

# BROTHERHOOD: ISLAM'S, AND CHRIST'S

A STUDY IN RACIAL AND  
RELIGIOUS CONTACTS IN THE NEAR EAST

*Being the Full Report of a Speech delivered  
at the Glasgow Congress of 1922*

BY  
CANON W. H. T. GAIRDNER

AUTHOR OF  
"The Rebuke of Islam," etc.

LONDON  
WESLEYAN METHODIST MISSIONARY SOCIETY  
24 BISHOPSGATE, E.C.2, AND 7 CARLISLE AVENUE, E.C.3

1923



*Made and Printed in Great Britain  
by Turnbull & Spears, Edinburgh*

# BROTHERHOOD : ISLAM'S, AND CHRIST'S

## I

It is unnecessary to tell this Congress that the one all-determining factor in the racial and religious contacts in the Near East is Mohammedanism, the religion of Islam.

This of course is obvious : but the discussion of why this is so brings us to considerations of grave and far-reaching import.

For, in this connection, the thing to lay hold of with the mind is that Islam is not simply a religion, in the sense of a theological system, or even a scheme of salvation. It is also, and equally essentially, a legal system ; a social system ; a culture ; and even (because it is in addition a political system) a nationality.

*A legal system.*—The canon-law of Islam covers human life down to its smallest details. It is true that much of this law-system (the *Shariat*) has been superseded in practice by civil codes, *e.g.* in its criminal and commercial sections. Yet other sections remain everywhere in full force ; while in some Mohammedan lands practically the whole law is operative and enforced ; and, further, at the back of every Mohammedan mind remains the thought that the whole of this system does abide and must for ever abide unabrogated.

*A social system.*—For the sections of the law which are still everywhere operative, even in lands controlled politically by European nations, are those which con-

cern marriage, divorce, and inheritance, *i.e.* those two subjects which lie at the basis of the whole social system—sex and property.

*A culture.*—In the broadest sense of the word: a literature, an art, an architecture; a general way of looking at things. And how potent this is! For one thing, it accounts for the strange fact that in the East Mohammedans do not become less ardently (some would say less bigotedly) Mohammedan when they abandon faith in its orthodoxy, or even become totally indifferent religiously. To such men, the culture of Islam is the last refuge of the East against the West. A well-known Anglo-Egyptian official once said to me: "The West has taken away from Islam its political power, and has imposed on Islam its machinery, inventions, dress, and what not; while with its philosophy it often even devitalizes faith: so that the last thing that remains, if Mohammedans are not to be wholly westernized and to sink their very being in the West, is Islamic culture." Thus Islam is not only a legal and social unity, but possesses one of the most important features of a racial unity as well.

*And even a nationality.*—For, at the very beginning, and from the beginning, "Church and State" have been considered indissolubly one, and that by divine and unchangeable decree. Thus the Islamic community had from the first the unity of a state: Islam was emphatically, and was called, a "nation." Church and State were one in the person of Mohammed; and the Koran, which to every Moslem without exception is the voice of God and not the voice of Mohammed, makes clear that the two were always to be one. And in every Moslem state they still are one. It is quite true that the political unity of the Mohammedan empire was soon broken up. It is quite true that political

entities, hardly to be distinguished from nationalities, soon developed within Islam, and that quite apart from Western and Christian impacts. But still the fact of the Caliphate remains, and that fact is always a politico-religious one, and not a purely spiritual one:<sup>1</sup> which supplies the reason why this Caliphate question is continually vexing the Foreign Offices of the West, and complicating the political loyalties of Moslem subjects in India and elsewhere. This gives the reason, too, why Mohammedans can never ultimately be patient of non-Mohammedan rule; and why in every Mohammedan realm the belief is firmly rooted that the Mohammedan element must be absolutely supreme; and that non-Mohammedans are to be reckoned as subjects not as citizens, and tolerated, rather than accepted as a natural and essential element of the body politic. There in a nutshell is the crux of religious and racial contacts in the Near East.

And now have I made clear why the problem of Islam is so formidable? It is so because it is not simply a religious one. It is a gigantic question of prestige. Islam includes within itself almost every imaginable prestige: a family prestige—for Islam is a vast brotherhood; and, as we have seen, a social, cultural, yes, and a national prestige as well. To ask a Mohammedan then to change his faith is like asking a westerner to change his nationality, which has been his chief pride all his life, for the nationality which, above all others, he has been taught to despise or even to hate. Is such a thing conceivable? It is the token of a miracle of grace that I can testify that even this thing has taken place and does take place. But to conceive of its taking place on a large scale, or in mass movements, is to conceive of the miracle of miracles.

<sup>1</sup> In spite of recent events at Angora.

Now if there is one feature of all the features we have been considering which more than all deserves serious attention and admiration, it is this fundamental fact of Islamic fraternity—of brotherhood. The fraternity of Islam (which throws open to the newest convert irrespective of race or colour the whole of this colossal repository of prestige) is a real thing. The admirers of Islam to-day say that it is the only working brotherhood available for this distracted world, the only unifying factor amid all its griding antipathies, the frictions of its racial, colour, and national contacts; the only feasible Catholicism; and that therefore it must be accepted as the final one. We shall not be able to allow this claim; for however generously we may concede to the Islamic fraternity idea our admiration, and find in it our rebuke, we cannot get over its fatal and even ghastly limitations. It is not founded on a universal God-like love; it is founded on a haughty pride in being the chosen people, a pride which is flattered and fed by accessions, and brings with it a bitter scorn for those who choose to remain without; a bitter scorn which results in a strange antipathy; an antipathy which can easily break out into furious hostility and hate. Those who say that Islam has been a tolerant religion (when compared with other state-religions of the Middle Ages or the old world) are right under a single aspect, namely its constitutional relation to the conquered minorities of other faiths which it undertook to protect within the Islamic state. But even here the tolerance of Islam was and is, at best, essentially the tolerance of contemptuous patronage, while, at its worst, it becomes a very ugly thing indeed. For if the tolerated, patronized, despised protégés (*Giaours*) ask for more than this, and begin to demand, insist on, contend

for, the human freedoms and rights of citizenship, as distinct from the limited rights of protégés conceded by the Moslem canon-law, then that tolerance is immediately and necessarily changed for a most deadly and murderous intolerance. For when the alien protégés have once lost those conceded rights, they are considered alien *rebels* "whose blood and property are free."<sup>1</sup> This is the key to the Balkan and Armenian horrors. And these facts are the rock-bottom of the question of religious and racial contacts in the Near East.

Then, is this the fraternity that humanity can afford to adopt as final? Non-Islamic realms are officially, even if nominally, described as "the Sphere of War" (*dār ul harb*). Is this the fraternity that humanity can afford to adopt as final? For Moslems whom patient investigation and sincere conviction drive to disbelieve Islam, and to adopt some other faith, the official penalty is death, and where the infliction of the death-sentence is not permitted the "pervert" is dogged by an official and popular hostility that is as cruel as death itself. Is this the fraternity that humanity can afford to adopt as final? The parable of the Good Samaritan might have been written for Islam: for emphatically to the Moslem his "neighbour" and his "brother" is exclusively his co-religionist. That unique charter of a universal tenderness, geniality and serviceableness which Jesus gave in this parable may not yet have been fully appreciated (God knows) even by the followers of Christ; but the fact remains that the parable is Christian, because it comes from Christ; and not Mohammedan, because it was simply beyond the mental and spiritual reach of Mohammed, and of orthodox Islam. Is the Islamic fraternity,

<sup>1</sup> *mubāh damuhum wa māluhum.*

then, the one which the world can afford to take unto itself as the final one? God forbid!

No. But, true though that No is, it must not conceal from us that we may as well let Islam alone unless we are prepared to offer to it and to the world a fraternity which is higher and nobler. The level of Islam is not an elevated one: compared with the level on which the mind and purpose of Jesus Christ moved and worked it is a low one indeed. But it is a much higher one than the level of most of what passes under the name of Christendom. The Spirit of Jesus is the only asset of the Church, the only thing we have to offer to Islam; but it must be, mark you, a spirit which animates not only the theology we are prepared to teach Moslems but the whole of life also, our human life in its entirety. And therefore it must animate not only the individual human life, not only the lives of the select (or at least selected) persons who go to Islamic lands as missionaries, but the life of the Christian community itself. The Christianized life which we offer to Islam must be corporate because (as we have seen) Islamic life is corporate. So we also must offer Moslems not only a salvation, but also a communal fraternity traceable to the mind of Jesus, and to the parable of the Good Samaritan, and so satisfy their social as well as their individual needs. And who is sufficient for these things?

## II

But actually then, what kind of fraternity has Christendom historically offered to Islam as a substitute for its own? What sort of a Catholicism? What programme for human unity? It is awful to

have to put this question—and despairing shame prevents one from answering it. Catholicism!—with Christendom rent through and through, devoid of even the wish to mend the rents! Fraternity!—with the poisonous attitude of the Christian sects to one another in Islamic lands, and alas! not in these exclusively. Human unity!—when Christian brotherliness seems hardly able even to mitigate, much less abolish, the bitterness between class and class, the racial dislikes, the downright hatred between nation and nation, and the awful fundamental antipathies of colour! Truly, in practice, Christian fraternity has been more limited than Islamic. And, were Jesus but a law-giver or an idealist philosopher of the past, our despair must needs be complete. But just because He lives, Jesus Christ yesterday, to-day, and for ever, then for ever is Christ greater than Christendom. He is the truth and reality, not Christendom; and to Him, as the Way to that Truth, and the Life that inspires it, must we return. The call “Back to Christ,” which comes to every Christian day after day, comes to Christendom generation after generation. Back to Galilee and the parable of the Good Samaritan; back to the charter of Catholicism inscribed under Mount Gerizim with one poor Samaritan woman as witness, and sealed under Mount Zion “at a place called Calvary”; back to the limitless brotherliness of the Spirit of Jesus; back to the nailing “of the enmity,” that typical arch-enmity between Jew and Gentile, and how much more between every other conceivable hostilities; back to the revolution wrought in and by Paul and the apostolic band, when Jewish exclusiveness was smashed through, when religious caste was, after one great pang, finally broken, and the prophecy of Jesus to the Samaritan woman under Gerizim was

realized in living, visible form, and translated into the Catholic Apostolic Church!

Now when and how did the Church of Christ lose the beautiful Galilæan idea of fraternity-without-reservation? I believe this question is one of deep importance and I wish I had time to work it out carefully in this address, for it has profound bearings on this question of the racial and religious contacts of the Near East even to-day, and explains some things that wellnigh break one's heart. But it must be enough to suggest the reason in a very few words: namely, that the Apostles' *spiritual* concept of the Church as a holy "nation," or the new "Israel," was debased and perverted into a *political* concept. In the former, intensity of love for the brethren within did *not* entail coldness, antipathy, and unbrotherliness for those without. No, they said "God willeth that all men should be saved"; "God is the saviour of all men, specially of them that believe"; and therefore "Let us do good unto all men, especially those who are of the household of faith." But with the conception of the Church as a political corporation, which was a hark-back to Jewish and old-world ideas, and which was taken over apparently without a thought when the Roman Empire adopted Christianity, the religious bond that united those within *did* entail coldness, unbrotherliness, and hostility to those without. Religion took over national antipathies. Those who remained outside the state-approved faith were treated as though they were outside the nation; and that loveless treatment was more than extended to the Christian sects whose views differed from the orthodoxy favoured by the Government. Good God, how soon and how far we got away from the fraternity of the Gospel of the Kingdom!

Is this dry history? or are we accounting for the poison which infects racial and religious contacts in the Near East to-day—and not the Near East only? As for Islam, no other conception even occurred to Mohammed or his successors. Non-Mohammedans were not to be considered or treated as brothers, neighbours, or fellow-citizens, as we have seen. Yet the Saracen Empire was better than the Byzantine, for it did at least countenance and protect its nonconformists, although with disdain and contempt, as we have seen.

And thus it was that in this fundamental matter of brotherliness the glowing, lovely, limitless catholicity of Christ was not followed up. Wise master-builders had laid the one possible foundation for it, which was Christ, but subsequent builders did not "have a care what they builded upon it": and with how much ugly, troublesome "wood, hay, and stubble," the rubbish of the secular-political concepts of the ages, and of their unregenerate national and racial hostilities, have we not now to deal! Yet deal with them we must if we are to help the East—or the West either—in its racial and religious contacts: if we are to go once more to Islam bearing the fraternity of Jesus' Gospel of the Kingdom.

Let us not go too far: there is, and on the Judgment Day there shall be manifested, a "without"; there is an outer darkness, and there is a hell. But we must not deceive ourselves. The closing words of the Sermon on the Mount; the words of Jesus to that Roman centurion; the solemn closing parable of the Sheep and the Goats with its not yet assimilated paradoxes, ought to be enough to remind us that the line of division between that "without" and that "within" is not drawn by official creed or confession; that the boundaries of the Realm and Nation of God are not

identical with those of any earthly corporation or nation or community whatever; that the line of division is ethical and spiritual; and that every individual or community that is pluming itself with the sense of privilege does so at its peril and exposes itself to a ghastly awakening "in that day": "I never knew you!" The whole history of Judaism as commented on in the New Testament, the whole history of the Church when compared therewith, combine to lead us to the solemn conviction that a return to Christ's teaching of fraternity is necessary not only for the salvation of the world but for the salvation of the Church itself: not only to bring those who come from the East and from the West into the Kingdom of God, but to save us children of the Kingdom ourselves from being cast into the outer darkness.

### III

Well then, Islamic fraternity, for all the lessons it has for us, is too fatally limited in its spirit and applications to save mankind. And though Christian fraternity, as realized corporately so far, has failed, Christ's fraternity nevertheless exists and is available: for Christ has the power of an endless life. Therefore it must be taken and offered to Mohammedans, in His name. And therefore missions to Mohammedans are necessary—nay, all the more absolutely necessary in proportion as Christendom has offered to Islam, in thirteen hundred years, so much that 'was not brotherly, nor Christlike, nor even humane; so much that has simply misrepresented Jesus Christ. When one thinks on these things, and when one then brings before one's mind some of the things which Christian

missions in the Near East have meant, and mean to-day, one realizes that they were and are worth it, even though they had not brought in a single convert. It were worth it to have given the New Testament to most of the Moslem peoples in their own tongues and so to have discovered to them at last the authentic portrait of Jesus Christ. It were worth it to have shown them by the Christlike ministry of doctor and nurse, and evangelist, and teacher, and pastor, that spirit of service for which Christ and Christianity really stand: worth it to have shown Mohammedans something they cannot gainsay, belittle, or confute, after having given them all these centuries so much that they have alternately despised and hated: worth it to have shown them something of the spirit of the Good Samaritan parable, the love which transcends all traditional barriers however high and however thorny, the neighbourliness which defines the word neighbour by—refusing to define it: worth it to have shown them if but one gleam of the catholicity of Christ and His Kingdom of Heaven.

Moslem missions are indispensable as an eloquent proof of brotherliness; as a tardy act of reparation; as a vindication of the claim of Christ to be the Lord and Saviour of all peoples; and as an answer to the serious counter-claim of Islam. These are the things which lead me to ask this great Congress—the individual Christians and the communities represented here—“Where are your Mohammedan missions? Can you afford not to have your hand in this great enterprise? not to make some contribution to the defence of the faith at this point of greatest difficulty, greatest anxiety, and greatest weakness?”

I urge this upon the Congress. And just because my next and final point might seem to neutralize this

appeal, I do urge it with emphasis. For my last point is, that however much we do along this line, it would be, in and by itself, insufficient. Even were every community that is represented here to equip a new medical mission in some unoccupied Moslem territory, it would be, in and by itself, unavailing, for it is clear that the whole task can never be accomplished by such means alone. For such means are after all specialized affairs. They emanate from an inner circle in the Church (even though that inner circle is, please God, slowly extending its radius), and they issue in highly specialized particular enterprises that are sharply distinguished from the general life of the Christendom which the evangelized see around them. Hence they do not seem to Mohammedans and heathen to be truly representative. They seem to be exotic; and it is just this exoticism of "foreign missions" which we want to get rid of—and especially in the case of the approach to Islam. Why do I say especially? Because it is the particular boast with Mohammedans that broadly speaking Islam has propagated itself naturally and without the aid of missionary societies with their organization and apparatus; that Islam adds its cubits to its stature without taking anxious thought. And the painful elaborateness of Christian missions, with their incommensurate result (as it seems to Mohammedans) fills them with scornful amusement. Their boast is that Islam is, in and by itself, a vast missionary society; and the spontaneity of Islamic expansion seems to them a sign of power like the power of nature herself, symbolic of a divine dynamic; while the fuss, effort, and struggle of modern Christian expansion seem to them to be eloquent of the artificial and the man-made. It is for this reason that I say that while the Churches must increase their missionary

effort, there remains something far more important even than that: they must become in themselves essentially missionary. The Christian community, in as far as it knows and feels itself to be a Christian society, must feel itself and know itself and be a missionary society. And this is only to say that it must be in its entirety throughout all its membership a Society of Friends, a *Unitas Fratrum*, with a fraternity which is that of the Good Samaritan and derives from Jesus Christ direct.

For surely it is of the essence of a fraternity to manifest itself in and by the community as a whole, and all the individuals thereof, not by specialist bodies to whom the business of brotherliness is delegated: as though the community and most of the individuals within it were saying to their selected proxies, "Here you, go you and do the brotherly! We will pay you to do it. This will be an admirable arrangement. It will leave many free to dismiss the whole subject from their minds, and some to sink back with relief into the good old British attitude of stand-offishness and to say that they thoroughly disapprove of the whole proceeding." How can this sort of brotherhood if offered to Islam appear to Mohammedans to be superior to their own, or anything but a ridiculous travesty of the Islamic fraternity, with its common meeting-place at Mecca, and the freemasonry of its *esprit de corps* from the Pacific to the Atlantic? And what sort of unity of purpose do such proceedings reveal, especially when contrasted with the steadfast unity of purpose which is Islam's?

It will not do. It is a spirit of corporate and individual aggressiveness that must be got back into the Christian community as such: the common consciousness that a religion of light cannot but give out

light wherever it is and under whatsoever circumstances, with the irresistible aggressiveness : of light itself ; an aggressiveness which cancels whatever is unpleasant in that word to our sensitive ears, because it is an aggressiveness which is so constant, so silent, so light-some, so true to the nature of light and the law of its own being. It is this sort of universal aggressiveness of witness and of goodwill that we want to get back into the bosom of the Church of Christ : the silent but pressing aggressiveness of sunbeams which cannot help penetrating, and when they penetrate bring nothing but illumination, and warmth, and life.

And this is all the more the case because however fatally defective is the message of Islam, and however ugly and un-Christlike are many of its features, the method which I have pointed to is Islam's method for the spreading of its message. The Mohammedan trader, or soldier, or official, when he enters non-Mohammedan territory does not " wait for an ordained man " to come along : he sees to it that some sort of praying-place is set up, and there he gives to the surrounding people the witness of his picturesque devotions. He does not mentally and actually leave the business of that witness to some groaning missionary society with a perpetual annual deficit, about 3000 miles off, which may presently come lumbering up with much machinery of organization, with specialized persons accompanied by their inevitable harmonium in a tin-box. No, that layman simply starts witnessing himself, and his witness (such as it is) is short and clear. And (mark this) there is something about his attitude and the tone of his witness which does succeed in conveying to that people that they are welcome to accept Islam, welcome to join him in that little mosque, to learn the picturesque drill of his devotions, and to repeat

with him that creed of witness : and that if they are so disposed he will teach them something, however mechanical and formal, or see that they get taught it. In short, there is something about his general attitude which suggests that although he is on principle unfraternal towards them, and occasionally hatefully and inhumanly so, as long as they remain outside, he will be fraternal as soon as they decide to step within. There is something about the attitude of every Moslem man, woman, and child which says "Welcome." This is the fundamental attitude we want to get back into the Church of Christ.

It would be too painful to contrast this with what actually obtains in our case, partly owing to the general British attitude of superiority and stand-offishness which we more than fully carry with our religion, partly because of the profound colour-caste prejudice, and partly because of sheer mental sloth and misapprehension of our own religion. But with Islam in view, and with Islam's example, are we not called, at a great Congress like this, to get back to the consciousness of the old ideal ? For the modern method of missionary societies was not the early one, and this Islamic method is not the monopoly of Islam. It was the first method of the Church, and it continued long to be its method, and its greatest conquests were won by it.

Is not the meaning of this Congress not so much the engineering of an attempt to strengthen certain Boards and certain Societies, as the registering of a determination to infuse a new consciousness and new aspiration into the entire Christian community ? Is it not to induce the Church members in the pews to take off the silencers and let out the vibrations of their Good news of the Kingdom—and the atmosphere

will do the rest ; to slide back their dark lantern's blinker-like shutter, and the luminiferous ether will do the rest ; to look to the power of the dynamo of their spiritual wireless, boldly send forth their message, and the ethereal waves will do the rest—yes, will put a girdle round the globe itself ? I am not talking of those who are only (alas !) Christians through registration in some registrar's office or on the census roll ; of un-Christian Christians ; heathen, pagan Christians : it is of the masses of well-intentioned Church members and adherents that I speak, when I plead that what these need is not so much a conversion to "foreign missions" by proxy, *i.e.* the support of this or that Board or Society, expressed mainly, sometimes entirely, in terms of money ; as a rectification of mental attitude, a switching of the mind round so as definitely to realize, first, that Christianity must march, and secondly, how it must march. I for one feel, especially in this address upon Islam, that I am speaking far more to the men and women outside this Congress than to the enthusiasts within it. And is there not a terrible danger that if we do not get this spirit into the general body of the Church of Christ we shall beget native communities in our own likeness, who will also insist before long on doing their work by proxy ?

Every Christian a witness, a lay, unofficial missionary ! We shall never win Islam (at any rate), not even attract it preliminarily, until we can get this primitive ideal right back into the consciousness of the Church, pervading and permeating all its members individually and collectively. More missions, certainly ; for the very efforts of so many lay-evangelists and witnesses will at once quadruple the demand for more teaching, and for men and women who will have the time and special qualifications for the teaching task. But

above all more unofficial missionaries. Every Christian a missionary!

How might this work out—apart I mean from a new way of saying, and teaching our children to say, the Lord's prayer? Ah yes! if all who said that prayer said it with the length, breadth, height, and depth of this intention, truly this world would very speedily be evangelized. But apart from this, I think of at least two ways in which our indirect work might be changed for direct. First, by caring for the stranger within our gates. "I was a stranger and ye took me not in." I think of many Egyptians who, as another Egyptian once said to me, have returned from Britain more hostile than they came. Because the hand of this Jesus-fraternity had never been outstretched to them they returned sour, scornful, confirmed in disbelief, unevangelized. And then I think of another Egyptian, a Mohammedan, who came to this city and was welcomed to its homes and its churches and returned if not to profess Christianity at least to be and to remain the friend of Christians and to confess to what he had seen of Christian fruit in the West: yes, and of another Egyptian who again was received thus, and who on his return to Cairo came to me to be baptized, and is now, with his Christian wife and Christian family, taking his part in the evangelization of the Near East. "I was a stranger and ye took me in." I know perfectly well that there are certain caveats, social complications and difficulties connected with this matter. There is no need or time to mention them just now—by all means let the caveats be made, the complications understood, and the dangers avoided. Suppose this done—and it can be done—would not the Church's evangelization of these tens of thousands of strangers from the East by means of Christian

fraternity and Christian witness be a more potent contribution to the evangelization of the East itself than the augmenting of our missionary revenues and the increase of the number of our missionary proxies? Speaking as a missionary who knows that class of men in their own country, I believe it would.

And the second way is by more direct witness of non-professional Christian persons in those eastern lands themselves. The last thing that our Anglo-oriental or Scoto-oriental Churches in those parts suggest to non-Christians is that they are the homes of a universal fraternity which says "Come inside." Rather must they appear like lodges of some close corporation, where Eleusinian mysteries of an Anglo-Saxon complexion are celebrated, admission being by white ticket only. And similarly missionary work in those lands is, at best, left, more or less benevolently, to the professional missionaries (proxies again!); at worst, heartily abused and cursed: while conversion is discouraged by most, the converts snubbed and disowned, and their genuineness denied at any cost. Under these circumstances direct, personal witness on the part of Anglo-orientals is extraordinarily rare. And yet I think of a certain R.A.M.C. officer in the War: a mere layman, a mere medical man; stationed in the Mohammedan east, the racial and religious contacts of which we have been considering. He also had a racial and religious contact. Yet he either knew no Arabic or only a smattering thereof. He had a black Sudanese servant, a Mohammedan—of the race which is generally considered the most hopeless of all from a missionary point of view. The officer was a soldier and a doctor. But he was also a Christian who believed in the parable of the candle and the candlestick. And so his Bible and prayer-book were

not kept at the bottom of his kit (if they were there at all)—they were visible by his camp-bed. The Sudanese servant observed that, doubtless, and knew that they were read in the morning, and that by that camp-bed this lay, unofficial Christian was wont to kneel, morning by morning. And then . . . that lay, unofficial Christian one day presented him with a Gospel in his own Arabic tongue. That was all : but it was enough. The light had shone, and had shone out, causing that Mohammedan African to comprehend that it was intended for him too ; that there was nothing unattainable about it ; and that the Christian fraternity was not a close corporation. And the message went home, and then came the opportunity of the mission station, of the specialized Christian missionary who did know Arabic, and the teachers who had the time and the training to teach. And so this Sudanese was taught and in due time was baptized, and became a true, delightful Christian ; and the last I saw of him was at a farewell meeting when a roomful of friends, themselves Moslem converts, some Egyptian and some Syrian, bade this African farewell ere he started for a distant outpost in Arabia, there to witness for Christ to the sons of Ishmael in the land of the great Ishmaelite Mohammed himself.

Could not this sort of simple proceeding be multiplied to any extent, given that all Christians had the same will, which means too the same mental adjustment, as that R.A.M.C. captain ?

What if everyone calling himself or herself a Christian, every soldier and every official, and every commercial traveller, and every merchant and every colonist, every resident, and every tourist, men and women alike, had this new vision, this new conception of Christianity and its brotherhood, this revised idea of propaganda,

its nature and its method? What if every Christian here at home were a missionary to the strangers within our gates, and were "neighbour" to them? What if the Church resolutely set itself to *this* enterprise of education rather than to the doubling of the income of its Boards and Societies, and the increasing by a fraction of the number of its delegated missionaries? And what if churches and congregations were ever holding a perpetual stream of lay-ordinations, when the tens of thousands of men and women of our roving race, who as a matter of course quit these shores for the east and the south and the far west, were equally as a matter of course to be commended to God through the Holy Ghost by and in the Church, to exercise in their new home abroad the great universal function and ministry of overt witness; the ministry of the sun when it shines; the ministry of the Samaritan when he served the alien neighbour; the catholic ministry of the apostles; the unofficial ministry of the brotherliness of Jesus Christ?

