Companions from taking down anything other than the Qur'an from the Prophet, opines in general: "The literary remains of all this activity are negligible, chiefly because at this stage the habit of oral transmission was still dominant, and perhaps even reinforced by religious discouragement of putting anything on paper except the Koran. The prejudice was most effective in sphere of religious studies, which were, of course, those most pursued" (p. 40). This surmise deliberately ignores the Prophet's encouragement to obtain knowledge even from China and the permission to record all knowledge. Instances are too well-known to be cited.

Another astonishing statement appears on page 41 to the effect that "Muhammad himself . . . . inevitably adopted a hostile attitude to it [poetry]". Although Islam discouraged satire and lampoon and other useless kinds of poetry, it in fact gave an impetus to Arabic poetics which later produced poets like Ka'b b. Zuhayr, Farazdaq, 'Umar b. Rabi'ah, Jamil, Kuthayyir 'Azzah and a host of others in the Hijaz, in Mesopotamia and other places, as has been mentioned by the author himself.

Professor Gibb is full of praise for the 'Abbasids, perhaps for the fact that in their regime he could trace "the contributions of the Aramaic and Hellenized peoples to Muslim literature and thought." (p. 47). The Umayyads, on the contrary, most of them being rigid Muslims, appear to the author to be "somewhat arbitrary" (p. 56) in their legal methods.

In spite of such statements to which exception could be taken, the book gives a very critical and comprehensive survey of the Arabic language in English and stands unique in its field. Irrespective of the sarcasm imbedded cleverly in the style and the language of the book it treats in a very masterly and skilful manner of every branch of Arabic studies. Drawing of a vivid and almost reliable picture of all the activities of the Arabs in different parts of Asia, Africa and Europe, remains its own peculiar feature.

Students of Arabic literature will, it is hoped, find this revised edition of a book, long out of print, extremely useful and illuminating.

KARACHI

M. S. H. MA'SUMI


Dr. Ghulam Wahid Choudhury, Professor and Head of the Department of Political Science, Dacca University (East Pakistan), has already made his mark as a keen analyst of Pakistan affairs by his earlier work Constitutional Development of Pakistan and a number of scholarly articles, published in recognized journals of Political Science and International Affairs. In the present volume, Dr. Choudhury undertakes to discuss the evolution of parliamentary institutions in Pakistan. He analyses the political, economic and social forces which in 1962 ultimately led to the constitutional change-over from parliamentary to presidential system of government under the revolutionary regime of Field-Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan.

The book has been divided into eleven chapters. The first five deal with the different constitutional stages through which the parliamentary system passed...
during the British rule, the adoption of the Government of India Act of 1935 with necessary modifications as the interim Constitution of Pakistan in 1947, the enactment of the First Constitution of 1956, and finally the induction and end of the First Republic of Pakistan. He characterizes the constitutional change of 1947 as 'a big transition from colonial democracy to political democracy'. After surveying the introduction of 'democracy by instalments' during 1861-1935, the author concludes: 'In fact the system which existed before Independence was based on the theory of 'strong executive' rather than on any idea of parliamentarism'. According to him, 'the system was unique in character,' and he prefers to describe it as 'viceregal' system. Dr. Choudhury, therefore, emphatically rejects the view that the parliamentary system of government was most suited to Pakistan and that the people were already accustomed to the working of this system.

The turning point in the constitutional evolution of Pakistan came about in 1947 when the Independence Act conferred sovereign powers on the Constituent Assembly. The Act further provided that during the interim period the Government of India Act of 1935 would be adopted with necessary modifications as the interim Constitution. Accordingly, under the interim Constitution, the Governor-General was required to exercise his powers on the advice of his Ministers. The bicameral legislature of the Government of India Act of 1935 was replaced by a unicameral legislature. The Constituent Assembly acted in two separate capacities, namely (i) as the legislature of the dominion in so far as it was to draft a constitution; and (ii) as the federal legislature for making ordinary laws of the country. The dual character of the Constituent Assembly ultimately precipitated a grave constitutional crisis in the country. In the Federation of Pakistan versus Moulvi Tamizuddin Khan case, the legal question that came up for discussion was 'whether assent of the Governor-General was required when the Constituent Assembly acted as the constitution-making body which was supposed to be sovereign'. The Federal Court decided that in all cases whether the Constituent Assembly acted as the Federal legislature or constituent body, the assent of the Governor-General was required, as a result of this ruling many Acts on the Statute Book became void. Professor Choudhury's conclusion on this point is fairly correct.

Professor Choudhury exploring the causes of the failure of the parliamentary system in Pakistan succinctly remarks: "Notwithstanding all these favourable factors: a respected and neutral Governor-General, an absolute majority in the legislature and wide popular support, Liaquat Ali Khan could not build an effective Cabinet system in Pakistan" (p. 42). Perhaps, this view of Professor Choudhury may be challenged by many, but in the concluding lines of the paragraph, he himself admits; "So before we ascribe any responsibility for the lack of proper growth of a cabinet system in Pakistan in the first Prime Minister, Liaquat Ali Khan, it should be kept in mind that it took more than a century to develop the Cabinet form of Government in the classic land of parliamentarism, England" (p. 42). It may be added that the success of parliamentary system in a country suffering from poverty, illiteracy, social transition, and autocratic traditions, essentially depends on a firm and stable leadership. But unfortunately in Pakistan the country was deprived of the two great leaders at a very early state. After Quaid-i-Azam and Liaquat Ali Khan there was no person left who
could carry the whole nation with him; and therefore, immediately after the assassination of Liaquat Ali Khan, second-rate leaders got themselves engaged in the worst scramble for power. In fact these politicians should be blamed for having strangled the parliamentary institutions in the country. In India, the semblance of parliamentary democracy that one noticed was mainly due to the uninterrupted monolithic leadership of Pandit Nehru rather than anything else.

During the early phase of parliamentary government in Pakistan, the relative equation of personalities of the Governor-General and the Prime Minister had been quite conducive to the working of parliamentary government. Jinnah-Liaquat and Nazimuddin-Liaquat combination worked very well, but later on, Ghulam Mohammed-Nazimuddin combination upset the psychological equation that could be congenial to the smooth working of Cabinet government. As a result under Ghulam Mohammed parliamentary system degenerated into autocracy. However, the dismissal of Khwaja Nazimuddin by the Governor-General Ghulam Mohammad and afterwards the dissolution of the First Constituent Assembly were steps towards undermining the parliamentary democracy in Pakistan. However, luckily due to the decision of the Federal Court, parliamentary system got a fresh lease of life but it could not survive the successive blows which were administered by the Governors-General. The Prime Ministers were appointed and dismissed regardless of all parliamentary conventions. The coalition politics further marred the prospects of parliamentarism.

Professor Choudhury very dispassionately surveys provincial political politics in both wings of Pakistan. Regarding East Pakistan his views on the language issue, economic disparity, and the defeat of Muslim League in the general elections of 1954, and the consequent assumption of government by the United Front, and its ultimate breakdown are based on the most objective analysis.

In Chapters III and IV the author focusses his attention on the politics of constitution-making, and the analysis of the Constitution of 1956. He enumerates those difficulties and problems which the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan had to face in drafting a suitable constitution for the country. The sharp cleavage of opinion among the legislators on the Islamic character of the state, the nature of federalism, the suitability of presidential or parliamentary form of government, problem of representation in the federal legislature and the language issue delayed the process of constitution-making in Pakistan.

In chapter V he examines the findings of the Constitution Commission regarding the causes of the failure of the parliamentary system in Pakistan. He correctly maintains that the late Constitution was quite workable in spite of its defects, but unfortunately the politicians were not sincere about its implementation in actual practice. He rightly blames Ghulam Mohammad and Iskander Mirza for having killed the parliamentary system, since they interfered with the democratic processes most wantonly. On this point, he disagrees with the Constitution Commission Report and observes: "The Constitution Commission seems to have failed to stress this aspect of the role of the Head of the State in assessing the causes of the unsatisfactory working of the parliamentary institutions in Pakistan" (p. 134). In fact this chapter is brilliant critique of the Commission's analysis.

According to the terms of reference of the Commission, it was called upon to suggest a machinery of government which must insure inter se 'The Consolida-
tion of national unity and a firm and stable system of government'. Keeping this objective in view, the Commission rejected the idea of even modified parliamentary government, and instead recommended the adoption of presidential system more or less on American model since it guarantees a strong executive, much needed political stability and efficient administration.

Criticising the recommendation of the Commission regarding restricted franchise, Professor Choudhury rightly points out that it "is not in tune with the spirit and notion of modern democracy" (p. 159). With regard to the Islamic provisions, the Commission favoured the adoption of the Preamble and other Islamic provisions of the late Constitution. However, on the question of bringing the existing law into conformity with the Qur'an and Sunnah, the Commission recommended that a Commission should be appointed to examine and recommend as to the measures for bringing the existing laws into conformity with Islamic injunctions.

In Chapter VII Professor Choudhury examines the final draft of the Constitution that was promulgated in March, 1962 and brings out the departures that it makes from the recommendations of the Commission's Report.

The presidential form of government as recommended by the Commission has been adopted in the new Constitution but with radical modifications. It deviates from the practice of the presidential system of government by investing the President with the overriding legislative powers and thereby rendering the legislature ineffective. Writing on the presidential system the author observes: "Those who make constitutions are often greatly influenced by the errors of the past and in doing so sometime they misjudge the present and the future". In the same strain striking a note of caution, he suggests: "It may be necessary in the course of the working of the constitution to provide some additional safeguards against the danger of arbitrary government" (p. 220).

The concluding chapter entitled "Dilemmas of Democracy" is an excellent summing up of the tragic failure of democratic processes in Pakistan and other countries of Asia and Africa. The foremost cause, in view of the learned writer, was the fact that "alien political institutions" were imposed from above and they did not grow from the bottom" (p. 270). In most cases the westernized intellectual elite were associated with the working of the democratic institutions, the masses had remained ignorant of democracy. Dilating on the socio-economic aspects of the problem, he remarks: "A delicate balance has to be maintained between political freedom on the one hand and socio-economic progress on the other," which in his view, "is by no means, an easy task" (p. 272). In this connection, however, it may be pointed out that the learned author does not probe deeper into the socio-economic causes of the failure of the parliamentary democracy in Pakistan, although he refers to this aspect here and there.

Professor Choudhury makes a strong case for an effective party system and free and periodic elections as the prerequisite conditions for developing healthy democratic traditions in the newly independent states of Asia and Africa. In his view, another factor that has retarded the evolution of democracy in Pakistan is the "anomic movements engineered mainly by the discontented elements in the larger cities" (p. 277). In addition to these factors, the constant "external threats" are "not conducive to the growth of free institutions" (p. 278). Talking
of the emergence of the New Political Order under Field-Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan, he says, "the great relieving feature of the recent developments in Pakistan is the fact that the rise of a military regime in Pakistan was not accompanied by any rise of an authoritarian doctrine" (p. 293). In a nutshell, the philosophy underlying the new political order is "to blend democracy with discipline". He concludes: "Fate of democracy in Pakistan as in many other parts of Asia and Africa depends on the development of a strong and sound foundation among the people" (p. 295).

The book which makes a comprehensive study of the history of parliamentarism in Pakistan is not only useful to the experts but also to students and the general reader. Surely it must draw the attention of the academic world.

Solecisms like 'datas' and 'machineries' mar an otherwise well-produced book. We hope these minor errors will be removed in a future edition.

KARACHI

MANZOORUDDIN AHMED

IQBAL'S GULSHAN-I RAZ-I JADID AND BANDAGI NAMAH, English translation with explanatory notes by Bashir Ahmed Dar, Institute of Islamic Culture, Lahore, 1964, pp. 77.

Gulshan-i Rāz-i Jadid (New Garden of Mystery) and Bandagi Nāmah (Book of Servitude) are the last two philosophical mathnawīs of Iqbal's famous Persian work Zabūr-i 'Ajam which otherwise consists primarily of ghazals (lyrics). The ghazal portion of Zabūr-i 'Ajam is already known to the English-reading public through a translation by Professor A. J. Arberry under the title Persian Psalms (1948). With B. A. Dar's rendering of the two poems in question the English translation of Zabūr-i 'Ajam now stands completed.

Iqbal wrote Gulshan-i Rāz-i Jadid in answer to the Gulshan-i Rāz of Mahmūd Shabistārī, an eminent mystic poet of Persia (c. 1250-1320 A.C.), whose thinking, in the normal tradition of Śūfism, is strictly pantheistic and quite typical for its ascetic bent. It is believed that this mode of thought, particularly as it has flourished in Muslim history, was given added impetus by the unspeakable ravages and atrocities suffered by the Muslims at the hands of the Mongol invaders in the 13th century. Mahmūd Shabistārī himself was a witness to the cultural chaos that followed the fall of Baghdad in 1258. His Gulshan-i Rāz, therefore, is as much of an echo of the mood of the time as it is an appreciable contribution to mystic literature. It speaks eloquently of the unity of all Being, of the illusoriness of physical existence and thus of the merit of self-abnegation and resignation.

That Iqbal had developed a strong antipathy for this way of thinking is most clearly indicated by the contents of Gulshan-i Rāz-i Jadid. There is no denying the fact that his own thought exhibits unmistakable mystic tendencies. But he was at the same time a rebel of the mystic tradition. For his mysticism purported to be personalistic and dynamic instead of being pantheistic and passive, and he advocated positive self-sufficiency as the norm of human conduct rather than the self-abnegation of traditional mysticism. Here was, therefore, a truly jadid (new) approach to an old mystery.