrary.

In the world of science, differences and deviations

from the current climate of opinion are only rarely tolerated. Free thinking is still in chains. Persecution too is rampant—although its nature is a bit different and that is because of the reason that science is not *as organised as is the state or as was the church in its period of degeneration when it instituted the Inquisition*. Here are some facts:

Scientists have to encounter and face greater opposition and rebuke from their own rank and file—from scientists and the learned 'authorities' themselves—than from any other group or authority. Galileo Galilei met with even greater opposition from his contemporary scientists than from the misguided Pope. He invented the telescope, and his first teacher at the University of Padua flatly refused to examine the planets or the moon through his telescope. He tried to disprove Aristotle, and his colleagues and other professors and scientists refused even to listen to him or see him throwing down different weights from the Tower of Pisa. And this happened even before the Church took any notice of Galileo.

Lord Bacon, the so-called inventor of the Inductive method, stubbornly and bitterly opposed the Copernican system. Harvey became the butt of severest criticism when he stated his revolutionary theory of the circulation of blood. He was dubbed as a crack and an unbalanced man. The opposition reached such limits that he lost half of his consulting practice—a new type of persecution of course! Pro-

fessor Stenson who discovered that the heart was a muscle, found the scientists of the Netherlands so unsympathetic that he had to leave Netherlands. He moved on to Italy. Jenner's views on vaccination met with bitter opposition. Auvénbrugger who discovered the method of the percussion of the chest, was subjected to such bitter attacks that he had to confess that: "*Envy and blame and even hatred and calumny have never failed to come to men who have illuminated art or science by their discoveries.*"²⁷ Medicine provides many examples of heresy-hunting. The fact that Sir Herbert Barker has been knighted suggests that his work is not altogether valueless; yet Dr. Axham was struck off the Medical Register for administering anaesthetics to Sir Herbert's patients. "If people chose to consult the arch-heretic Barker, let them at least suffer as much physical pain as possible in the process."²⁸

British Medical Association has really made things uncomfortable for medical innovators and 'heretics'. It may be noted that as medical science is organised this expulsion was resorted to. In other cases, opposition and boycott have been the usual methods.

This criticism of Samuel Butler on the Darwinian

27. These instances are from *Science and the Supernatural: A controversy between Arnold Lunn and J. B. S. Haldane* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, 1935). They have been quoted by Arnold Lunn and despite his 'protests' Prof. Haldane could not disprove them.

28. *Science and the Supernatural*, p. 78.

theory of Evolution were simply ignored and ridiculed ; perhaps, because he opposed a 'giant' of science. This neglect has been admitted by Prof. Thomas in his work, '*Darwin and Modern Science*'. Even Mendel and his views on heredity were blissfully ignored because they were critical of the 'accepted views' of the age.²⁹

Dr. Douglas Dewar, a Fellow of the Royal Zoological Society, was not given a chance even to present his viewpoint which was a challenge to the evolutionary thought in 'The Proceedings of the Zoological Society'. The editor returned his manuscript with Secretary's following remarks : "I am sorry, but the Publication Committee cannot accept your paper. We got the opinion of a first-rate palaeontologist and geologist about it, and he told us that although it must have taken a very long time to compile it, he thought this kind of evidence led to no valuable conclusion."

The validity of the evidence is not being challenged ; the 'authority' has only *disliked* the conclusion. Dr. Dewar writes about the evolutionary theory which he has challenged on scientific grounds

29. Arnold Lunn. *The Revolt Against Reason* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, London). p. 152. This has been admitted by the leading scientist Baleson also. About Darwin himself Carlyle's intolerance is well known. See : Bertrand Russell. '*Science and Religion*,' London, 1949. p. 78. A recent work provides a wealth of testimony on this point. See : C. D. Darlington. '*Darwin's Place in History*', Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1959.

that :

"Those who do not accept this creed are deemed unfit to hold scientific offices ; their articles are rejected by newspapers and journals ; their contributions are refused by scientific societies and publishers decline to publish their books. Thus the independents are today pretty effectively muzzled."³⁰

Commander Acworth's brilliant book on birds and his first law of currents viz : "No bird and no machine can experience any pressure from the movement of the medium in which it is supported and operating" received similar treatment. *Nature*, the leading scientific magazine, reviewed this book of Commander Acworth with smears and ridicules—a book which was described by the *Manchester Guardian* as "a really remarkable book—a direct challenge, soundly reasoned, to generally accepted ideas about flight, especially migratory flight of birds, insects and indeed anything."³¹

Earlier, even T. H. Huxley, the famous scientist and the colleague of Darwin pointed out that "pedantry and jealousy are the besetting sins of scientific men." In a letter, which he wrote after sending a manuscript to a scientific society, he said : "I know that the paper I have just sent is very original and of some

30. Douglas Dewey, *Difficulties in the Evolutionary Theory*. Also Arnold Lunn, *The Revolt Against Reason op. cit.*

31. Arnold Lunn, *ibid.*, p. 154.

importance, and I am equally sure that if it is referred to (Mr.) that it will not be published. He won't be able to say a word against it, but he will pooh it to a dead certainty. You will ask with some wonderment why? *Because for the last twenty years (Mr.) has been regarded as the great authority on these matters and has had no one to tread on his heels, until at last, I think, he has come to look upon the natural world as his special preserve and 'no poachers allowed'.*"³²

Mr. Lunn calls this heresy-hunting: "An attempt to rule the amateur out of court and to impose upon the man in the street a dictatorship of specialists." He thinks that "organised science is gradually usurping the position which was once held by the Church."

This muzzling of the free opinion is most menacing in the case of the dogma of evolution. Mr. Arnold Lunn quotes a Fellow of the Royal Society who once told him that it was professional suicide for a biologist to attack the prevalent theory of organic evolution. Dr. Dwight, Professor of Anatomy at Harvard, declares in ringing tone:

"The tyranny of the *Zeitgeist* in the matter of evolution is overwhelming to a degree of which

32. In this letter Huxley earlier wrote:

"You have no notion of the intrigues that go on in this blessed world of science. Science is, I fear, no purer than any other region of human activity: though it should be. Merit alone is very little good; it must be backed by tact and knowledge of the world to do very much." *Vide Arnold Lunn, Science and the Supernatural, p. 75.*

outsiders have no idea. Not only does it influence (as I admit in my own case) our manner of thinking, but there is oppression as in the days of Terror. How very few of the leaders of science dare to tell the truth concerning their own state of mind."³³

Dr. Alexis Carrel, author of the well-known book, *Man the Unknown*, who is also a Nobel Prize winner, complains of the same thing. He undertook a study of the miracles of Lourdes and declared that he embarked upon the venture when it was *dangerous for his future career to become interested in such a subject.*"

Sir Oliver Lodge, a leading scientist declares: "It is singular and perhaps depressing that the obscurantist's attitude of theologians in the past has been so amply imitated by the pontiffs and high priests of science in the recent past. They will oppose their admirable theories and great knowledge of the universe to resist the incursion of fresh information; they oppose observed facts on a *a priori* and utterly inadequate ground."³⁴

We have confined ourselves to a study of the conditions in the free world. The situation in Russia and its satellites is more depressing. The reader is referred to "*Scientists in Russia*" by E. Ashby, "*Death*

33. Quoted by Lunn, *ibid.*, p. 104.

34. *Science and the Supernatural*, p. 210.

of a Science in Russia" by Conway Zirkle, and "Soviet Genetics" by Julian Huxley to have an idea of the thought control that is the order of the day in the Communist countries.

CHAPTER VIII

Liberty in the Modern World

WE have already seen what is happening in the world of science. Now let us look to the state of liberty. The fact is that the overall state of liberty and free thinking in the modern world is appalling. Bertrand Russell, after looking at it, cries in agony. When asked : 'why he thought that Russia was not as black as she has been painted and America not as bright and shining as we tend to be told,' he replied :

"I don't think Russia is quite as black as a good many people believe. I don't know much about Russia, but from all I can learn, it is pretty bad. Bad enough, America, of course, is white-washed. A lot of horrible things happen in America of which people are not sufficiently aware. There is a kind of underground tyranny, a tyranny which is not very much in the open but is very very effective. Any man whose opinions are the least bit radical lives in a state of terror that—

(a) he will lose his livelihood ; and

(b) still further that he may be tarred and permanently out ; so to speak.

I think there is a very great state of terror in America and our newspapers don't sufficiently emphasize it."³⁵

Another question and its reply are germane.

Q : Isn't that the tragedy, on both sides of the Atlantic—that the thinking man is afraid to open his mouth. And is it not true that a very real underground censorship exists which silences all sorts of worthwhile voices and ideas, keeping facts out of circulation ?

A : (by Russell) : Yes, yes. And you must expect me to be aware of this considering that I was sentenced to six months' in gaol for saying that, in America, troops were sometimes used against strikers. That is what I was sent to gaol for. They didn't deny the fact, they simply said it was the sort of fact you shouldn't mention. Nobody denied the fact, which I quoted from an official American document. So you must expect me to be aware of this."³⁶

35. Bertrand Russell, *How Near is War ?* (A Fleet Forum Publication), p. 20.

36. Bertrand Russell, *ibid.*, p. 25.

It may be noted that seven employees of UNESCO refused to appear before the Congressional Committee of U.S.A. for "screening" on the plea that the oath as international civil servants precluded them from discussing either their

(contd.)

The conditions in America are such that they make all the worshippers of liberty and freedom bow down their faces in shame. Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, a well-known American, who was at one time President of the University of Chicago says :

"Education is impossible in many parts of America today because free enquiry and free discussion are impossible. In these communities, the teacher of economics, history, or political science cannot teach. Even the teacher of literature must be careful. Did not a member of Indiana's Textbook Commission call Robin Hood subversive ?"³⁷

Teachers and other responsible officers have been fired and expelled from the universities of Harvard, California, Texas and Michigan for discussing 'dangerous ideas.'

'Censorship of textbooks is flourishing throughout the country, though it rarely reaches the dizzy heights of imbecility attained by the Jersey City Junior College. Everywhere text-

own political views or those of their non-American colleagues with agents of U.S. Government. Dr. Luther Evans, the Director General of UNESCO sacked them for this 'crime' because the Congressional subcommittee had told him that the dismissal of those seven officers was a condition of the U.S. dues payment to UNESCO. So they were dismissed and despite the verdict of the I.C.C. Tribunal that the dismissals were illegal, they were not rehabilitated. (*The New Statesman and Nation*, London, November 3, 1956).

37. Quoted by Nathaniel Mickleen, *The Listener Weekly* (London), Sept. 9, 1954, p. 388.

books of history, politics, and economics are under attack by patriotic or filio-pietistic organisations.³⁸

And free inquiry and real objectivity have become a forlorn hope. The result is that :

"Already civil servants are afraid to read certain magazines or join certain organisations. Already teachers hesitate to discuss certain issues in class ; not long ago the New York City Board of Education sought to reassure them on this : *you may discuss Communism objectively, it said, as long as you tell the pupils how wicked it all is !* Already men and women hesitate to join minority parties or 'dangerous' organisations, or to agitate for reform. And well they might ! Sometimes ago a much decorated Negro army captain was asked to resign from the service because he was charged with reading the *Daily Worker* and because his father was alleged to have fought segregation in public housing."³⁹

About the plight of freedom in education a thorough perusal of the Investigation Report of the California Civil Liberties Union will be very instructive. We quote just one paragraph :

"Cost a year of horror and failure for students,

38. Henry Steel Cammager, *Freedom, Loyalty Dissent*, (Oxford University Press), 1954, p. 12.

39. Henry Steel Cammager, *ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

teachers and administration; the firing of twenty-six instructors; the dropping of forty or fifty regular courses; the resignation of a large number of professors; the refusal of many well-known scholars to accept appointment; condemnation of the Regent's action by faculties of other universities and learned societies; and a general loss of confidence in the University . . . In the long record of higher education no offence against freedom and justice has equalled in scope and ruthlessness the offence now committed at the university."

The conditions so deteriorated that a leading psychologist in his speech at an international psychological meeting in Montreal (Canada) while criticising the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, said that it made it impossible to hold international scientific meetings in the United States. He said that too many foreign scientists have been refused visas to come into the country. Speaking of the climate of fear, this professor said :

"A strong fear that his family may starve and a strong fear that what he says will lead him into conflict with the current climate of opinion, will tend to make a scholar poorer, more timid teacher, a blind type of research worker, and a neurotic committee man."⁴⁰

40. Quoted by Helen Freeland Gibb in a letter under the caption "Free Speech and American Liberty" in *The Listener*.

Most staggering proof of this climate of fear is provided by the behaviour of the lawyers who are afraid to defend those charged as subversives. The Canon of legal Ethics provides⁴¹ that a lawyer owes "entire devotion to the interests of the client . . . No fear of judicial disfavour or public unpopularity should restrain him from the full discharge of his duty." A Report of a Special Committee of the American Bar Association of July 1953 states that 'American lawyers generally recognise that it is the duty of the Bar to see that all defendants, however unpopular, have the benefit of counsel for their defence ! 'Yet, persons charged with the so-called subversive activities are finding it almost impossible to obtain proper counsel—nay, even any counsel at all.' In the Baltimore case of *U.S. vs. Frankfeld* defendants appealed in vain to more than thirty lawyers to take their case. In the case of *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania vs. Nelson* the defendant was forced to represent himself in a trial for sedition after having appealed to 700 lawyers in different cities, but all in vain. In the case of *U.S. vs. Flynn* defendants submitted to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals an affidavit stating that "They have written to more than twenty-eight law firms throughout the country requesting an interview to discuss the retainers of said firms an appeal therein. Of this number twelve did not reply at all to appel-

41. Canon No. 15.

lant's requests ; and all sixteen who did reply refused to grant the requested interview on the grounds that they either could not or would not accept a retainer therein."⁴²

It is this climate of fear, of the persecution of free thought, and of the intolerance of the non-conformist⁴³ that made Bertrand Russell say :

"I cannot remember any occasion in England when the leading elected representatives of the sovereign people had to be sent to prison as common thieves as happened in Indiana some thirty years ago. Any Englishman going to America at the present time has the strange experience of a population subjected to a reign of terror, and always obliged to think twice before giving utterance to any serious conviction. English people hold the clearly subversive opinion that a teacher should not be deprived of his post merely on the ground that he has published a well-documented investigation of some facts inconvenient to a certain

42. See H. S. Commager. *Freedom, Loyalty, Dissent*. pp. 11, 12.

43. The views of a leading journalist Mr. Herbert Tingsten may here be quoted with profit. He writes: "The investigation of Un-American activities has not been limited to Congressional Committees or to the last decade or two: it has gone on unceasingly in America and by a very large part of the American people. Intolerance is to some degree the fruit of America's unique situation and has been the basic condition for the forming of an American people."

Herbert Tingsten. "Conformity in America." *The Manchester Guardian Weekly*. April 12, 1956.

rich fan. Yet this is part of the system which in America is called "democracy". The word "democracy" was not ambiguous until recently. It used to mean government by elected representatives of the people. Now it has lost this significance. In Russia it means government by a military tyranny, in America it means government by a plutocracy; or, at any rate government in which plutocracy is uncurbed."⁴⁴

This lengthy and painful discussion has been presented only to point out some living realities which are often ignored in a debate when passions hold the ground and sober reasoning is relegated to the lumber-room. Often the critics of religion try to confuse the issue by narrating, in an emotional vein, the follies of the Christian Church and, then, by concluding that religion and intolerance are the inseparable twins. It was not a pleasant venture to describe the festering sores of humanity.⁴⁵

But we had to do that only to balance the situ-

44. Bertrand Russell. *Democracy and the Teachers in the United States*. *The Manchester Guardian Weekly*, November 1, 1951. Mr. Russell is very modest about England. If I remember correctly, not very long ago, an important officer was fired in England on the ground that his wife was a communist some twenty years ago!

For the latest situation in America the reader may read with profit *The Torment of Secrecy* by Edward A. Shils.

45. This description does not, and must not mean that the modern civilization has no virtues and that science has not been conducive to human welfare. The writer is an admirer of many pleasant features of the West and fully credits it for countless scientific and other achievements.

(contd.)

tion and thus present the true picture before the common reader. This discussion leads us to two pertinent conclusions :

(a) The state of liberty in the modern society is not as rosy and satisfactory as some uninformed propagandists try to paint. Fanaticism, violence, intolerance and cruelty are not merely things of the past; they are the bitter facts of today as well. Despite all enlightenment and emancipation, man has not risen above the level of the brute. The apologists of the modern West must know that their valley is not so green !

(b) History shows that intolerance has been more severe, more biting and more inhuman in the secular and atheistic regimes, and this *fact* takes the wind off the sails of those critics who allege that *religion breeds intolerance*. If intolerance reigns in the absence of religion, its causes must be searched somewhere else.⁴⁶ It is fallacious to say that religion is the mainspring of fanaticism and intolerance and with the purge of religion from the socio-political life an era of peace, prosperity and tolerance would come upon the suffering humanity.

But he cannot close his eyes to the other side of the picture. And in these pages he has presented only that part of it because the nature of the inquiry he had embarked upon called for that alone. Whatever he has presented has been taken from authentic Western sources and necessary references have been given for those who want to pursue the study further.

46. Charles Dickens said : "Cruelty and abuse of absolute power are the two bad passions of human nature."

CHAPTER IX

Tolerance and Islam

NOW we come to the other part of the question : Is Islam intolerant ? A comparative study of the history of religions shows that Islam has never been intolerant, in the sense it is alleged. On the contrary, Islam has been a great liberating and civilizing force for humanity. It enkindled the torch of knowledge and learning. It gave a fillip to Science and technology. It introduced to man the true concepts of freedom, equality and justice. It taught man the greatness of love, brotherhood and tolerance. It was none other than the Holy Qur'an which asked Muslims not to abuse the idols of the infidels. Respect for other people's feelings is an article of faith with the Muslims. The Qur'an and the *Hadith* inspired man with the real ideals of tolerance and the history of Islam bears ample testimony to it.

It is not possible here to embark upon a very comprehensive and detailed discussion of this topic, nevertheless, we briefly give the teachings of Islam, and the evidence which history unfolds. Here again

we shall extensively present the views of non-Muslim historians most of whom do not have any sympathy for Islam—for, isn't it a fact that in a court of justice, the evidence of one's opponent in one's favour is deemed to be the most reliable and decisive!

Islam, it must be clearly understood, is not a mere religion, a hotchpotch of rites and rituals or a utopian moral philosophy. *It is a complete way of life, an ideology which provides guidance for every field of human activity.* It is an all-embracing system, a social order, a polity, an economic ideology—in short, a *complete code of life.* Thus it does not consist of a few moral teachings, presented by utopian philosophers, extremely admirable but of no avail in the practical walk of life. Its moral teachings are backed by sanctions which can make them living realities. It has tempered power with virtue and justice with strength so that the moral values may become enshrined in the everyday life of the individual and the society. The Islamic State is established for the purpose of bidding virtue and forbidding evil. The Holy Qura'n says:

"If We establish them (the Muslims) in the land (i.e. give them power), they will establish regular prayers and give regular charity, enjoin right and forbid wrong—with God rests the end (all decisions) of (all affairs)."⁴⁷

47. *Al-Qur'an*, XXII: 41.

Islamic approach to the moral problems does not resemble the approach of the philosophers—it aims at changing the system of life and reconstructing it in the light of the moral teachings. It wants to establish the moral values and, as such, is, on the one hand, a philosophy of life and, on the other, a scheme of action. Islam is not a lifeless moral philosophy, it is a living dynamic way of life, a social system and a state. As such it uses the powers of the state for the establishment of justice and virtue.

Tolerance is one of the fundamental requisites of justice and an idea about the Islamic concept of tolerance can be had from a study of the following fundamental principles of Islam.

ISLAM : THE RELIGION OF EQUALITY

1. The essence of the Islamic ideology is *Tawheed*—the principle of Unity of God. It is the bed-rock on which the entire Islamic system of life rests. *Tawheed* means that there is One Supreme Lord of the Universe. He is Omnipotent, the Sustainer of the world and mankind. He is the Creator of the world, the Lord of the Universe, the Sovereign, the All-Powerful.

Tawheed is not a mere metaphysical concept ; it is a dynamic belief, a revolutionary doctrine, a historic force and a communion with destiny.

Islam says that all men are the creatures of One God—*they are all equal*. Distinction of colour, class,

race or territory are sheer illusions and ideologies which are based on such distinctions are the greatest menace on earth. Humanity is *one single family of God* and there can be no sanction for these barriers. Men are *one*--and not Bourgeois or Proletariat, White or Black, Aryan or non-Aryan, Occidental or Oriental. Islam gives the revolutionary concept of the Unity of mankind and the Equality of human beings. Men are to be respected not because they are wealthy, or powerful, or belong to a certain race, caste or territory—but because they are *human beings*. Allah says :

“We have made the children of Adam respectable.”⁴⁸

It is further said in the Holy Qur'an :

“O! ye people! surely We have created you of a male and a female; and made you tribes and families so that you may identify each other: Surely the noblest of you in the sight of Allah is the one amongst you who is most pious (and most mindful of his duty to Allah). Allah is All-Knowing.”⁴⁹

Respect for human beings, the principle of the equality of man and the successful banishment of irrational distinctions of race, colour and territory constitute the basic teachings of Islam. Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyer, a leading Hindu thinker, writes :

“What does Islam stand for? I regard and all

48. *Al-Qur'an*, XVII: 70.

49. *ibid.*, XLIX: 13.

thinking men recognise Islam as the one and only democratic faith that is actually functioning in the world today. Being a Hindu, firmly entrenched in the Hindu faith, I yet make bold to say so. My own religion has not succeeded, despite its fundamental philosophy, in implementing in practice the *oneness of humanity*. No other religion, whatever its theory may be, has brought into practice the essential idea of oneness of man before God as Islam has done It is only in Islam that there can be no such problem as those presented by the Boers in South Africa, as those prevalent in White Australia or in the Southern States of the United States of America or even in England among the several strata of society."⁵⁰

Arnold Toynbee expresses similar views in his "*Civilization on Trial*" and attaches to Islam great importance *vis-a-vis* weeding out the evils of the modern age. He says:

"Two conspicuous sources of danger in the present relations of this cosmopolitan proletariat with the dominant element in our modern Western society are race-consciousness and alcohol; and in the struggle with each of these evils the Islamic spirit has a service to render which might prove, if it were accepted, to be

50. *Eastern Times*, 22nd December, 1944.

of high moral and social value. "*The extinction of race consciousness as between Muslims is one of the outstanding moral achievements of Islam, and in the contemporary world there is, as it happens, a crying need for the propagation of this Islamic virtue . . .*

"As things are now, the exponents of racial intolerance are in the ascendent, and, if their attitude towards 'the race question' prevails, it may eventually provoke a general catastrophe. Yet the forces of racial toleration, which at present seem to fighting a losing battle in a spiritual struggle of immense importance to mankind, might still regain the upper hand if any strong influence militating against race consciousness that has hitherto been held in reserve were now to be thrown into the scales. *It is conceivable that the spirit of Islam might be the timely reinforcement which would decide this issue in favour of tolerance and peace.*"⁵¹

SANCTITY OF HUMAN LIFE

2. Islam not only stands for oneness of humanity and equality of man, it attaches the greatest importance to the sanctity of human blood. Human life has been made sacred and human blood can't be spilled without just cause. This is what the Qur'an says :

51. Arnold Toynbee, *Civilization on Trial* (Oxford University Press, 1953), pp. 205-206 (*Emphasis Ours*).

' On that account, we decided for the children of Israel that *whosoever killeth a human being—unless it be for murder or for spreading fasād (mischief, corruption and persecution), it shall be as if he had killed all mankind ; and whoso saveth the life of one (person) it shall be as if he had saved the life of the entire mankind.* Our Prophets came unto them of old, with clear proofs (of Allah's Sovereignty), but even after that, many of them continued to commit excesses in the land."⁵²

At another place, while discussing the characteristics of a Muslim, the Qur'an says :

"Those, who invoke not, with Allah, any other God ; nor *slay such life as Allah hath forbidden, except for just cause*, nor commit adultery—and who so doeth this, shall pay the penalty."⁵³

This injunction occurs in the Qur'an several times. The Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) said : "Of the great sins, the greatest is *shirk*, then comes taking of human life, then disobedience of the parents, then telling of lies."

On another occasion the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) said :

"A Mo'mim continues in spreading his faith (and stops only when) he is faced with taking

52. *Al-Qur'an*, V : 32.

53. *ibid.*, XXV : 68.

human life without just cause."

'Just cause' in the sight of Islam, is that defined in V : 32 quoted above. Thus the human life has been sanctified and the spilling of the human blood has been made *haram* save when a person resorts to murder or when his powers are used in creating *fitna* and disorder in the land. If a person commits these crimes he loses the sanctions and provides a just cause for the taking of his life. These are the two major conditions when taking of the human life has been permitted.

JUSTICE AND THE RULE OF LAW

3. Islam enjoins its followers to decide the problems which confront them with justice whatever be the consequences. In matters of law, all are equal and no distinction can be entertained in the administration of justice. Rule of law is supreme and administration of justice is above everything else. In matters of law and justice it does not recognise any distinction even between Muslims and non-Muslims. The Holy Qur'an says :

"And when you judge between man and man judge with justice."⁵⁴

"Allah enjoineth justice and kindness, and giving to kinsfolk . . ."⁵⁵

54. *Al-Qur'an*, IV : 58.

55. *ibid.*, XVI : 90.

"We verily sent our Prophets with clear proofs and revealed with them the Book and the Balance, that mankind may observe justice, and revealed iron (coercive power of the state) wherein there is mighty power and many benefits for mankind and that Allah may know who helpeth Him and His messengers . . ."⁵⁶

And that :

"O ye who believe ! Be ye staunch in Justice, Witnesses for Allah, even though it be against yourselves or (your) parents, or (your) kindred, whether (the case be of) a rich man or a poor man, for Allah is nearer unto both (than ye are). Follow not the lusts (of your hearts and passions), lest ye swerve and lapse (from truth and justice), and if ye distort (Justice) or decline to do Justice, verily God is acquainted with all that ye do."⁵⁷

This is the teaching of Islam which enjoins its followers to establish untempered justice in every situation. The Qur'an says : be just even in your dealings with your foes and enemies.

"O ye who believe ! Be steadfast witnesses for Allah in equity and justice, and let not hatred and enmity of a people seduce you that ye deal not justly. Deal justly, that is nearer to your

56. *Al-Qur'an*, LVII : 25.

57. *ibid.*, IV : 135.

duty to Allah... Lo! Allah is informed of what ye do.⁵⁸

And the history of Islam bears ample testimony that Muslims translated this ideal into practice. The Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) in a case of theft by a very influential woman decided the case against her and awarded the penalty. On being approached by some dignitaries of the city he declared: 'Had Fatimah, daughter of Muhammad, committed the crime, she would have received the punishment without fail.'

In the days of Caliph 'Umar a person of the tribe of Bakr bin Wa'il killed a non-Muslim of Hirah. The Caliph ordered that the murderer be handed over to the kith and kin of the deceased. This was done and the successors of the assassin executed him.⁵⁹

During the reign of the third Caliph, 'Uthman, a verdict was given to execute one of the sons of Caliph 'Umar because he was said to have killed Hurmuzan and also the daughter of Abu Lulu under the impression that she too was involved in the murder of his illustrious father.

In the days of 'Ali, the fourth Caliph, a Muslim was accused of murdering a *Zimmi*. The charge being proved, 'Ali ordered the execution of the Muslim.

58. *Al-Qur'an*, V : 8.

59. Maududi, *Islamic Law & Constitution*. Islamic Publications Ltd., Lahore, Chap. VIII.

The brother of the deceased, however, submitted that he had forgiven him. But 'Ali was not satisfied and only after his insistence and the assurance that he had received the blood money, 'Ali consented to release the murderer. On that occasion he declared:

"Whosoever is our *Zimmi* (protected i.e. the non-Muslim citizen of an Islamic State), his blood is as sacred as is our blood and his property is as inviolable as is our property."⁶⁰

Even in the later periods when the Islamic society had degenerated, the instances of unique justice are not wanting. A Hindu sued Sultan Muhammad bin Tughlaq in the court of a *Qadi* and the Sultan appeared in the court to satisfy his claim.⁶¹ Sher Shah Suri penalised his son for misbehaving with the wife of a certain *banya*.⁶² Aurangzaib Alamgir punished the grandson of his Prime Minister Asad Khan, Mirza Tafakhur who outraged the modesty of a non-Muslim woman. Alamgir wrote: "It is my duty to prevent oppression on the people who are a trust from the Creator."⁶³ It was because of this justice of Muslims that even non-Muslims preferred them to the rulers of their own faith.

T. W. Arnold writes in "*The Preaching of Islam*":

60. Maududi, *Islamic Law and Constitution*, p. 179.

61. Travels of Ibn Barutah.

62. M. Zakaullah: *Tarikh-i-Hind*, Vol. III, p. 341.

63. Sarkar, *Anecdotes of Aurangzeb*, pp. 109-11, see also: *Journal of Pakistan Historical Society*, Vol. II, No. 1, article: on 'Tolerance in Islam.'

"When the Muslim Army reached the valley of the Jordan and Abu 'Ubaidah pitched his camp at Fihl, the Christian inhabitants of the country wrote to the Arabs, saying: 'O Muslims, we prefer you to the Byzantines, though they are of our own faith, because you keep better faith with us, and your rule over us is better than theirs, for they have robbed us of our goods and our homes.' The people of Amessa closed the gates of their city against the army of Heracl and told the Muslims that they preferred their government and justice to the injustice and oppression of the Greeks."⁶⁴

THERE IS NO COMPULSION IN RELIGION

4. Islam is a missionary faith and Muslims are enjoined to preach their religion and establish the Word of God on His land. There are two aspects of the problem: forbidding evil and oppression, and enjoining right and virtue. The Islamic instructions are that there should be no compulsion in religion and people of other faiths must not be converted to Islam by force. But, force can—and should—be used for the banishment of hostility, aggression and transgression (*Tāghoot*) which are the mainstay of persecution, oppression and intolerance. Islam does not consent to the toleration of the intolerant and

64. T. W. Arnold, *The Preaching of Islam (Shirkat-i-Qulam, Lahore)*, pp. 55.

the oppressor. Abul A'la Maudūdī states this very clearly in his scholarly treatise : *al-Jihad fi al-Islam*,

"The sword of Islam is sharp for those who are aggressors and who want to crush Islam and the Muslims, or who create disruption in this world and resort to oppression and persecution—and none can deny the genuineness of this stand—but those who are not oppressors, or aggressors or persecutors, who are not out to eliminate Islam or put obstacles in the way of Allah and who do not destroy the peace and tranquillity of the human society decidedly the sword of Islam has nothing to do with these people. They may belong to any faith, and entertain and cherish any belief, however wrong and un-Islamic that may be, Islam does not disturb them, their life and property is *haram* (forbidden) in its sight and the sword of Islam is impotent against them."⁶⁵

This is based on the following injunctions of the Holy Qur'an :

"Whoever killeth a human being—unless it be for murder or for spreading *fitna* (mischief, corruption and persecution), it shall be as if he had killed the entire mankind."⁶⁶

"And fight them until there is no tumult or

65. Abul A'la Maudūdī. *Al-Jihad fi al-Islam*. Islamic Publications, Ltd., Lahore, pp. 122.

66. *Al-Qur'an*, V : 32.

oppression and persecution (and there prevails Justice) and religion is for Allah: but, if they cease, let there be no hostility except against those who practise oppression."⁶⁷

"Fight in the way of Allah against those who fight against you, but begin not hostilities (and do not transgress the limits prescribed by Allah). Lo! Allah loveth not aggressors."⁶⁸

"And whoso defendeth himself after he hath suffered wrong—for such, there is no way (of blame) against them. The way (of blame) is only against those who oppress mankind and wrongfully rebel in the earth. For such there is a painful doom."⁶⁹

"God forbids you not, with regard to those who fight you not for (your) Faith, nor drive you out of your homes, from dealing kindly and justly with them: For Allah loveth those who are just. God only forbids you, with regard to those who fight you for (your) faith, and drive you out of your homes, and support others in driving you out, from turning to them (for friendship and protection). And whoever befriends them, they are the people who are unjust."⁷⁰

These injunctions are very explicit. But it has

67. *Al-Qur'an*, II: 193.

68. *ibid.*, II: 190.

69. *ibid.*, XLII: 41-42.

70. *ibid.*, LX: 8-9.

further been clarified in the Book of Allah that use of force and compulsion in the preaching of Islam is not permitted.

"Let there be no compulsion in religion. The Right Path has surely been made distinct from the Wrong; then, whoever disbelieves in the transgressor (*Tāghoot*) and believes in God, he has, then, got hold of the firm handhold; on breaking therefor. And God is Hearing, Knowing."⁷¹

This verse was revealed in Madinah and the occasion on which it was revealed throws light on its meaning. In the fourth year of *Hijrah* the Holy Prophet exiled the *Bani Nadīr* for their mischief-making. The exiled included those children of *Ansār* who were Jew at that time. It was a practice with Medinites that if the children of any woman did not survive, she would take vow to make the child who survives, a Jew. It were these children who left Madinah with the *Bani Nadīr*. When Islam had fully consolidated the *Ansār* said they allowed their children to be made Jews when they had not come to the fold of Islam and thought that Judaism was superior to their faith. But after Islam they cherished no such illusion and had full faith in Islam. And they wanted to compel their children to embrace Islam and said that they were not prepared in any

71. *Al-Qur'an*, II: 256.

way to let them remain Jews. It was in this context that the verse was revealed and it said: "Let there be no compulsion in religion."⁷²

The Muslim Jurists and authorities on *Shari'ah* have very clearly explained the meanings of this verse which enunciates a fundamental postulate of law. Ibn al-Kathir, the great scholar of Islam, writes in his monumental commentary on the Qur'an:

"Don't compel any one to embrace Islam for this religion is so obvious and evident, its arguments are so clear and convincing, and its appeal is so manifest that it is not necessary to compel anybody to enter its fold. Whoever has been given guidance by Allah and whose heart is open to truth—will embrace it out of free will and those whose faculties have been sealed, there is no use of forcing them into the fold."⁷³

The famous commentator of the Qur'an Zamakhshari, while determining the meaning of this verse, writes:

"Allah has not permitted the use of force and compulsion in matters relating to *Iman* (belief) and has left it to the free discretion of the

72. Vide: *Abu Daud, Nasā'i, Ibn Abi Hatim and Ibn Hayyan*. For ready reference, see Maudūdi, *al-Jihad fi al-Islam*, pp. 122-3.

73. *Tafsir Ibn Kathir* (Urdu translation), Karachi, Vol. III, p. 7.

people. This verse is explained by another verse of Holy Qur'an: "If Allah had willed the entire humanity would have embraced Islam. O Prophet! then would you force the people to repose belief? This means that had Allah willed to make all people Muslims, He would have made so. (But He did not adopt that course) and left the entire problem to the free will and discretion of the people."⁷⁴

The illustrious Muslim philosopher Fakhruddin Rāzī writes in his *Tafsir* :

"This view (that there is no compulsion in religion) is further confirmed by the fact that immediately after this verse Allah says: 'The Right Path has surely been made distinct from the Wrong.' Thus reasons have been explicitly stated, arguments have been made crystal-clear. The other method which is left is that of compulsion—but it is inappropriate, and is not permitted for it runs counter to the principles of human responsibility."⁷⁵

The above discussion very clearly shows the Islamic approach to tolerance. This view is stated in the Holy Qur'an and has been upheld in the same spirit by all the leading Muslim thinkers of every

74. Zamakhshari. *Tafsir Kashshāf*, quoted by Maudūdi, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

75. Imām Rāzī. Quoted by : Maudūdi, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

age. Is this intolerance? Is this fanaticism?—it remains for our critics to prove if there is any substance in their allegations!

ENDS DO NOT JUSTIFY MEANS

5. That's not all! Islam further asks its followers to preach the faith in the best possible way and adopt those means which are good and just and respectable. Islam refuses to attach any worth to the demoniac dictum: 'Ends justify the means'. In this respect the following are the teachings of the Qur'an:—

"And good and evil are not equal of each other. Repel (evil) with that which is better and lo! he between whom and thee there was enmity shall be as if he was (thy) warm friend."⁷⁶

'Call towards the Lord's path with wisdom and with goodly exhortation. And reason with them in the best and fairest way.'⁷⁷

"Abuse not those unto whom they pray beside Allah lest they wrongly revile Allah through ignorance. Thus unto every nation We have made their deed seem fair. Then unto their Lord is their return, and He will tell them what they used to do?"⁷⁸

—This is what Islam stands for. If this is "into-

76. *Al-Qur'an*, XLI: 34.

77. *ibid.*, XVI: 125.

78. *ibid.*, VI: 109.

lerance" we would like to borrow a few words from Shakespeare and say :

*"What's in a name ?
That we called a rose
Shall by any other name
Smell as sweet."*

History bears ample testimony that Muslims are the people who not only preached these precepts, they also translated them into practice. Soon after his arrival at Madinah the Holy Prophet granted a charter to the people, wherein it was stated : "The Jews who attach themselves to our commonwealth shall be protected from all insults and vexations : they shall have an equal right with our own people to our assistance and good offices they shall practise their religion as freely as the Muslims ; the clients and allies of the Jews shall enjoy the same security and freedom ; the guilty shall be pursued and punished . . . all true Muslims shall hold in abhorrence every man guilty of crime injustice or disorder ; none shall uphold the culpable though they were his nearest kin . . . All future disputes between those who accept this charter shall be referred, under God, to the Prophet."⁷⁹

The advice which Abu Bakr al-Siddiq, the first Caliph of Islam, gave on the occasion of the Syrian

79. Quoted by Muhammad Hamidullah, *Political Order during the Reign of the Holy Prophet* (Urdu) Also Amir Ali, *The Spirit of Islam*, pp. 58-59.

expedition shows the real Islamic spirit. He said :

“Remember that you are always in the presence of God, on the verge of death, in the assurance of judgment and in the hope of Paradise. Avoid injustice and oppression, consult with your brethren and study to preserve the love and confidence of your troops: When you fight the battles of the Lord, acquit yourselves like man, without turning your backs; but let not your victory be stained with the blood of women and children. Destroy not palm trees, nor burn any fields of corn. Cut down no fruit trees, nor do any mischief to cattle or such as you kill to eat. When you make any covenant or article, stand to it and be as good as your word. As you go on, you will find some religious persons who live retired in monasteries and propose themselves to serve God that way: let them alone, neither kill them nor destroy their monasteries.”⁶⁰

Prof. T. W. Arnold, commenting on this humanitarian approach of Islam writes : “*The self-restraint of the conquerors and the humanity which they displayed in their campaigns must have excited profound respect and secured a welcome for an invading army that was guided by such principles of justice and moderation as*

60. Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, pp. 309-10. For ready reference see *Journal of Pakistan Historical Society*, Vol. II, No. 1, p. 67.

were laid down by the Caliph Abu Bakr." "When Jerusalem submitted to the Caliph 'Umar" states Dr. Arnold, the following conditions were drawn up :

"In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate, the following are the terms of capitulation which I, Umar, the servant of God, the Commander of the faithful, grant to the people of Jerusalem, 'I grant them security of lives, their possessions, and their children, their churches, their crosses, and all that appertains to them in their integrity, and their lands and to all of their religion. Their churches therein shall not be impoverished, nor destroyed, nor injured from among them ; neither their endowments, nor their dignity ; and not a thing of their property ; neither shall the inhabitants of Jerusalem be exposed to violence in following their religion ; nor shall one of them be injured.'"⁸¹

Caliph 'Umar visited the holy places but how cautious and careful he was, again read in the words of Arnold :

"In company with the Patriarch, 'Umar visited the holy places, and it is said while they were in the Church of the Resurrection, as it was the appointed hour of prayer, the Patriarch

81. Arnold. Quoted by Abdul Latif: *The Mind Al-Qur'an Builds*, Agapusa, Hyderabad, 1952. p. 75.

bade the Caliph offer his prayers there, but he thoughtfully refused, saying that if he were to do so, his followers might afterwards claim it as a place of Muslim worship."⁸²

This has been the attitude of Islam. But our friends do not hesitate to paint Muslims as wild beasts. But can they permanently conceal the glaring realities of history from the eyes of the whole world? Can they deny facts by the smokescreen of mere "pooh pooh"? They may hurl the charge, but it will fall off as water falls off the duck's back.

This is what the non-Muslim historians say of tolerance in Islamic history :

Gibbon in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* writes :

"To his Christian subjects, Muhammad readily granted the security of their persons, the freedom of their trade, the property of their goods and the tolerance of their worship."⁸³

Dr. Robert Briffault says :

"Theocracy (a term he uses as synonymous with religious government—K.A.) in the East (meaning particularly the world of Islam—K.A.) has not been intellectually tyrannical or coercive. We do not find there the obscurant-

82. T. W. Arnold. *The Preaching of Islam*, p. 57.

83. Gibbon. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, pp. 269-70.

ism, the holding down of thought, the perpetual warfare against intellectual revolt, which is such a familiar feature of the European world, with Greece and Rome at its back."⁸¹

According to Muir, the Islamic "leniency towards the conquered and their justice and integrity presented a marked contrast to the tyranny and intolerance of the Romans. . . . The Syrian Christians enjoyed more civil and popular liberty under the Arab invaders than they had done under the rule of Heraclius and *they had no wish to return to their former state.*"⁸²

Sir Thomas Arnold has said the same thing. He writes:

"In the first century of the Arab Rule the various Christian churches enjoyed a toleration and a freedom of religious life such as had been unknown for generations under the Byzantine Government."

Such references can be multiplied beyond number. Every honest historian has to admit that. And this proves that *every religion has not necessarily engendered intolerance*. Decidedly, Islam has not. Hence, the phrase that religion generates intolerance is a pack of lies and a tissue of falsehood; and the attempt to hurl this charge against Islam is simply nonsensical. The allegation cannot stand the test of scrutiny on any count. On inquiry it falls to the ground because it is a false allegation and has the feet of clay.

84. Robert Briffault, *The Making of Humanity*, p. 113.

85. Muir, *The Caliphate: Its Rise, Decline and Fall*, p. 128.