

Native Administration into its full-fledged form. On a series of legislations that helped give the system its final shape – legislations such as the Village Courts Ordinance 1925 and Powers of Shiekh's Ordinance were amended. But, without any doubt, the most important legislation was the Native Courts Ordinance 1932 which prevailed as the basic Law of Native Administration throughout the rest of the colonial period. It created a hierarchy of Native Courts vested with far reaching administrative and judicial powers to hear and settle Civil and Criminal Cases. This law can be truly seen as the apex of earlier legislations and a genuine manifestation of the Principles of Indirect Rule outlined by Lugard. It is useful to point out that the The Local Government Ordinance in Rural Areas 1937 laid the groundwork for Local government proper, and for the first time. Local government gradually gained momentum at the expense of native administration ever since.

In sum, this book will prove to be a very important and reliable source of information in areas as diverse as Sudanese politics, public policy, public administration and history. It serves well the authors' envisaged goal of documenting the administrative policies of the Colonial Administration and probably the most informative source thus far compiled.

Occidentalism: The West in the Eyes of Its Enemies. By Ian Buruma, Avishai Margalit. Publisher: The Penguin Press, 2004, pp.165. ISBN: 159-420-008-4.

Reviewer: Ataullah Bogdan Kopanski, Department of History and Civilization, Intenational Islamic Univrsity Malaysia

The thin book with an eye-catching anti-capitalist Nazi agitprop poster is written in a fluent politically correct Newspeak. It is a Voltarian kind of philosophical spoof of the late Edward Said's monumental *Orientalism* (1980). Two champions of the postmodern liberalism, influenced by the Golden Age of the Americanized Occident, took revenge for the Palestinian author's meticulous deconstruction of

the overt Judeo-Christian and the covert Zionist “Islamic studies.” But their shallow survey of ideas antagonistic to the “western universal values” preached by the crusading missionaries of “Democracy and Liberty” failed miserably to eclipse Said’s devastating exposition of the real political intentions and deficiency of scholarship of the Orientalists. Edward Said never confused the glorious traditions of the anti-imperialist, anti-colonial and populist Occident with the western crimes against the non-European majority of mankind. And he never condoned atrocities of the oriental despotic vassals of the Western Powers. This is exactly what Ian Buruma, Dutch-origin Asia columnist of the *New York Review*, and Avishai Margalit, a Shulman Professor of Political Philosophy at the Hebrew University in West Jerusalem did. For sure, Buruma’s anti-Muslim bias in his reports on the Southeast Asia cajoles the arch-American Mind of the neocons but it totally smudges his infirm reputation as the “expert” on Asian totalitarianism. Margalit represents the old leftish yeshiva of Israeli semi-liberalism ignored by Sharon and his party but favoured by American moderate philo-Zionist philanthropists.

Occidentalism leans heavily on the works of Sir Isaiah Berlin, Jewish-origin Russian political philosopher born in Latvia. Berlin, who was knighted in 1957 by Queen Elizabeth II and made a member of the Order of Merit in 1971, divided thinkers and writers into two classes: the Hedgehogs, who like Aristotle or Shakespeare “know many things,” and the Foxes, who like Plato or Dante, “know one big thing.” Margalit wrote about him a thick panegyric. Following Berlin, Margalit also divides the thinkers and writers into two types: those who are with US, and those who are against US. In this one small book, he and his coauthor filled the colossal intellectual abyss between Sir Isaiah Berlin and George Bush Jr.

Occidentalism: The West in the Eyes of Its Enemies is a larger version of Buruma’s and Margalit’s article published in *The New York Review of Books*, (Vol. XLIX, No.1, January 17, 2002) in which the authors investigated the latest anti-imperialist Islamic manifestos against democracy and liberty of the once again crusading Anglo-American Occident. Ian Buruma and Avishai Margalit also desperately respond to two post-9/11’s Occidentalists bestsellers: Gore Vidal’s *Perpetual War For Perpetual Peace. How We Got To Be So Hated* (New York: Thunder’s Mouth Press, 2002), Ziauddin

Sardar and Merryl Wyn Davis' *Why Do People Hate America?* (Oxford-Cambridge: Icon Books, 2002), and the post-Oklahoma City revised adaptation of Gerry Spence's *From Freedom to Slavery. The Rebirth of Tyranny in America* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 1995). All four Occidentalists are not revisionists but they deeply disturbed the supranational cabal of Occidentophiles from New York and Tel Aviv. Before a vitriolic attack against "Islamic terror and extremism," the authors examined the European Romantics and the Russian Slavophiles' hatred of the commercial cities. Citing the Biblical and Qur'ānic condemnation of the hubris of the ancient Babylon and Tower of Babel, they ponder the nefarious anti-urban cultural revolution of Maoists and Khmer Rouge. They criticise the "totalitarian architecture of North Korea and Kuala Lumpur" but they exonerate by *argumentum silentium* the totalitarian urban behemoths and replicas of American downtown in Singapore, Tel-Aviv or Dubai.

The authors acknowledge the long existence of Islamic urbanism but immediately evaluate the "tension" between the "corrupt" Islamic big cities and the more "authentic" Muslim nomadism, not in Ibn Khaldunian terms but in the categorization of Richard Hofstadter's "theory of change," jettisoned thirty-years ago by historians as a very poor explanation of social conflict between the urban and rural populations. For obvious reason, the history of slums in New York, Boston, Chicago and London is not an object of Buruma-Margalit's speculations. The authors guide their readers to the conclusion that the contemporary Islamic Revival (*al-ṣahwah al-islāmiyyah*) is "an inauthentic" and "fascist" cultural pseudomorphosis which decelerates the alleged process of transmutation of still "Old Ummah" into the New Westernized Orient, a pivotal particle of New World Order. They try to convince ahistorical readers that Occidentalism, a suspected product of European Romanticism, Russian Slavophiles and the western anti-modernist sages (Oswald Spengler, Peter Sorokin, Lewis Mumford) is essentially an obsolete cult of heroism shunned by the "open-minded and progressive" yuppies of the Old West and New East, but adopted by the "alienated Muslim extremists." Claiming that the German Nazis invented the militant Islamic Occidentalism, like the authors do, is a journalist chimera of Daniel Pipes, Stephen Emerson, Michael Ladeen and Judy Miller, the four most vicious New Zionist Islamographers and architects of

newest anti-Muslim/Arab safari in the US tabloids owned by the paleo-Zionist news-making gazette-barons. The book is a significant contribution of neo-Zions to Salem-styled trial of Muslims, marked by them for pre-emptive attacks.

The book will surely be read by all militant crusaders and their post Islamic collaborators, ex-new leftists and secularist moderates. It is, however, worthless as a supplementary reading for students of history and political science in the Muslim world.