

OPEN ACCESS

MA 'ARIF-E-ISLAMI (AIOU)

ISSN (Print): 1992-8556

mei.aiou.edu.pk

iri.aiou.edu.pk

Contrast Opinions of Orientalists on the Spread of Islam: A Critical Analysis

***Dr. Muḥammad Shahzad Azad**

Lecturer, Islamabad College for Boys, G-6/3, Islamabad

**** Dr. Abdul Rauf Zafar**

Professor/Chairman, Deptt., of Islamic Studies, University of Sargodha, Lahore Campus

ABSTRACT

Islam approached the whole Peninsula so rapidly because of the true spiritual, social, political and educational teachings of *Islam*. Great sympathetic attitude, unbeaten determination and restless hard work of both Prophet *Muḥammad* (peace and blessings of *Allah* be upon him) and his followers were the key sources for this fastest ever intellectual missionary progress. The power was utilized by them, on unavoidable occasions, only to extend the boundaries of their state, but never to compel the conquered ones towards *Islam*. This historical reality is no more unknown to the modern orientalists. Yet a good number of them, including William Muir, Washington Irving, George Sale and many others propagated that the Muslims promoted their religion and widened their state altogether by force of sword. They have well been answered logically and historically by their fellow orientalists who not only rejected all such accusations on the missionary role of Muslims, but also acknowledged *Muḥammad* (peace and blessings of *Allah* be upon him) a moral symbol for Humanity. They maintain that *Islam* went on its spiritual growth even in the political degradation and economic weakness of its Empire. They proved that the Islamic teachings not only influenced the public of the lands conquered by the Muslims but they also proselytized the Non-Muslim conquerors of the Muslim territories. As None of the orientalists except Thomas Arnold has written such a comprehensive book for this sole purpose to attest thoroughly the extension of *Islam* in all over the world, and the answers of the orientalists quoted in this paper are scattered in their individual general works on *Islam* or its Prophet (peace and blessings of *Allah* be upon him), therefore this research paper is written to collect about all types of the objections and the justifying defensive statements of the orientalists on the spread of *Islam* on one place and to present a precise conclusion by analysing and evaluating them in the light of the authentic history .

Keywords: Spread of *Islam*, spiritual teachings, sympathetic behavior, missionary role, historical facts, and truthful orientalists.

Introduction

This research paper is produced to answer the research question, 'are the means of the extension of Islam in the world logically justified? A good number of the Western writers have expressed their reservations and tried to conclude this research question that the means of Islam's spread in the world were the use of power, compulsion, sword and violence. Though much has been said and written by the Muslim writers on the justification of the spread of Islam over so vast a portion of this world that Islam's extension was due to various causes, social, political and religious. Among all of these, one of the most powerful and effective factors at work in the outcome of such a stupendous result, has been the unremitted missionary labors of Muḥammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) himself and the Muslim preachers, who spent their whole lives to invite the unbelievers to the right path of Allah Almighty. But the need was felt to provide the justification of the means and sources of the spread of Islam by the evidences from the findings of the Western orientalists for the satisfaction of the critics of the Islamic means of its extension from the West. Therefore, as the topic of this research paper shows, it has been tried, for the answer of the research question of this paper, to go deep into the Western literature on the Islamic history and has been presented a good amount of the authentic historical evidences of the unbiased and impartial orientalists. In this research paper, a sufficient number of the orientalists' stand-points has been shown who not only admitted the means of Islamic spread justified but also furnished solid historical evidences in favour of these means. They admitted and confirmed that the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and his followers propagated the message of the Almighty with a solid and firm determination. As a matter of fact, the spread of Islam was the result of the Divine teachings of the Holy Qur'ān and the attraction of extreme sincerity, truthfulness and the ideal morality in the personality of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and the kind behaviour of his followers with their subjects. An other addition can be included in this area of research of the historical evidences by the non-Muslim writers of the earlier

period of Islam when it was being spread by the caliphs of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). As being the eyewitnesses, their writings can widen the area of research of this topic and increase the worth and the authenticity of the justification of the sources of Islamic extension. These types of evidences could not be included in this article because of the unavailability of the Arabic historical literature of early Islam in Pakistan, and the limited size and space of this paper as it requires a complete book to meet its requirements.

During his missionary work, the Holy Prophet had to suffer a lot of hurdles like the persecution, humiliation and hardships all of which were faced by him with bravery and patience. The more he was tortured by his enemies, the more unyielding he was found in his belief and mission. This fact has also been admitted by the modern class of European scholars of Islam known as orientalist. As John Bagot Glubb Pasha (1897-1986)¹ tells us of 'something special' in the person of Muḥammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) that inspired in his followers a passionate devotion. His words are:

*"The mystery of the extraordinary enthusiasm provoked by Islam at the time of its appearance can only be explained by reference to the personality of the Prophet himself. Whatever qualities He may have possessed or whatever actions he may have performed, there can be no doubt that there was something about him which inspired in his followers a passionate devotion."*²

According to bagot Glubb, these were the impressive qualities in the Prophet's personality which made his followers the real devotees of his cause. But in spite of being aware all about these facts, many of the orientalist's assert in contrast to the authentic history and the historical behaviour of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) towards his bitter enemies during his life at Madina. They maintain that from the date of his migration from Makka to Madīna with the altered circumstances of his life there, Muḥammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) seems entirely in a new role. He was no more the preacher, the warner and the apostle of God to His people, whom he would persuade of the truth of the religion, revealed to him, but now he appears rather as the unscrupulous bigot, using all means at his disposal of force to assert

Contrast Opinions of Orientalists on the Spread of Islam: A Critical Analysis

himself and his opinions. Washington Irving (1783-1859)³, another noted orientalist, expresses the similar observation of Prophet's behavior at Madīna in his book 'Mohammad and His Successors'. His words read:

*"He now arrived at a point where he completely diverged from the celestial spirit of the Christian doctrines, and stamped his religion with the alloy of fallible mortality. His human nature was not capable maintaining the sublime forbearance he had hither to inculcated."*⁴

He opines that a poor Islam of kindness and forbearance turned into the religion of force and sword at Madīna. According to him Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) could not maintain the divine character of his previous Christian ideas of harmony, sympathy, forbearance and forgiveness after having the authority of a ruler at Madina. He says more definitely:

Such were the doctrines and revelations which converted Islamism of a sudden from a religion of weakness and philanthropy, to one of violence and the sword.⁵

Although most of the orientalists are aware of the historical reality of Prophet Muhammad's (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) temper, patience, the sense of forgiveness and his sympathy towards his enemies even on the occasions of his victory over them as on the battle of Badr and the victory of Makka, they, inspite of this, go against the living history. Similarly Washington Irving too, knows that Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and his followers mostly remained on a defensive position rather than offensive. Therefore, majourity of the impartial historians present Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) as the representative of peace and harmony while Washington Irving and some of his fellow orientalists earnestly present him as a representative of violence and sword.

George Sale (1697-1736)⁶, an orientalist of a good say among the circles of the orientalists, admits that Muḥammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) remained kind and moderate in his Makkan life. But he also assumes that his passiveness was due to his weakness and want of power. As soon as he got the social and economic prosperity, he turned into an aggressor and a warrior. He writes:

"But this great passiveness and moderation seems entirely owing to his want of power, ... for no sooner was he enabled, by the assistance of those of Madina, to make head against his enemies, then he gave out, that God had allowed, by him and his followers to defend themselves against the infidels; and at length as his forces increased,

he pretended to have the divine leave even to attack them, and to destroy idolatry, and set up the true faith by the sword.”⁷

Sale’s this commentary cannot be verified. Because according to the history of Holy Prophet’s life, ever written either by the Muslims or other historians, the more he was powerful the more he was kind and generous to the public. His victory of Makka is the best occasion to explain his attitude as a conqueror and a ruler. The fact of Muḥammad’s (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) being sympathetic to his fellow Arabs is known to almost all the well-known orientalis, a large number of whom acknowledge him generous one both as a common preacher and as a conqueror. Thomas Walker Arnold (1864-1930)⁸ considers it false to suppose that Muḥammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) laid aside his missionary role at Madīna and after getting a large army at his command, he ceased to invite unbelievers to embrace Islam.⁹ Stanley Lane-Poole (1854-1931)¹⁰ is reported to have certified Muḥammad’s (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) entry into Makka as better than any victorious entry in the world. He asserts:

“It was thus that Mohammad entered again his native city. Through all the annals of conquest, there is no triumphant entry like unto this one.”¹¹

He appreciates the Holy Prophet’s (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) triumphant entry into his native city as an exemplary entry in the world. Dr. Henry Stubbe (1932-1976)¹² also acknowledges his victorious entry into Makka as ‘the victory of a Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) rather than an emperor’. He speaks about the Holy Prophet’s (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) behavior as observed by the then Makkans.

“His Moslemin seem all to be animated with the same spirit; nor do the inhabitants of Mecca find themselves governed by an emperor and an army, but by a Prophet.”¹³

Henry Stubbe appreciates the Muslim conquerors’ attitude with their conquered fellow nationals and admits that the Makkans found themselves under the rule of a Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) not an emperor.

Tor Julious Efraim Andrae (1885-1947)¹⁴ is also of the view similar some what to those of George Sale and Irving. He enlightens the pages of history about the cause of the growth of this universal faith in the world. He describes his opinion:

“The satisfaction and joy of victory increased the prophet’s consciousness of his calling. The thought grew in him that the world must be compelled by force to obey Allah’s word and commandments,

if preaching did not succeed. Thus, even at this time, shortly after the battle of Bedr, the principle is formulated which for a season made the sword the principal missionary instrument of Islam.”¹⁵

The reader may ask Andrae that if Muḥammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) thought of compelling the people to his faith after Badr, then why did he not take revenge from his foes and force them to embrace Islam on his victory of Makka. And which reason stopped Andrae from giving any single instance of Muḥammad’s (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) use of compulsion from history in support of his claim? Actually, neither he could find such example in history nor he or any of Prophet’s (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) detractors is in a position to answer such questions.

Washington Irving’s opinion leaves the impression that no quality ever possessed by Muḥammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), or any attraction in his teachings could be helpful for him in proselytizing the pagan Arabs. It was, says Irving, only the sword which was proved the final source for Muḥammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) to force the public to follow the new faith. He describes:

“None of these attributes, however, have been sufficient to enforce conviction, and even the miracles of Moses and Jesus have been treated with unbelief. I therefore the last of the prophets am sent with the sword! Let those who promulgate my faith enter into no argument nor discussion; but slay all who refuse obedience to the law.”¹⁶

There are two points of wonder in this passage for any reader of Prophet’s (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) life. Both are dealt with as:

1. Irving’s statement ‘None... law’ is based on either his ignorance from the Qur’ānic rules of preaching or is the outcome of his abhorrence with Islam and its Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). Because neither the Holy Qur’ān instructed Muḥammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) like this nor he commanded his followers to act in such an aggressive attitude. But, on the contrary, he as well as his followers faced the persecutions and hardships from the Makkans with patience for about thirteen years and never reacted in such an aggressive behavior and always asked the Almighty to guide their enemies in the right path. As it happened on the occasion of Prophet’s missionary visit to Taif where the public reacted in violence on Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and his then secretary with him. The Holy

Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) hoped and prayed for them to be guided by the Almighty to His right path.¹⁷

The Qur'ānic instructions to the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), to preach them in quite a polite manner, have not been out of the reach of the orientalist. Some of them assuredly express their appreciations. Thomas Arnold a wellknown and somewhat impartial orientalist, describes these Qur'ānic rules of preaching in the following way:

*“The duty of missionary work is no after-thought in the history of Islam, but was enjoined on believers from the beginning, as may be judged from the following passages in the Qur'ān—which are here quoted in chronological order according to the date of their being delivered.”*¹⁸

After this he notes more than twenty verses of the Holy Qur'ān from both Makkan and Madanite Sūrās in which Allah Almighty commands the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) to preach his faith with wisdom, kindly warning, and the sympathetic behavior. The Holy Qur'ān also asks him not to force the pagans to embrace Islam and reminds him that the duty assigned to him is only the plain-spoken preaching.

Some of these verses mentioned by Thomas Arnold are being mentioned here:

ادْعُ إِلَى سَبِيلِ رَبِّكَ بِالْحُكْمَةِ وَالْمَوْعِظَةِ الْحَسَنَةِ وَجَادِلْهُمْ بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ¹⁹

“Summon to the way of your Lord with wisdom and with kindly warning: debate with them in the kindest manner.”

وَقُلْ لِلَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ وَالْأُمِّيِّينَ أَأَسْلَمْتُمْ فَإِنْ أَسْلَمُوا فَقَدْ اهْتَدَوْا وَإِنْ تَوَلَّوْا فَإِنَّمَا عَلَيْكَ الْبَلَاغُ وَاللَّهُ بَصِيرٌ بِالْعِبَادِ²⁰

“And say to those who have been given the book and to the ignorant, do you accept Islam? Then, if they accept Islam, they are guided aright: but if they turn away, then your duty is only preaching; and God's eye is on His servants.”

فَإِنْ تَوَلَّوْا فَإِنَّمَا عَلَيْكَ الْبَلَاغُ الْمُبِينُ²¹

“Then if they turn their backs, still your office is only plain-spoken preaching.”

لَا إِكْرَاهَ فِي الدِّينِ²²

“Let there be no compulsion in religion.”

وَلَا تَزَالُ تَطَّلِعُ عَلَى خَائِنَةٍ مِنْهُمْ إِلَّا قَلِيلًا مِنْهُمْ فَاعْفُ عَنْهُمْ وَاصْفَحْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُحْسِنِينَ²³

Contrast Opinions of Orientalists on the Spread of Islam: A Critical Analysis

“You will not cease to discover the treacherous ones among them, except a few of them. But forgive them and pass it over. Verily, God loves those who act generously.”

All the Qur’ānic passages mentioned above prove that there was no indication for the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) to use the force of sword to compel his people to the acceptance of his Divine belief. Rather there were numerous instructions for him to be kind and generous to all, whether they obey or disobey.

2. Washington Irving, as usual, has given no reference to the source from where he has taken the Holy Prophet’s (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) saying. He should have noted the original Arabic text for the better understanding of it. But actually it seems the fabrication of Irving himself as the Holy Prophet could never say in contrast to what was revealed to him.

Irving also points out the secret key link between Muḥammad’s needs and the Arab’s aggressive temper that caused the spread of Islam. He argues:

“The fugitives flocking to him from Mecca, and proselytes from tribes of the desert; were men of resolute spirit, skilled in the use of arms, and fond of partisan warfare...In the exaltations of his enthusiastic spirit he endeavored to persuade himself, and perhaps did so effectually, that the power thus placed within his reach was intended as a means of effecting his great purpose, and that he was called upon by divine command to use it”.²⁴

It is the point of much astonishment that a historian asserts ‘proselytes...partisan’ and yet assumes that Muḥammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) alone compelled them by force to follow him, and they all yielded before him without any obstruction. The query emerges here, that was a single Muḥammad’s (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) strength more powerful than that of them all who not only defeated them but also forced them to follow his commandments? And which reason precluded them from using their warlike skills against him? The reality is that they were skilled in the use of weapons but were influenced, as we have already shown, by the Qur’ānic teachings and the friendly character of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him).

In the coming pages, we endeavor to analyze and [override](#) all of such assertions of the orientalist in the light of the logic and some more moderate opinions of learned orientalist. Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881)²⁵ answers the allegations of orientalist generally, and Washington’s statement particularly, in a quite logical way

and concludes this issue in these lines:

Much has been said of Mahomet's propagating his religion by the sword. It is no doubt far nobler what we have to boast of the Christian religion, that it propagated itself peaceably in the way of preaching and conviction. Yet with all, if we take this for an argument of the truth or falsehood of a religion, there is a radical mistake in it. The sword indeed: but where will you get your sword! Every new opinion, at its starting, precisely in a minority of one In one man's head alone, there it dwells as yet. One man alone of the whole world believes it, there is one man against all men. That he takes a sword, and try to propagate with that, will do little for him. You must get your sword! On the whole, a thing will propagate itself as it can. We do not find, of the Christian religion either, that it always disdained the sword, when once it had one. Charlemagne's conversion of the Saxons was not by preaching.²⁶

Thomas Carlyle criticises the Western writers' biased and partial comparison of the ways through which Christianity and Islam were extended in the world. He considered it a gross error to favour the missionary ways of Christendom for its popularity in the world and to undermine the Islamic methods of missionary approach towards the public. Moreover, the authentic history of Islam confirms that Carlyle's logic is quite natural and of a big weightage that a single thinker with a sword can never compel the world to accept his opinion because neither it happened in the world yet, nor can it be the case in future. Stubbe also holds the very thought that the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) did not force his people to adopt his heavenly message. He favors the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) in these words:

"It is a vulgar opinion that "Mahomet propagated his doctrine by the sword," and not only compelled the Arabians at first to receive his religion, but obliged his successors by a perpetual vow or precept to endeavor the extirpation of Christianity and all other religions, thereby to render his own universal. But how generally so ever this be believed, and how great men so ever they be who support it, yet is it no other than a palpable mistake."²⁷

Henry Stubbe too, Just like Thomas Carlyle has gone against some of his fellow orientalist's conclusion that Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) spread his religion through the inhuman use of sword and

extremism. In his view point, this finding of the orientalists is nothing more than a plain historical mistake. Moreover, he denies all the allegations on Prophet Muḥammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) concerning his preaching of Islam in these words:

*“But tho’ the Christian doctors and some popes have urged them, thereby prepared apologies for the Mahometans, I do find Mahomet proceeded any further in Arabia the desert then to exterminate idolatry, but not to force men to the profession of Islamism. He himself gave letters of security to the Jews and Christians in Arabia, and never used any violence to them upon the account of religion.”*²⁸

Henry Stubbe leaves no more space for the Western allegations on the Personality of Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) of having propagated his religion through the use of sword and violence. He denies categorically the Prophet’s (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) forcement of the non-Muslims to confess Islam. Rather he admits that the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) himself issued the leetters of security and peace for the Jews, Christians and the Makkan infidels who forced him to leave his beloved native city. He also confesses that Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) never used violence against them in the cause of his religion.

Renold Victor Courtenay Bodley (1892-1970)²⁹ appreciates the generosity of the Muslim rulers with which they behaved their public in such a way:

*“Wherever the Muslim armies went during the centuries succeeding Mahomet’s death, they never made vassals of the conquered, they never exploited their natural resources for their selfish benefit...On the contrary, the Muslims knew nothing of the world over which they were spreading or what it might give them. They naturally took full advantage of what they found, but always in conjunction with the local inhabitants. These, for the most part, had become Moslems and were consequently, by that fact, brothers and allies.”*³⁰

Here Bodley open heartedly admits overall historical behaviour of the Muslim rulers with their non-Muslim subjects that they never made their subjects as their slaves, never exploited their rights and properties. But in contrast they shared the benefits of their government with their conquered people and lived with them as if they were their brothers and allies.

Thomas Arnold mentions another logical instance from history that the

continual warfare rather kept the unbelievers away from the influence of peaceful and moral teachings of Muḥammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). While the close peaceful relationship between the Muslims and the Pagans after the truce of Ḥudaybiyyah (A. H. 6) caused the so rapid conversion of infidels to Islam.³¹

All the statements of orientalist mentioned above clearly show that the spread of Islam was due to the logical and natural teachings of the Holy Qur'ān and the sympathetic attitude of Prophet Muḥammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). The orientalist have also confessed that the preaching of Islam was done by the Muslims more politely than the propagation of Christianity by the Christians. Stubbe has devoted a complete chapter entitled 'Justice of Mahometan wars' in his work 'An Account of the Rise and Progress of Mahometanism' and considers the Islamic concept of war justified and also criticized the Christian methods utilized for the promotion of Christianity. Thomas Arnold also condemns the Christians for using undue means for the propaganda of their religion.³² The following passages read to differentiate the Islamic causes of its spread from those of Christianity. Bodley gives his analysis about this difference between Christianity and Islam in such a realistic note:

*"Why did his doctrines spread so much more rapidly than those of the Jews and Christians? What was the difference in Mohammad's teaching and that of Moses and Jesus? Why is the ratio of practicing Moslems greater than the ratio of practicing Jews and Christians? ...What can be, and will be, explained now, are the main principles of Mohammad's new faith, the name of which is Islam, not Mohammadanism."*³³

Bodley has raised so solid questions of which definitely expose that Islam spread much more rapidly than Christianity and Judaism because of the deep logical and natural impression of Prophet Muhammad's teachings and his social and spiritual method of preaching them. Moreover, he confirms the impressive impact of these teachings on the minds and the hearts of the believers that they practically lived their lives in accordance with the spirit of these teachings. And finally, the highest number of the practicing Muslims in the world, indicate clearly that their adherence to the spirit of Islam is due to its teachings not because of the fear of the Muslim bigotry or sword. Godfrey Higgins (1772-1833)³⁴, a noted biographer of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), compares the Christian and Muslim ways of governance, calls them contrast to each other and favours those adopted by the Muslims. He expresses:

Contrast Opinions of Orientalists on the Spread of Islam: A Critical Analysis

“Nothing is so common as to hear the Christian priests abuse the religion of Mohammad for its bigotry and intolerance. Wonderful assurance and hypocrisy! Who was it expelled the Moriscoes from Spain because they would not turn Christians? Who was it murdered the millions of Mexico and Peru, and gave them all away as slaves because they were not Christians? What a contrast have the Mohammadans exhibited in Greece! For many centuries the Christians have been permitted to live in the peaceable possession of their properties, their religion, their priests, bishops, patriarchs, and churches.”³⁵

Godfrey raises so harsh but concrete questions on the historical behaviour of the Christian conquerors with their subordinates in Spain, Mexico and Peru. They expelled the Moriscoes from Spain, gave all the inhabitants of Mexico and Peru as slaves just because they had no belief in Christianity. He also quotes an example of the Muslim conquerors' kind attitude towards the conquered Christian inhabitants of Greece who lived for centuries with complete social, religious, political and economic freedom under the rule of the Muslims.

Some of the extremely realistic and impartial orientalist have added the only point that the boundaries of Muslim empire, however, were enlarged through the wars but they never enforced the nonbelievers to their religion. Godfrey, Stubbe and Bodley are among such orientalist who open heartedly confess it. Stubbe gives his precise commentary:

“In the Alcoran also there are several passages wherein he permits the unbelievers to hold their own religion, and declares that every of them, Jew, Christian, or other, might be saved if he holds that there was one God, the Creator, a day of Judgment, and lived justly and uprightly. By all this it appears that Mahomet and his followers make war not to enforce others to their religion, but to enlarge their Empire.”³⁶

Stubbe, moreover, concludes this comparison thus:

“When we say that the religion of Mahomet was propagated by the sword, we must understand only as a consequence of their victories, and not that they forced men by slaughters and murders into their opinion. I doubt Christianity owes its extension to more unjust methods.”³⁷

In both of the passages mentioned, Henry Stubbe gives his appreciation of the Quranic rule for the non-Muslim subjects to live in the Islamic state with

freedom by holding their own religion with just a single demand to believe in the oneness of God. He also opines, though of little historical authenticity and worth, that the Muhammadans made wars not to enforce others to their religion but to enlarge their empire. He argues further that Christianity is extended by the use of more unjust means. The point here is to be noted that the Muslims believe that Islam is the true and the sole original religion of the Almighty and is a perfect solution for the spiritual, material needs and the problems of the humanity on earth. So the Muslim conquerors thought that their Divine Empire should be as large as possible so that the maximum number of the humanity may be able to avail all the benefits of the havonic kingdom. As a consequence of the enlargement of the Muslim empire, its inhabitants, both the Muslims and non-Muslims, found it a blessing from the Almighty as the most peaceful place to dwell on the earth. Arnold also holds the same view that successes of Muslim arms, however, also attracted the people towards Islam.³⁸

This discourse concludes that the use of sword was one of the sources of the extension of Muslim state, but not the sole cause of the spread of Islam in any case. It is the human nature that the human beings dislike to be forced by threat to do, accept or to believe in any thing. In case, if someone is forced by the warning to do or accept anything that he dislikes, he may accept or believe in the demanded thing but this will be for the time being until he gets rid of the threat of the enforcement and will show his disbelief again. Bodley gives a solid proof from the authentic history that the propagation of Islam in all over the world was due to the friendly relationship of Muslim conquerors with the conquered peoples because nowhere in the world, after the departure of Muslim conquerors, people left their new faith of Islam save in Spain, the real causes of which require a long tale. He argues:

“The proof of this friendly relationship is that, except for Spain, all the countries which the Moslems penetrated between the seventh and fourteenth centuries have remained faithful to the cause of Islam, and regard Mecca as the center of their civilization.”³⁹

In the statement mentioned above, Bodley appreciates the friendly relationship of the Muslim rulers with their conquered peoples in all over the world. He admits the historical reality that the subjects of all the countries, conquered by the Muslim rulers save Spain remained Muslims devoted for the cause of Islam. Godfrey Higgins stands the most accurate and justified in his proof in the support of his argument. He gives a very unique and interesting example from history that not only the Muslim conquerors attracted their public towards their

religion but also the conquered Muslims impressed their conquerors to believe in their faith of Islam. He quotes:

*“The first attack, or one of the first attacks of Turks on the Saracen, took place in the later end of the eighth century. They came from the north betwixt the Caspian seas, and were not then of the Mohammadan religion. But they soon afterward came over to the religion of their conquered Saracens. In this conversion of their conquerors, a most remarkable and pointed refutation is given to the often repeated charge, that Islamism was indebted to the sword for its success. For here is a grand proof that Islamism not only converted those whom it conquered: it converted its conquerors.”*⁴⁰

This is the unique historic example of the Muslim characteristics any type of which cannot be found in the spheres of other religions that the conquerors embraced the religion of their conquered people. Such conversion of the conquerors was definitely indebted to the impressive characteristics of the Muslim subjects and the peaceful and logical teachings of Islam.

Conclusion

It can be concluded from the previous discussions, evidences and the opinions that some of the orientalist like William Muir, Washington Irving, George Sale and Tor Andrae have gone far away from the production of an accurate and historically authentic answer to the basic research question under discussion in the paper that ‘whether the means of Islamic extension in the world are logically justified or not’. They committed a gross mistake to make Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and his followers responsible for propagating their faith by the force of compulsion. Infact they could produce no instance from history, in favour of their assertions, of Prophet’s (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) or any of his follower’s use of sword for the cause of compulsively proselytizing the unbelievers. This is because, human history has a story of the spread of Islam, attested by the logic and by the realistic orientalist, totally different from which narrated by them. This only may, however, be said that the successful political entries into far distant areas played their role in the expansion of the boundaries of Islamic state but not the religion of Islam. Thomas Arnold has rightly marshalled the primary causes due to which the unbelievers attached themselves to the faith of Islam as the simple and rationalistic character of Muslim creed, solid faith in the oneness of the Almighty, brotherhood, equality, peacefulness, their determination and strength of will, uncomplaining submission and patience in facing the bitterest misfortunes in the way

of Allah and finally the measure of toleration enjoyed by the unbelievers under the Muslim rule, the like of which cannot be found in Europe until quite modern times.⁴¹ Similarly, John Bagot Glubb Pasha, Godfrey Higgins, Henry Stubbe, Thomas Carlyle and R. V. C. Bodley, have discarded the allegations of William Muir, Washington Irving, George Sale and Tor Andrae through their presentation of logical evidences from the annals of authentic history and have provided us their help to produce a precise comprehensive conclusion of our basic research question through the academic investigation. The message and the spirit of the Quranic teachings and the psychological methodology of preaching assigned to the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), as mentioned and appreciated by Professor Thomas Arnold, are also a proven authentic source for the better understanding of the missionary approaches of Islam. As this article deals with some of the misunderstandings of the Western scholars of Islam, and their followers in the West as well as in the East, they all are advised, through this paper, to study the impartial literature of the unbiased orientalist mentioned above and the Quranic missionary instructions provided to Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and his followers and revise their stand-point in an academic and scholarly aptitude. Hopefully, through this scholarly approach, they, like others, will get a sufficient amount of satisfaction about the justification of the Muslim wars and the extension of Islam.

References

1. *Born in Preston, Lancashire, a British soldier, author and scholar of the Eastern political, religious and social studies. Author of the following publications:*
 - *The Great Arab Conquests.*
 - *The Empire of the Arabs*
 - *A Short History of the Arab Peoples.*
 - *The Lost Centuries: From the Muslim Empires to the Renaissance of Europe.*
 - *The Life and Times of Muhammad.*
2. *Pasha, John Bagot Glubb, The Empire of the Arabs (London: Hodder & Stoughton, First ed., 1963), 22. For further study of Bagot's views, his remarkable work, The Great Arab Conquests (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1963) should be consulted.*

Contrast Opinions of Orientalists on the Spread of Islam: A Critical Analysis

3. *Born in New York, A biased American short story writer, an orientalist and a diplomat of early 19th century. Author of various literary works including 'Mahomet and his Successors'.*
4. *Washington Irving, Mohammad and His Successors, Vol. 1, (India: ABI Prints & Publishing. 1988), 152.*
5. *Ibid., 154-155.*
6. *Born in Canterbury, Kent, England. A British scholar of Quranic and the Arabs' cultural studies. Ex-member of the 'Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.' The writer of a Quranic translation and commentary named 'The Koran' and the 'Sacred Books of the East.' He also wrote the introduction of the book 'Universal History'.*
7. *George Sale, The Koran (London: George Routledge, 1898), 38.*
8. *A British Orientalist. Ex- professor of Arabic language & literature at University of London. One of Allama Muhammad Iqbal's favourite teachers.*
9. *Thomas Walker Arnold, The Spread of Islam in the World (New Delhi: Good Word Books, 2001), 34.*
10. *Stanley Lane-Poole Born in London, England. He wrote dozens of books including, 'The Story of the Moors in Spain.' And Arabic-English Lexicon.*
11. *Godfrey Higgins, Apology for Mohammad (Lahore: Premier Book House, 1929), LXXI.*
12. *He was born in Partney, a village of the district Lincolnshire, England. A noted determined and fearless British writer on both religious as well as political studies. He wrote about a dozen books some of which are:*
 - *A light Shining out of Darkness.*
 - *A Vindication of that Prudent and Honourable Knight, Sir, Henry Vane.*
 - *An Account of the Rise and Progress of Mahometanism.*
13. *Henry Stubbe, An Account of the Rise and Progress of Mahometanism Ed. Mahmood Shairani (Lahore: Orientalia Publishers, 1975), 128.*
14. *Born in Vina, A Swedish scholar of comparative religion and a Bishop of Linkoping, Sweden. Author of various prominent works with one 'Mohammad the Man and his Faith' on Prophet Muhammad's life.*
15. *Tor Andrae, Mohammad the Man and his Faith (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1956), 147.*
16. *Irving, Mohammad and His Successors, Vol. 1, 154.*

17. *An-Nadavi, Abul Hasan Ali Alhusaini, As-Sirah An-Nabawiyyah (Berut: Darus-Shurooq, 5th ed. 1983) 130.*
18. *Arnold, The Spread of Islam, 3.*
19. *The Holy Qur'ān, 16:125.*
20. *Ibid., 3:20.*
21. *Ibid., 16:82.*
22. *Ibid., 2:256.*
23. *Ibid., 5:13.*
24. *Irving, Mohammad and His Successors, Vol. 1, 153.*
25. *A wellknown British instructor and philosopher of oriental and social studies. He was proved a rebel in his study-life as well as in professional life. He left both formal study and his job and set himself in studying books individually.*
His book on the French revolution got a high degree of popularity in Europe and France. He also wrote a series of lectures on the most influential & heroic personalities in human history with the title: 'On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History.' He devoted his first lecture for the personality of the Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and defended him, through a deep impartial academic approach, from all the majour allegations of his Western critics. He also criticized his critics because of their biased biographical approach.
26. *Thomas Carlyle, On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History (New York: J. M. Dent & Sons), 295-96.*
27. *Stubbe, An Account of the Rise and Progress of Mahometanism, 180.*
28. *Ibid., 181.*
29. *A British Army Officer, journalist and renowned author of about 18 books including 'The Messenger' on the biography of Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) in 1946.*
30. *Bodley R. V. C., The Messenger (London: Robert Hale 1946), 95.*
31. *Arnold, The Spread of Islam, 37.*
32. *Ibid., 7-8.*
33. *Bodley, The Messenger, 83.*
34. *A Magistrate of British origin, born in Owston, Yarkshire and died in Cambridge. A prominent advocate of social reform, a historian and*

Contrast Opinions of Orientalists on the Spread of Islam: A Critical Analysis

orientalist. Author of several works with one of the earliest apologies from West for the life of Muhammad in 1829 entitled: Apology for Muhammad.

35. Higgins, *Apology for Mohammad*, 123-124.

36. Stubbe, *An Account of the Rise and Progress of Mahometanism*, 184.

37. *Ibid.*, 188.

38. Arnold, *The Spread of Islam*, 35.

39. Bodley, *The Messenger*, 95.

40. Higgins, *Apology for Mohammad*, 131.

41. Arnold, *The Spread of Islam*, 413-420.