

para. 2 is a *non-sequitur*. Spelling mistakes are rare, except in German vocabulary, as on p. 139 (4 times Griesbach, not Greisbach), p. 142 (Religionsgestchichtliche Schule) and p. 209 (Ibn Ḥazm's title under "Wiedermann" is unrecognizable).

Ghulam Haider Aasi, Associate Professor of Islamic Studies at the American Islamic College in Chicago, of Pakistani origin, has made the mistake of offering for publication what had been drafted as his Ph.D. thesis at Temple University. This, at any rate, seems to explain a lot of material in the book that is not immediately relevant for its subject, including an enormous 14 page bibliography, and the unnecessary use of foreign vocabulary, like *weltanschauung* (for which the adequate translation "world-view" exists).

I am certainly not alone in hoping that Dr. Ansari will soon continue his new series on comparative religion with Ibn Taymiyyah, yes, even before that by a complete edition in English of Ibn Ḥazm's *Kitāb al-Faṣl*.

Modern Islamic Political Thought by Ḥamīd Enāyat. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Islamic Book Trust, 2001, 307. pp. ISBN 983-9154-15-X.

Reviewer: Dr. Wahabuddin Ra'ees, Department of Political Science, IIUM.

After the collapse of *al-khilāfah al-ʿUthmāniyyah*, some Western intellectuals believed that Islam had become socially and politically irrelevant and that Islam and modernism are antithetical. Hamid Enayat challenges this perception and shows the relevance of Islam to the contemporary world by investigating the intellectual legacy of the sunnī and shīʿī schools of thoughts in Islam. Enayat explores two essential elements in the writings of modern Muslim thinkers: (1) "the concept of the Islamic State from the time it was revived after the abolition of the" *khilāfah ʿUthmaniyyah* and (2) "the Muslim response to the challenge of alien ideologies of nationalism, democracy and socialism" (p. xvi).

Enayat, first, argues that sunnī-shīʿī dispute has come of age, moving "from confrontation to cross-sectarian fertilization" (p. xiv)

made possible by shī'ī intellectuals' aggressive practice of *ijtihad* (independent judgment). This has given rise to, in Enayat's words, 'shī'ī Modernism'. Sunnī-shī'ī dispute is not about the fundamentals of religion like the nature of Allah or His messenger. It was over matters that were "decidedly marginal" (p. 43) concerning personalities, and certain concepts. Attempts to overcome these disputes failed because of the absence of a dialogue. This dialogue was revived with the emergence of the first generation of Islamic modernists who explained Islam using contemporary language. The movement led by Jamāluddīn al-Afghānī and Muḥammad 'Abduh spoke of Muslim unity against colonial powers, human rights and liberation or freedom of Muslim lands. This helped to remove many barriers that existed between the two schools.

Enayat commences with a critical investigation of the relevance of traditional intellectual Muslim political heritage. He argues that politics and religion are closely linked both in traditional as well as modern Muslim political thinking. In the first four decades of Islamic political history, sunnism, shi'ism and the khawārij movement were three principle political trends influencing Muslim political thinking. But the traditional political legacy was bent upon "justifying the tyranny in the name of religion" (p. 16). The writings of modern Muslim political thinkers, however, are based upon the premise that Muslim societies can not be run on dictatorial principles of governance, a point not understood by the Western critics of Islam. However, unlike shi'ism, sunnism showed much more adaptability to changing circumstances.

Islamic modernists, benefiting from the prevailing Western currents of thoughts, began to reassess traditional Muslim political legacy in the light of Western intellectual legacy. They essentially saw no contradiction between original Islamic patterns of political thought and most of the operational concepts and doctrines in Western political thinking. For example, democracy operationally was not anti-Islamic. Enayat cites Aḥmad Amīn, a renowned Egyptian historian, who objected to shī'ī theory of Imamate because it violated the modern conception of democracy.

Enayat in discussing the approaches adopted by the Islamic modernists in reconstructing Muslim thought does not distinguish between operational and philosophical foundation of Western intellectual legacy. Borrowing of concepts, institutions and doctrines

from the West without looking into their philosophical foundations could prove very problematic.

In the chapter on the 'Crisis over the Caliphate,' Enayat points out two new types of challenges to the Muslim political thought: (1) Arab nationalism and (2) secularism. Secularists, both indigenous forces within and some non-Turk subjects of the Turkish Ottoman Caliphate, advocated Westernization of Muslim thought. They argued that the caliphate should be abolished as it had no political and religious significance. The Arab nationalists also believed that temporal authority is the sole prerogative of the Arabs. These ideas are a clear departure from traditional Muslim legal thought. The sunnis and shi'is did not reject the highest political institution in Islam. They only disputed over its forms. The secularists and nationalists, however, refused to see any utility in it. Even more shocking, according to Enayat, to the orthodox belief was when some Islamic modernists of Iqbāl's caliber supported the abolition of Caliphate. However, a new breed of activists led by Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā undertook the task of reformulating the concept of the Islamic State at the time of the collapse of the Ottoman Caliphate in 1924. In Riḍā's understanding, all territories under the control of the Muslims should be united and controlled from one center (i.e., Mosul). Enayat, however, considers Riḍā's views on the Islamic state as unrealistic. Enayat concludes that Riḍā's exposition serves only one purpose: "the parallel existence of a religious and political state" (p. 123), which became an overriding goal of the Movement of Muslim Brothers. To Enayat, this purpose had one major negative impact: using religion for justification of political expediency.

Enayat views the Egyptian and Iranian variants of the movement of the Muslim Brothers as more revolutionary and its Pakistani variant, Jama'at-e-Islami, as less revolutionary. He rightly points out that such tendency either in Egypt, Iran or Pakistan was essentially due to the social conditions in which the founders of these movements lived in.

Enayat argues that the authoritarian tendencies under which Muslims lived and still live are due to political, social and other factors. He says while the political elites subjugated the masses, the intellectuals, sunnī and shī'ī alike, failed to develop a more systematic study of politics as an academic discipline. Traditionally, politics was discussed as part of jurisprudence and theology. Fundamental political problems were given trivial treatment. He rejects types of regimes that

deny their citizens the essential freedoms of speech, assembly and action, as they are essential instruments for actualizing political objectives of the Islamic state. An inclusion of the works and opinions of jurisconsult of Abū Ḥanīfah, Abū Yūsuf, Shāfiʿī and Ibn Khaldūn's caliber might have strengthened Enayet's argument.

Enayat concludes that there exists an intellectual vacuum which needs to be filled in. The contemporary Muslim intellectuals need to rise to this challenge. The works of Modern Muslim political thinkers provide a foundation. The many political problems call for searching minds to explore these dimensions of Muslim political life. Systematic study of politics must subject the past intellectual legacy to critical reassessment based on the practices of Rightly-Guided Caliphs and the teachings of Qur'ān and the Prophet Muḥammad. The new approach to the study of politics should discard currents of thoughts that stigmatize and romanticize the political history and consider it as part of present realities. However, Enayat does not attempt to provide a methodology or an approach that can be used as a theoretical frame of reference for reassessing traditional Muslim intellectual political legacy. He, however, identifies the political problems that need systematic investigation to show that Islam is progressive and in essence a religion of freedom, justice and prosperity for mankind.

Enayat's work is commendable for Muslim revivalists and political activists alike irrespective of doctrinal belief. It provides adequate direction for the wide spectrum of activities that needs to be undertaken for the purpose of the reconstruction of Islamic political thought. A revised edition of Enayat's *Modern Islamic Political Thought* was long over due.

Remembering Partition: Violence, Nationalism and History in India by Gyan Pandey. London: Cambridge University Press, 2001, 232 pp. ISBN 0521002508.

Reviewer: Beerendra Pandey, Asst. Professor, Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal.

Gyan Pandey's *Remembering Partition: Violence, Nationalism and History in India*, like Riu Menon's *Borders and Boundaries* (1998) and