end of this period will become autonomous (pp. 131-34).

The first four articles in the fourth part of the book contain Professor Bashgil’s answer to his critics. Akis (Reflection), a Turkish periodical, published an interview with the author in which he was described as a reactionary without any value to the nation, and devoid of knowledge. Expressing his regrets over the campaign of vilification launched by his critics, Professor Bashgil has tried to give a satisfactory explanation about his views on the various national problems. He says there is a lack of thinkers in Turkey because there is no proper spiritual atmosphere for the training of original men of thought, on account of the authoritarian character of the Turkish regimes that have been in power since the establishment of the Turkish Republic (pp. 146-148). He suggests the formation of a Council of Religious Affairs to deal with the religious problems of Turkish Muslims. In his concluding remarks, the author discusses the moral and intellectual crisis in Turkey at present which, in his opinion, is brought about by blindly copying the West.

The book provides an excellent study of the Constitutional problems of Modern Turkey, particularly of secularism and its application. Few Turkish authors have written so well on the subject in recent years. Professor Bashgil’s original thinking is convincingly logical. He has an inimitable style of his own in marshalling facts and driving his ideas home to his readers. His ideas have wielded great influence over the intellectuals in Turkey. The credit that he deserves for his sincere and penetrating analysis of Turkey’s constitutional problems is truly reflected in the recent framing of a new Constitution of the Turkish Republic, the formation of a bicameral legislature, and the clarification of clauses on human rights in the new Constitution.

KARACHI
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This is a collection of essays written from time to time by Miss Maryam Jameelah, an American Jewess, who accepted Islam some time ago. In the introductory part of the book, she narrates the story of her conversion to Islam from the Jewish faith. She says she was repelled by the exclusivist temper of Zionism and although her parents told her that Islam would alienate her from the American society, she finally chose to follow what she believed to be the true religion.

The first chapter of her book deals with “the Philosophical sources of Western Materialism.” She begins by pointing out that in the so-called medieval ages the dominant concern of the Christians and Muslims alike was their salvation beyond the grave. But with the formation of centralized monarchies in Europe, when kings, bankers and merchants replaced the Church as patrons of art and learning, emphasis shifted to developing the potentialities of each individual here on earth to the fullest extent possible. This, she says, was the birth of the Western civilization as we know it. It would rather be difficult to refute the view expressed by Miss Jameelah.

She believes that the right given to the individual to interpret the Bible
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as he wished, the rejection of the Pope’s authority and of the Latin language as the common language of scholars in Europe greatly strengthened the movement towards secular nationalism and the division of Europe into numerous independent sovereign states.

Referring to the changed intellectual outlook due to the advance in science, Miss Jameelah rightly points out that, feeling like a stranger in the universe without tangible proof of any God who cherished his welfare, Western man abandoned as futile the search for the ultimate meaning and purpose of life and began to regard Nature as he does today as an enemy to be conquered possessed and then manipulated by mechanical means to advance his material well-being. She also attacks the Darwinian concept of biological evolution which, being wrongly applied to society, gave birth to the idea that whatever is more modern is into facts more advanced and progressive in the sense of being morally more desirable. The distinction, therefore, between moral progress which has to be won after each time and material progress which is automatic was lost. “Historians,” she adds, “come to look upon man as part of nature evolving to his present state from lowly offings with all of his achievements having been painfully acquired in the struggle against a hostile environment.”

While generally supporting Miss Jameelah’s thesis in respect of the change in the intellectual and religious outlook brought about by modern science, we would assess the fact that much more was assumed by modern science than it could justify on rational grounds.

The second chapter of Miss Jameelah’s book deals with Dr. W. C. Smith’s book, “Islam in Modern History”. She maintains that Dr. Smith regards the creation of Pakistan as a mistake and chides the Pakistanis for idealizing their past. She further gives quotations from Dr. Smith’s book in which the latter has praised the Indian Government for stopping the riots against the Indian Muslims and giving them freedom to practice and preach their religion. It may be pointed out in this connection that non-Muslims in Pakistan, including the Hindus, enjoy far greater security of life and property and an equal measure of religious freedom.

As regards Dr. Smith’s charge quoted by Miss Jameelah that the Pakistanis are trying the impossible task of reliving a segment of Arabian history, we would only say that the question cannot be disposed of so easily. It is an issue which involves a deep knowledge of history and a much deeper knowledge of Islam as a religion, policy and culture. The idea of a continuous linear progress in history which is presupposed by Dr. Smith’s criticism of Pakistani Muslims, is one which has been recently questioned by many philosophers of history on very solid grounds.

The fourth chapter examines the philosophy of Zia’s Chohal’s (as does the third deal mainly with his social ideas). According to Zia’s Ghakal, the European civilization is essentially a continuation of the ancient Mediterranean civilization which was founded by the Turkish peoples, such as Somerties, Scythians and the Mykane. It is rightly pointed out by the author that this is a clear attempt to distort history. Indeed, it is an attempt to revive racism by stressing the ethnic origins of a people without regard to their religious beliefs and social ethics. Like all nationalists, Zia’s Ghakal saw nothing but good in his own race.
and people and glorifies their past. It is a pity that this clarification by socialies and nationalism goes for modernity. Gilkey includes Hynes and Phoenixian among the Turks, but Miss Jameelah points out that both of them were Semitic peoples. Gilkey further argues that Russia remained backward until Peter the Great hastened the process of Westernization. He, therefore, wants Turkey to follow in his footsteps and Westernize itself. He forgets the fact that Russia was a part of the general Christian civilization, though its Christianity differed from Latin Christianity. Even so, Russia always figured in the political alignments of Europe. Therefore, it is historically inadvisable to treat it as an isolated unit far removed from the developments which were taking place in Western Christendom. It was quite natural for it receive inspiration and influence from the countries of Western Europe. But Turkey had been and still is a part of the Islamic civilization. Therefore, what was good and feasible for Russia may not be good and feasible for the Turks.

Another chapter deals with Thāb Ḥusnayn, the ideal of Egyptian nationalists. Thāb Ḥusnayn's theme is a variant of Ziya Gilkey's. The former connects Egypt with European civilization by tracing the ancient links which he supposes bound the Egyptians to the Greeks and through which the two exerted their influence on each other. The author rightly points out that "the contrast between the heroic stature of Ramses and the sculpture of Phidian; the Pharaonic monarchy and Athenian democracy is too great to suggest that the latter was derived from the former." Thāb Ḥusnayn cites the fierce rebellions of the Egyptians against the Arab Musullimah who conquered their country. But Miss Jameelah again calls the nail on the head when she says that the battles against the Muslims were waged by mercenary Byzantine troops, while the Copts or native Egyptians welcomed the Arabs as deliverers. Thāb Ḥusnayn further maintains that the essence of Islam is the same as that of Christianity conveniently forgetting the important and far-reaching differences in their attitude to God and man, as well as the way in which they seek to order the lives of their followers.

In the seventh chapter Miss Jameelah refers to the political systems of the Muslim countries and says that "a democratic Government such as is practised in my country (U.S.A.) is far more compatible with the spirit of Islam." She accepts her thesis with certain reservations, one of which is that Islam neither the legal nor the executive, but yet the people are empowered to change the fundamental legislation of the Qur'an and the Hadīth. At the same time Miss Jameelah says, "No truly Islamic government can be established until a complete revision of the Ghulāt' takes place. The four great orthodox schools of Muslim law, founded between the eighth and ninth centuries A.C., were well adapted to the society prevailing then. Unfortunately, their successors who closed the door to Ijāiid and practiced Ījāfīr with Gharīb a forest."

We would have preferred the word Fiqh or jurisprudence, where Miss Jameelah uses the word Ghulāt, for the latter cannot be stamped.

The last chapter deals with the question whether Islam needs to be reconciled with the present-day requirements. Much of what Miss Jameelah has said in this chapter will appeal to every Muslim of sound thinking. We would only add that the question often asked whether Islam is compatible with the
modern times has not been subjected to a dispassionate examination. It is more of a slogan in the mouth of those whose understanding of history is at-deal. The times are largely what we make of them. The current of history has itself been turned by resolve stern imbued with the spirit of sacrifice for their ideals. We do not claim that the course of history can be changed absolutely, because to a certain extent historical forces elude our power. But much of history depends upon the ideas that influence men's minds and the amount of energy they can put forth for the realization of those ideas. Our decisions, provided they are not wholly irrational and opposed to the fundamental needs of human nature, can influence the course of history to a much greater extent than many people imagine. The important question about Islam is not whether it is compatible with times, but whether it answers the permanent needs of human nature. If it does, it has still a great issue and can mould and modify the current of human history.

In conclusion, we would say that Miss Saeedah's book is marked with considerable scholarship and much acute thinking. It is a book which should be carefully studied specially by those who have been overserved by the material progress either of the West or of Communist countries.
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