BOOK REVIEWS

On page 241, referring to Quaid-e-Azam Sir Muhammad Ali Jinnah’s decision to combine in himself the offices of Prime Minister and the League President, Mr. Binder says, “Some rather questionable tactics were used to accomplish this maneuver.” Mr. Binder accuses Sir Muhammad Ali Jinnah for having used “questionable tactics” but does not substantiate his allegations by any evidence. Sincere scholarship demands that such irresponsible statements should not be made. In fact, the motivation behind combining the League Presidency with the Prime Ministership, was to assure greater and closer co-ordination between the League organization and the League parliamentary party. Moreover, from the very inception of Pakistan, the League organization had suffered a great setback because its leadership had to concentrate upon the task of setting up a viable administrative machinery. This decision was taken also for providing a more vigorous leadership to the Muslim League. It would be wrong to suggest that it was only a maneuver to prevent the Muslim League from criticizing government policies.

Mr. Binder’s book deserves the attention of all serious students of Pakistan who may usefully apply themselves to its careful study. The author has done a painstaking job in collecting all the relevant materials regarding the most sensitive question of Islamic constitutionalism in Pakistan.

Karachi.

MANZOOR-UD-DIN AHMED.

Tariq Zafer Tunaya, TÜRKIYENIN SIYASI HAYATINDA BATILILASMA HAREKETLERİ (Westernisation Movements in Turkey’s Political Life).

Prof. Tariq Zafer Tunaya is an ex-professor of Constitutional Law and Political Science, University of Istanbul who is at present Turkish Delegate at NATO Headquarters, Paris. He has produced this book on a subject of topical interest. It is a welcome addition to his well-known work TÜRKIYEDE SIYASI PARTİLER (Political Parties in Turkey).

The first part of the book surveys the development of Western ideas and institutions in the Ottoman Empire from 1718 to its downfall in 1918. The second part is devoted to the process of Westernisation in the Turkish Republic. The third and the last part deals with the different viewpoints on the problems raised by Westernisation in recent years.

The penetration of Western ideas into the Ottoman Empire began in 1718. Modernisation of the Ottoman Army served as a vehicle of Western influence. After 1826 the process of Westernisation became smooth and steady as the Yeni Ceri (called Janissaries by European writers) organisation whose influence over the Sultan’s government had assumed alarming proportions, was abolished and entirely wiped out by a total massacre of its members. The ulama who were influential in Ottoman politics were also associated with the Yeni Ceri. With the abolition of the Yeni Ceri, therefore, the Sultan’s government got rid of these two influential institutions in so far as the introduction of reforms was concerned. This historic event happened during the reign of Mahmut II who is generally called an enlightened despot by Turkish historians, but was referred to as “Gavur Padishah” meaning “Infidel King” by his conservative Muslim subjects.
The Young Ottomans included great writers, journalists and poets like Namık Kemal and Ibrahim Shinasi Efendi who greatly contributed to the awakening of the Turks and who instilled a vigorous patriotic feeling into their nation. Their efforts culminated in the heralding of the era of Constitutionalism. The first written Turkish Constitution, prepared by Midhat Pasha, came into effect in 1876 during the reign of Sultan Abdul Hamid II. Soon after its promulgation, however, the Sultan suspended the Constitution, dismissed the Parliament, and ruled like an autocrat with his well-known network of secret police for the next thirty-one years and a half. The Constitution of 1876 was reinstated after the Young Turk Revolution of 1908. Shortly after this famous event which is known in Turkish history as hurriyetin ilani (the declaration of freedom), Sultan Abdul Hamid II was deposed. The young Turk regime that lasted until 1918 introduced several Western reforms. During this phase of Westernisation, the characteristic features of the reforms introduced in Turkey was the dualism between the new and traditional institutions, Islamic law and Shari'ah courts existed along with the Western civil and commercial laws and the civil courts. Secular educational institutions imparted Western education side by side with the Medreses that were centres of Islamic education.

This dualism was brought to an end by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the President and Founder of the Turkish Republic. Under Atatürk's Leadership, the Sultanate and the Caliphate were abolished. The entire body of Islamic laws was abrogated and replaced by Western laws. The Turks accepted secularism as a principle of State policy, and they became part and parcel of the Western civilization after having disowned all historic links with the Eastern civilization. The modern Turks have tried to give a new meaning to the 20th Century civilisation by identifying it with the Western civilization, and by claiming it as the common heritage of mankind. However, this interpretation runs counter to the view of religious groups in the Western world who regard it as a Christian civilization. The conservative Muslims also identify the Western civilization with the Christian civilization.

The clash of opinion on the Westernisation of Turkey continues, and a synthesis of Western and Turkish cultures is yet to be effected by politicians. The Turks have set up a Republic with the framework of the Western system of democracy. They are now trying hard to make this system work. The bitter truth about this problem lies in the fact that the regimes in Turkey came into power with promises of human freedoms, but when they left they had become unconstitutional. The regime of Adnan Menderes, for example, illustrates this statement. The spirit of the Kemalist Revolution was revived by the military regime headed by General Cemal Gürsel that came into power after the coup d'etat of May 27, 1960.

The general treatment of the subject is fairly impressive. The book is well documented. The writer's expression becomes in places apologetic and highly tinged with the fervour for Turkish nationalism. There are certain discrepancies in the terminology used in connection with Islam, particularly the words theocracy and Shari'ah. The writer describes the Ottoman Empire as a theocracy (p. 7). This is a purely Christian and Western concept of a state ruled by priesthood which does not apply to Islam. It may be a simple question of
semantics, but usually such an uncautious application of Western terminology to Islamic concepts and institutions always results in fallacies and confusion.

The author's use of the word \textit{Shari'ah} is quite surprising when he says: "The rules of the establishment of the Ottoman State, its programme as to who will wield sovereignty and in what manner, the rules regarding the individual and the State, all of these were desired to be clarified with Islamic principles. All these principles were given the name of \textit{Shari'ah}" (p. 8). A great misunderstanding is caused by the author's last sentence in this quotation. The fact is that these principles were derived from the \textit{Shari'ah} which is a general name given to the vast body of Islamic law and its principles covering the entire field of human conduct from ethics to principles of State policy. The rules of the \textit{Shari'ah} are applicable to a Muslim from his birth until his death. When the author describes the principles of the Ottoman State policy as \textit{Shari'ah}, he has perhaps unconsciously created a new and restricted definition of the word. Another interesting comment on the \textit{Shari'ah} occurs on page 10: "The \textit{Shari'ah} was insufficient from the standpoint of the Constitutional institutions, state organisation and government." In his footnote the author says that this view has been generally accepted. He quotes Omer Lutfi Barkan's article on the \textit{Shari'i} aspects of the Ottoman State published in the Journal of the Faculty of Law, University of Istanbul, and Enver Ziya Karal's \textit{Ottoman History} as his sources. But this quotation in itself does not provide any support to the authenticity of the statement made by the author. It could be a convincing point if he would have explained as to how and why the \textit{Shari'ah} was insufficient to meet the requirements of the Ottoman State which was founded on the principles of the \textit{Shari'ah}.

Discussing the Islamic educational system in the Ottoman Empire, the author quotes unsubstantiated views again, this time from Na'ima's \textit{Ottoman History}: "But this educational system became submerged into a staunch dogmatism. This system aimed at preparing people for the hereafter and not for life. The \textit{Madrasa} prepares human beings for the Hereafter, because Islam gives preference to \textit{din} over the world" (p. 13). No argument is given here to prove the assertion that the Islamic educational system was not meant for this world, and that Islam gives preference to \textit{din} over the world. Perhaps the author has used this extract with an uncritical approach because it fits his treatment of the subject very well.

A similar opinion is expressed by the author on the ulema whom he holds responsible for the decline of the Ottoman Empire (p. 17). This is a very bold assertion, but it is not supported by any argument or reasons outlining the factors that led to the decline of the Empire. He simply points out that the organisation of the ulema had become defective. How and why such a phenomenon came about? No answer is given to this question. The author seems to have avoided any discussion of the causes of the decline of the Empire probably because the subject is unexplored up to this time. The corruption rampant in the Imperial Household, the intrigues of the European wives of the Sultans from the 17th Century onward and the gradual deterioration of the Sultan's authority are important topics connected with the decline of the Empire. Instead of discussing these factors, the author has just blamed the ulema without any convincing arguments.
The author makes self-contradictory statements when he asserts that the ulema had become "the guardians of the absolute authority of the Padishah" (p. 15) and when he mentions in another place that the "Ulema had in this respect appreciated and actually directed many a rebellion" (p. 15). It appears as if the responsibility for all the evils of the Empire rests with the ulema. It is hard to reconcile the contradictory statements that the ulema were the source of strength in so far as the authority of the Sultan was concerned, and that it were they who played the leading role in organising revolts against the monarch.

The author's uncritical praise for the West is all the more surprising. Referring to the reforms of Sultan Selim III, he remarks: "A special characteristic of this movement lies in the acceptance of the superiority of the West over the Ottoman Empire in every way" (p. 22). Although this view is repeated throughout the book, there is no argument to substantiate it. The controversy on the idea of the complete Westernisation of Turkey is deep-rooted in the cross-currents of Turkish politics today. The Westernists who are in fact a microscopic but highly influential minority have no ideology except the idea that the Turks should become "Western" in the fullest sense of the word. The Nationalists who represent an overwhelming majority believe that the basis for Turkish Nationalism is Islam. They maintain that Islam and nationalism are not inconsistent or mutually contradictory. The victory of the Turkish Nationalists at the General Elections held in Turkey in October, 1961 is only an indication of the popularity that they are enjoying at present. It is also a barometer that points out the strength of Turkish Nationalism in Turkey's politics at present, and the great promise that it holds for the future.

Prof. Ali Fuad Bashgil is one of the most eminent and ardent supporters of Turkish Nationalism among the Turkish intellectuals. He has written a great deal on the problem of Westernisation in Turkey. He has pointed out clearly that secularism has divided the Turkish intellectuals into "Nationalists and Westernists" (p. 196). Prof. Bashgil has severely criticised the abuse of secularism in Turkey as a weapon against religion. He says: "Rights of religious education and training, authorship and preaching, emanating from the principle of religious freedom do not exist in Turkey today." (p. 148). The author does not comment on this statement. He has simply summarised his views under the caption "Views on the insufficiency of secularism."

A quotation from a speech of Atatürk, supporting the author's attitude towards Westernisation, is particularly noteworthy. The author has quoted from Atatürk's inaugural address to the Grand National Assembly of Turkey on the occasion of the fourth annual session of the second election period: "We are after all Western. With our old civilization that dominates the old world, we shall follow the ways of the civilization of the present century, not only in a praiseworthy manner but also having broken all the chains, we shall try to achieve a higher standard than that of this civilization... We shall throw away all nonsensical beliefs" (p. 111). A correct translation of this extract is practically impossible, and this is, therefore, only an approximate rendering. It would be better to paraphrase it. What Atatürk meant to say shows the complexities of the mind of a charismatic personality. The ideas compressed into these sentences probably mean to point out that the Turks would march
ahead along with their old civilization that dominates the old world, but they would follow the way of the Western civilization in a praiseworthy manner, having broken all their links with the past. After these accomplishments the Turks would outsmart the Western civilization by achieving a higher level than that of the West. Finally, the Turks would throw away all the nonsensical beliefs that have hitherto kept them chained to their traditions.

However admirable this view of Atatürk may be, it can be nothing more than a political slogan that he used to inspire his people for achieving the highest level of progress. It can never be accepted as a fact or an opinion that is unanimously accepted in Turkey today.

The book is quite useful and provides a basis for further study of the subject.

Karachi
MUHAMMAD RASHID FEROZE


This book is one of the Asia-African Series, planned by the publishers, under the general editorship of Bernard Lewis and intended to cover comprehensively and systematically both the old and emergent new states of the continents of Asia and Africa. Other books in the series will deal with Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Pakistan and Muslim India, Persia, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, India, Ghana, Japan, Syria, Somaliland, Vietnam and Georgia. The book deals with the establishment of the Funj State in the early sixteenth century till the present-day Sudan, the one known as the Egyptian Sudan till recently. In describing the British phase of the Sudanese history, the rise and fall of the Mahdiya, the Condominium and the Republic the author has drawn upon inter alia the Arabic archives seized at the time of Kitchener’s reconquest of the country and which had remained untouched for over half a century. The origins, growth and subsequent eclipse of the movement started by Muhammad Ahmad ibn ‘Abd Allah, who believed that he was the Imam sent to establish the Faith and the Custom of the Prophet and that he was the Expected Mahdi, the divine leader chosen by God at the End of the World to fill the Earth with justice and fair-play have been dealt with in a fairly objective and balanced manner. The atrocities committed by the British on the ill-armed and poorly clad troops of the Mahdi and his Khalifah ‘Abd Allahi have also been largely dealt with but in a style and manner that gives the impression that the British did so only when driven to the wall.

The last chapter of the book deals comprehensively with the principal elements that entered into forging the Sudan culture during the last century and a half. Many of the statements contained in the book are, however, merely descriptive and no attempt at an analytical appraisal of the events seems to have been made; the reason, in all probability, being popular rather than the scholarly character of the book.

Karachi
A. S. BAZMEE ANSARL