

Strictly Confidential.

*Not to be reproduced without  
permission of the Secretary.*

## News and Notes.

A Monthly Paper printed for the private use of the  
Members of the Missionaries to Muslims League.

---

Series IX.

No. 11.

November, 1921.

---

Nov. 1st = 30th Safar, (2nd mo.) Nov. 2nd = 1st Rabi'ul-Awwal, 1340, A.H.

---

### Should we Alter our Methods with Muslims ?

A SYMPOSIUM.

II.

Dear Mr. Bevan Jones,

It is difficult to understand why Mr. Sherwood Eddy and those associated with him in conference in Egypt came to the conclusion that, in dealing with Muhammadans, controversy and controversial literature, and even the comparison of Islam with Christianity, should be avoided. Undoubtedly all that is "offensive" or "bad-tempered" should be avoided, and the utmost politeness and sympathy should sweeten our intercourse with Muhammadans; but my fairly long experience has been that the moment we put forward the claims of Christ there comes a "But....."

Seeing that we are regarded as Kafirs: that we are supposed to be presenting a corrupted Gospel and perverted representation of "Hazrat Isa"; and that our hearers are firmly convinced that no one can be saved who is not a Mussulman, I find it impossible to comprehend how controversy and the discussion of the comparative merits of the two religions is to be avoided. Even though our hearer may be so broad-minded as to admit that Christianity is good enough for us, he will not understand why he should embrace it, until he is convinced that Muhammad cannot save him and that Christ alone can; and this result cannot be secured without controversy and comparison. In the early days of my missionary career I used to put on Afghan clothes and go into the masjids of the Peshawar District, and converse with the Mullahs. Much as I deplored it, and much as I longed for a patient hearing, on no single occasion that I can remember could controversy be avoided.

If our purpose is definitely to convince the Muhammadan that Christ is the only Saviour from the power and penalty of sin, and that if he continues to trust in Muhammad for salvation he will perish, will some missionary kindly show us how this can be done without controversy and comparison. Perhaps he may say, "Just state the Gospel message, and leave the Holy Spirit to produce conviction." Would that this could be done! But, in the first place, will our Mussulman hearer listen patiently, without question or objection, while we do this; and secondly, is this sufficient? Neither the prophets of the Old Testament, nor the apostles of the New Testament, when addressing Jews or idolaters, adopted this course. They exposed the errors of idolatry and Pharisaism, while they advocated the truth. And this, I believe, has been the method adopted by our most able missionaries, Pfander, French, Lefroy, Zwemer, Sell, Goldsmith, Weitbrecht, Stanton, and others. If I am wrong, I may be corrected. Perhaps some experienced missionary may be able to show us a more excellent way.

A. E. DAY.

*Batala, Punjab. Sept. 1921.*

---

### III.

I believe with all my heart in the principle of trying to win Muslims by friendship rather than by controversy. Why should we seek points of difference rather than points of contact? I believe that much more is gained, in our work among women and children, by making much of all the truth we can find in their hearts, wherever that truth may have come from, and however it may have found its way in.

To leave Mohammed "severely alone" seems to be a very good principle, and I am quite sure that all literature that is "unnecessarily offensive" or "bad-tempered" should be "immediately withdrawn," and that such style of preaching and teaching should be abandoned for ever.

But there is some literature which may be called controversial that I should be very sorry to see withdrawn. For instance, I felt it a distinct loss in my work when Dr. Mead's tract, 'The Son of God' (Mus. Beng No. 18), went out of print. Many a time I have silenced troublesome interruptors by the gift of that tract with a friendly word, and the effect of reading it has been to stop scoffing and to bring about a better understanding and a more friendly attitude. I have found the M. B. tract No. 5 on 'Fasting' very useful, too. The tone of many of the old M. B. Leaflets seems to me to be excellent, and I cannot say that I think such controversial literature should be immediately withdrawn.

When we are questioned concerning points of difference by those who desire to know where we differ from them and why, I think they have a right to expect some such fair and honest statement from us as these tracts supply.

I do think, however, that controversial literature should be used very carefully, and I most heartily wish that we had, for ordinary use, more good and attractive literature in which no trace of controversy could be found.

C. WILLIAMS.

*Mymensingh,*

*24th September, 1921.*

---

## The Meaning of Khilafat.

THE Moplah outrages against the Hindus of Malabar and the general absence of their condemnation by Indian Moslems, and the numerous Khilafat organisations in the country, are bound to set many Indians, particularly Hindus, athinking about the real meaning of the Khilafat. 'Young India' of the 8th instant contains an article on the subject by Mr. Gandhi, but unfortunately it does not give the clear explanation one would expect. In fact we have not seen any authoritative interpretation of the term anywhere. Mr. Gandhi admits that for the Khilafatists, "religion may sustain itself by temporal power." But what does "sustain" mean? Does it mean 'defend,' or does it mean 'propagate'? We press for a reply. India is entitled to it. We have had enough Khilafat propaganda, we have had enough forcible conversions to Islam. *We demand to know whether the latter is by the leaders of the former considered a legitimate and natural part of Khilafat.* If it is, then of course that is the end of Hindu-Moslem friendship, and it is as well that we should know it. If the Sultan of Turkey is to be invested with the power of a great army, in order that by his sword he may propagate Islam, then of course it will be useless to expect any but Moslems of that turn of mind to grow enthusiastic about redressing the wrongs inflicted on the Khilafat by the Sevres Treaty.

We believe, however, too much in the political sanity of the bulk of our Moslem fellow-countrymen to think for one moment that, when pressed, any but an obscurantist fraction will define Khilafat so as to include the propagation of their faith. So there remains the other theory of the function of Khilafat, viz. for the defence of Islam. What however does that mean? Does it mean that the Sultan of Turkey (or whoever the Khalifa may be) is to be given his big army in order that he may protect his religion in his own country, say, in Turkey, or outside of it too? If the latter—which seems the natural explanation—it implies that if, say, a Buddhist mob in China attacks a mosque, a Turkish army should be available to restore order and protect the rights of the Moslems attached to that particular mosque. We put it to Mr. Gandhi that if he was a Chinese he would hotly resent the interference of a foreign power on such a pretext. Would he then not equally resent the arrival of a Turkish army in Ahmedabad, even

if sent to protect Moslem interests set at nought by a Hindu mob there? Let us be quite plain about it, that even if Mr. Gandhi cannot or will not resent such an occurrence, every other Hindu would, and we venture to believe most Indian Moslems would too.

*The simple fact of the matter is that in a modern State there is no room for any theocratic power such as the Khilafat stands for.* In a modern State such as India is to-day and will be even more so to-morrow, the right of every citizen to the free exercise of every religion, is one of the fundamentals guaranteed by the State—a guarantee in the maintenance of which every citizen, 'qua' citizen, is interested. If there are outrages committed in Malabar to-day, the participants are being apprehended by the forces of the Crown, by a State which is neutral in religion, which does not care two straws about any religion as such, but which cares very much about the mutilation of persons and the destruction of property. The Dorset Regiment was not called in because they are Christians, but because they are Crown forces. The abominable treatment meted out by some of these Moplahs to Hindus is not being punished by an army of Hindus who as Hindus rush to the defence of their co-religionists. If every aggrieved Moslem, instead of whistling for a constable, can call in his Khalifa, every Hindu would certainly be entitled to call in a special Hindu Defence Corps, the Christian his crusading Knights, and we suppose now-a-days there would even have to be a flying squadron of Zionist braves, ready at a moment's notice, to go to the succour of any victim of an anti-semitic press attack. Really the idea would be farcical, if it were not so grave. Mr. Gandhi and his Moslem friends really must be made to realize that we are no longer living in the Middle Ages. Feudal barons no longer keep their own armed guards for swagger and protection, but have to go to common law for their rights. Feudalism has gone; theocracy has gone. We believe it still exists to-day in the one solitary case of Tibet: but India emphatically refuses to take that country for its model.

The only possibility remaining is that Khilafat means the power of Turkey to defend Islam in its own borders. If that is all it means everybody will accept it, only why should it be called Khilafat, seeing that the right to his religion is the civic right of the citizen in every modern country, and not in Turkey alone? If Mr. Gandhi and his friends had called upon Indians to protest against the carving up of another Asiatic Power, Turkey, to provide a holiday for western patrioteers and profiteers against the breaking of solemn pledges; against the over-reaching of western Imperialism gone mad in its endeavour to swallow the whole East—would not every Indian have been able to join him heartily in this protest, even to-day? But if any Indian so joined him yesterday, believing that Khilafat meant nothing more, he certainly can no longer do so to-day. The practical interpretation which some Moplahs to-day have put on Khilafat has made that no longer possible. No Indian can now afford to go on toying with the

Khilafat. If it has any meaning, it is one that is incompatible with any modern State; if it has no meaning—well, no need to preserve so misleading a label. In either case let us be quite clear that India will have no more of it.

Hindu-Moslem friendship cannot be erected on the basis of making Hindus adopt a Moslem religious tenet such as the Khilafat, any more than on that of making Moslems adopt a Hindu religious tenet such as reverence for the cow. Such friendship can only be brought about if Hindus and Moslems meet, not on the religious but on the civic basis of a common citizenship in a common motherland. It may have seemed a politically clever move to exploit a common hatred by harnessing a religious enthusiasm to it, we know now that the latter is as likely to turn against its ally as against its foe. Let us all realize that it has been the greatest blunder ever made by an Indian statesman to re-admit religion into politics under the cry of a Khilafat wrong.—From "*The Servant of India.*"



## The Crescent Wanes in the Philippines.

THE Crescent of Mahomed spreading westward from Mecca was checked first at Tours by the Franks under Karl Martel in 732, and finally at Vienna by the Poles under John Sobieski in 1683. The rise of the Spanish nation up to 1492 was largely a story of the fight between the Cross and the Crescent for the body and soul of the Spanish peninsula. And strange it is that the Conquest of Granada, which broke the last hold of Mohammedanism on Western Europe, occurred in the same year as the discovery of America.

The discovery of America began that second advance of Christianity toward the west which was destined to block the way of Mahomed in the east, just as the Conquest of Granada had blocked it in the west. It was only twenty-nine years after the fall of the Kingdom of Granada, and only twenty years after the expulsion of the Moors from Spain that the Spanish friars, sailing to the Philippines with the Great Navigator, found themselves again face to face with their old enemies, the Moslems. Naturally they gave these oriental Moslems the same name, Moors, which they applied to the hated Moors back in Spain.

Mohammedanism spreading eastward crossed India and Malaysia, then turned northward through Borneo and established itself firmly in the southern islands of the Philippine archipelago. It was already stretching out long arms to the north in 1570 when the Spanish colonizer, Legaspi, captured the native city at Manila from Lacondola, a Mohammedan sultan who had established the Moslem Crescent in this northern island only a few years before. The aggressiveness of the Spanish conquerors and the fiery zeal of the Spanish priests stemmed this advancing tide of Mohammedanism, and made Christians of all the low-land Filipinos except those in the southern islands, where the followers of the Koran had already developed that deadly spirit of fanaticism which has been the chief defence of Mohammedanism against the missionaries of every other faith.

But the vigorous Spanish clergy who so effectively rid the Spanish peninsula of Moslems either by conversion or expulsion in 1500, found themselves unable to rid the Philippines of Mohammedanism either by conversion or expulsion. Moroland in the Philippines was practically as free from Spanish control and Spanish missionaries in 1896 as it was two centuries or even three centuries earlier. The bravery of the Spanish soldiers and the burning zeal of the Spanish priests were both defied by this unified population of fanatical Moslems in the southern islands.

These Moros were more than unconquerable—they were aggressively insolent. Year after year they sailed north in their tiny "vintas" to ravage the coast towns of the Christian Filipinos, kill the men and carry off the women and children for slaves. The old stone forts to be seen along the coast of Luzon and the Visayans are grim reminders of the day when these fearless Moro pirates sailed up from the south like so many wasps and within sight of Manila Bay itself terrorized the Christian inhabitants in open defiance of the Spanish government. Not till the coming of steamboats were the Spaniards able to stop this piracy, but even steamboats and modern guns did not suffice to conquer the Moros in their homeland.

Such was the deadlock between Mohammedanism and Christianity when the Americans took over the Philippines in 1899. The fact that this deadlock was of three hundred years' standing gave us caution in trying to solve it. We established civil government among the Christian Filipinos almost immediately. Schools were opened, courts were established, roads were built and the process of making the Christian Filipinos a self-governing people was well begun by 1902. But in Moroland it was quite different.

In 1899 Brigadier General John C. Bates negotiated a treaty with the Sultan of Sulu in an attempt to solve, at least temporarily, this Moro problem. In 1903 a sort of civil government under military control was provided for Moroland and Major General Leonard Wood was placed in charge to make it work. He did. In 1904 he found the treaty with the Sultan of Sulu unsatisfactory for all concerned and abrogated it. General Tasker H. Bliss relieved him in 1906, and General John J. Pershing had charge from 1909 to 1914, at which time military control gave way to genuine civil government and a civilian governor.

During the eleven years of aggressive military administration, 1903 to 1914, the Moros were disarmed as to firearms. They were punished without fail for rebellion, piracy and fanatical violence. They received justice through the courts such as they had never known before, and they learned to appreciate it very much. A number of public schools were opened, many roads and trails were built, and the people in general were made familiar with modern institutions and accustomed to having their affairs administered by people of a different race and religion.

Thus it came about that while the rise of Protestantism and the revival of Catholicism were combining with the public schools, the courts, the newspapers and a thousand other agencies to give the Christian Filipinos a new birth of spiritual, moral and intellectual life, the military administration in Mindanao and Sulu was eliminating that deadly fanaticism which had served as an impassable barrier to the entrance of Christianity into Moroland for more than three hundred years. Consequently, when real civil government was established in Moroland in 1914, the Christian Filipinos were ready to send and did send hundreds of their best teachers into Mindanao and Sulu to educate the Moros just as the American people sent eight hundred of their best teachers to the Philippines in 1901 to educate the Christian Filipinos.

The present policy in Moroland is to Filipinize the Moros. Just as we in America are striving to Americanize the mass of foreigners in our cities, just so are the Christian Filipinos attempting to Filipinize the Mohammedans in Mindanao and Sulu. The methods employed are many. The public schools are the chief agency, and more than seven hundred Christian Filipinos, a few Americans and many native Moros were teaching among the Mohammedans and pagans of the southern islands last year. In an issue of the Philippine Free Press not so many months ago the superintendent of schools in Moroland advertised for three hundred more teachers from the Christian provinces.

Another method of Filipinization has been colonization. Moroland includes the most fertile part of the archipelago, but it is sparsely populated. In 1913, when General Pershing was still in command, a colony of Christian Filipinos from the over-populated province of Cebu were given homesteads of forty acres each in the Cotabato valley adjoining the land of resident Moros. These colonists were given financial aid by the government. The chief purpose in this case was to increase the rice production of the Philippines, but the introduction of a Christian population as permanent settlers in the heart of this long-established Mohammedan community has great spiritual significance. During the seven years since the establishment of this colony the Christians and Mohammedans in this fertile valley have prospered and have become good friends and neighbors. This project started a flow of migration from the over-populated Christian provinces of the north to these under-populated, fertile provinces of the south, which is bringing from twelve to fifteen thousand Christian Filipinos into the pagan and Mohammedan regions of Mindanao and Sulu every year.

Of course, the Philippine government is not carrying on any proselyting campaign. The government officials and the public schools are non-religious. But modern science, western institutions, and an increasing contact with Christian personalities are sure to have a profound effect upon the future of Mohammedanism in the Philippine Islands. It has been said repeatedly by Christian missionaries that Mohammedanism can not survive the critical atmosphere of modern science and western civilization. If this be true, the faith of Mohamed is doomed in the Philippine archipelago, because certain it is that public schools, newspapers and democratic government are opening up every corner of the archipelago to modern science and western civilization.

However, the Christians in the Philippines are not content to remain silent when the way is open to teach their faith to a people who have never heard it. Missionaries, both Protestant and Catholic, American, Spanish and Filipino, have gone into this virgin field to spread their gospel, and the presence of an increasing number of Christian immigrants greatly facilitates the establishment of Christian churches. Relieved of the responsibility for public schools and hospitals, since the government provides these, the Christian missions in Mindanao and Sulu should make great progress during the next twenty years when the first public school generation of Moros will be coming into full citizenship and when these richest valleys of the archipelago are being settled so rapidly by Christian Filipinos from the north.

Just one cloud hangs on the horizon and that one is menacing. The spirit of fanaticism is quiescent just now, and the education of all Moro children through the public schools will insure its efluence in the future. But the lack of adequate funds to provide the necessary schools, a decline

in the fairness and efficiency of the government administration, too great a weakening of the military force back of the civil government will pave the way for the spread of some local conflict between Mohammedans and Christians until it becomes a religious war throughout Moroland, reviving fanaticism and Moro solidarity in its ancient form. Such a happening would set back progress in Moroland at least a generation. It would destroy the present bright hopes of a unified Filipino nationality as a possibility of the near future. The avoidance of such a happening depends upon retaining sufficient troops in the southern islands to discourage the few recalcitrant Moros from attempting insurrection, keeping the government in Mindanao and Sulu scrupulously free from partisan influence and impractical theories, and providing ample government funds from the insular legislature until economic development and increasing prosperity make the revenues of these Moro provinces somewhat commensurate to their needs.

It was strange indeed that in one famous year one and the same nation should drive the Moors out of Western Europe and also enter upon an enterprise of discovery which was destined to block the advance of Mohammedanism in the East. It is equally strange that the same generation of Americans who, breaking all precedents, went to the Far East there to meet and defeat Mohammedanism on its eastern frontier, should also, against all precedents, go to Europe to help in a war which meant the break-up of the Turkish Empire on Mohammedanism's western frontier.

*From 'The Christian Herald' New York.*

### NEW MEMBERS.

222.	Rev. G. W. Hicks,	B.M.S.	Gaya,
223.	Miss M. A. Bradfield,	Aust. B.M.S.	Brahmanbaria Bengal.
224.	Rev. T. C. Kelly,	Aust. B.M.S.	Serajganj, Bengal.
237.	Miss U. Montgomery,	Meth. E.M.	Bidar, Deccan.
243.	Rev. G. E. Simmons,	Can. Ch. M.	Kaifeng, China.
252.	Miss S. M. Grove,	C.E.Z.M.S.	Madras.

*The annual subscription to the League is now only Rs. 2-0-0. The Secretary will be glad to send spare copies to addresses mentioned by members with a view to securing new subscribers. News and requests for prayer will always be welcome and should be sent early in the month to the Hon. Secretary :—*

Rev. L. Bevan Jones,  
Baptist Mission,  
Dacca, Bengal, India.



PRINTED AT THE ORISSA MISSION PRESS, CUTTACK,  
BY REV. R. J. GRUNDY, SUPERINTENDENT.



