MUṢṬAFĀ KĀMIL:

NATIONALISM AND PAN-ISLAMISM

MUṢṬAFĀ KĀMIL: NATIONALISM AND PAN-ISLAMISM

by

Nadia Fahmi

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research of McGill University in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Arts in Islamic Studies

Montreal, Quebec

1976

ABSTRACT

Author: Nadia Fahmi

Thesis title: Mustafā Kāmil: Nationalism and Pan-Islamism

Department: Institute of Islamic Studies

Degree: M.A.

This thesis defines the role played by Mustafā Kāmil in the development of the nationalist movement in Egypt. It is shown that his importance lay in having revived a spirit of patriotism among his countrymen at a time when the nationalist movement seemed to have become extinct following the British occupation of Egypt. He also promoted the idea of Pan-Islamism with the sole object of safeguarding Egypt's independence.

SOMMAIRE

Auteur: Nadia Fahmi

Titre de la thèse: Muṣṭafā Kāmil: Nationalisme et Panislamisme

Department: Institut d'Etudes Islamiques

Le degré: M.A.

Cette thèse definit le rôle de Muṣṭafā Kāmil dans le développement du nationalisme égyptien. I y est demontré que son importance consiste dans le fait d'avoir ranimé l'esprit de patriotisme defaillant des égyptiens à la suite de l'occupation britannique du pays. De même, il y est demontré que son idée de panislamisme n'avait pour but que la sauveguarde de l'indépendence de l'Egypte.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am most indebted to Prof. Charles J. Adams, Director of the Institute of Islamic Studies, for his invaluable assistance, constructive criticism and constant encouragement.

I also wish to extend my thanks to Prof. Niyazi Berkes for his helpful suggestions and stimulating seminars.

The typing of the manuscript was patiently carried out by Mrs. Adele Brownlee.

NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

The Arabic names and words are rendered according to the transliteration system used by the Library of Congress.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

For some 300 years before the French expedition arrived in Alexandria on July 2, 1798, Egypt had been undergoing one of its "longest periods of isolation and economic and cultural stagnation since its conquest by Islām...the discovery of the Cape route diverted transit trade from its territory and reduced it to a backwater province of the Ottoman Empire," deprived of all contact with the West.[1]

Napoleon's expedition shattered this isolation, ushering in a period of westernization which was to last for a century and a half. In addition to inflicting a humiliating defeat on the forces of the ruling Mamlūks, Napoleon and his 100 savants introduced new concepts, those of the French Revolution, hitherto unknown in Egypt or the Arab world. These new concepts were contained in his various edicts and proclamations. The first, drafted on July 1st, 1798 aboard his ship the Orient, is held to be the most important in introducing and transmitting a number of new ideas.[2]

Four principal new concepts were contained in this proclamation and reiterated in several other edicts.

Addressing the Egyptian people, in the name of the French Republic, "which was based upon liberty and equality," Napoleon introduced "the concept of 'Republic' to an Arab audience for the first time."[3]

The second concept, which he stressed, was the ethnic difference between the Mamlūks and the Egyptians, the rulers and the ruled. The Mamlūks were usurpers, who had come from the Caucasus and Georgia to

oppress the majority of the Egyptian people. He contested their claim to a God-given right to rule Egypt and to monopolise the positions of the state.[4] "Napoleon argued implicity that the Egyptians owed no loyalty to their rulers...or, for that matter, to any Muslim government that mistreated them in such fashion."[5]

The third concept introduced by Napoleon was the idea that all people had a right to equal opportunity, the only distinction among them being reason, virtue and knowledge. He pledged that no Egyptian would be barred, henceforth, from entering the highest position and acquiring the most elevated status and promised "that a native Egyptian government would be established to run the affairs of the country."[6]

Finally the proclamation contained "a distinct appeal to the concepts of Egyptian nationalism and of an Egyptian nation."[7]

These concepts may not have produced "an immediate effect" because they were "insufficiently understood by the masses and even by the cultural spokesmen of the time," but they were destined to be of major importance in later developments in Egypt and the Arab world.[8]

L. ʿAwaḍ considers them the basis of all political and social thought in Egypt. The Egyptian historian al-Rāfiʿī writes that Napoleon's proclamation awakened the spirit of Egyptian nationalism, for no conqueror had ever before paid homage to the grandeur and importance of Egypt, nor addressed himself to the Egyptian people with a pledge to make them masters of their own destiny.[9]

Napoleon also introduced a new system of government into Egypt when he established the Cairo and rural councils and later on the General Council. These Councils marked the first participation of the true

leaders of Egypt, the 'Ulamā', in the system of government. It gave them their first training in a domain from which they had been totally excluded under Turkish and Mamlūk rule.[10]

At no time during the 3 years of French occupation was there complete submissiveness on the part of the people of Cairo. Resentment of foreign rule was enhanced by proclamations emanating from the Porte against the infidel French. Calls for prayers from the minarets were used to enhance the antipathy against the French occupying forces.

The first major revolt which began in Cairo on October 21st, 1798 and spread to the rural areas, was triggered by the exorbitant taxes levied by the French forces on merchants, artisans, villagers and cultivators. Looting by French troops and harsh retaliatory measures against the population were additional factors.[11] The centre of resistance was al-Azhar and its leaders were the 'Ulamā', Shaykhs and notables including noted leaders such as Shaykh Muḥammad al-Sadāt and Shaykh Aḥmad al-Sharqāwī.

The revolt was ruthlessly suppressed by the French occupying forces. It, nevertheless, indicated the Egyptians' hatred for foreign rule of any kind, whether this rule was Turkish, Mamlūk or French.[12]

The leadership of the second Cairo revolt (20 March - 21 April) was mainly in the hands of the Turks and Mamlūks stationed on the outskirts of the city. Even though some Egyptian leaders such as Sayyid 'Omar Maqram, Naqīb al-Ashrāf and Sayyid Aḥmad al-Maḥrūqī, the leading merchant, were involved in the revolt they were not able to play a decisive role nor to stop the massacre of Copts instigated by the Turks and Mamlūks.[13]

This massacre led the Copts to band together and form the Coptic Legion under the Command of General Ya'qūb whose project for Egypt's independence was the first of its kind.

First Independence Project

Ya'qūb had collaborated with the French forces in their battles with the Mamlūks. He is said to have developed a close friendship with General Dessaix when the latter had set up his headquarters in Asyūṭ Upper Egypt. From the French General, the Coptic mu'allim is said to have learnt a great deal about the principles of the French Revolution.[14]

Ya'qūb sailed with the French forces on August 10, 1801 aboard the British ship, Pallas under the command of Captain Joseph Edmonds. Four days later he died from an incurable fever. During these four days, he held several conversations with Captain Edmonds, during which Ya'qūb elaborated his plan for Egypt's independence, a plan he had hoped to submit to Britain and France for endorsement and support.[15]

Ya'qūb designated himself and a group of people accompanying him as the "The Egyptian Delegation" authorised by all sects of the people to negotiate the independence of Egypt with the European Powers. Prior to his departure with the French forces, Ya'qūb is known to have held a meeting with the Coptic notables of Cairo but there is no mention in Jabartī's records of a meeting with the Shaykhs and 'Ulamā' of Cairo.[16]

Ya'qūb told Captain Edmonds that any rule in Egypt was preferable to the rule of the Turks and that he had joined the French forces prompted by his patriotism and his wish to alleviate the miseries of his countrymen. The Ottoman Empire was disintegrating, he argued, and Britain should seek to benefit from this situation. It was impossible for either England

or France to possess Egypt as a colony, yet an independent Egypt would no doubt be more influenced by Britain because Britain owned the sceptre of the seas. An independent Egypt would flourish rapidly and would become rich from her agricultural products and her exclusive trade with Central Africa.[17]

Ya'qūb's argument was evidently aimed at convincing Britain that she was in no need of colonising Egypt since she could enjoy a monoply over trade with Egypt in view of her naval power. He warned Britain, however, that France could regain her friendship with the Porte and bring pressure to bear on the Porte to close all ports to British trade, thereby, gravely affecting British trade, if not completely destroying it.[18]

The government of an independent Egypt would be just, firm and nationalist and would consequently be respected, obeyed and loved by the people. An attack by the Turks and Mamlūks could be repelled by the European Powers. At the same time Egypt would temporarily use a foreign auxiliary force of 12,000 to 15,000 men and this force would become the nucleus of an Egyptian national force.[19]

Concluding, Ya'qūb affirmed that Egyptians in general and their delegation in particular, would exert every possible effort to win their freedom from the yoke oppressing their unfortunate country.[20]

Although Ya'qūb's project may have been secretly prompted by the French after their failure in Egypt,[21] it still remains a project of great significance since its object was to achieve Egypt's independence from Turkish, French and British domination.

The idea of taking advantage of the rivalry between the Great Powers would be used by rulers and national leaders of Egypt for many decades to come.[22] Egypt's history from the French expedition until 1904 is marked by the continuous struggle among the Ottoman Empire, France and Britain to dominate Egypt. According to L. ʿAwad there were three main tendencies in Egypt throughout this period. The first held that anything was better than government by Europeans even if this meant the continuation of Turkish and Mamlūk rule. This group included the leaders of the second Cairo revolt and those who, later on, advocated the maintenance of Ottoman suzerainty over Egypt. The second felt that anything was better than government by the Turks and Mamlūks even if this meant acceptance of European rule. To this group belonged those who fought under the banner of the French forces against the Mamlūks and those who would accept the British occupation of Egypt. The third wished to save whatever could be saved and included the ʿUlamāʾ of al-Azhar and the moderate notables of the Diwāns established by Napoleon. They accepted the fait accompli and hoped for an opportunity to effect a change. In later years ʿAbduh and his followers could be said to belong to this group. These tendencies were to continue for generations and were only to merge in the 1919 nationalist revolution.[23]

Egypt's First Political Thinker

In the wake of the confusion caused by the departure of the French forces, Muḥammad ʿAlī, an Albanian officer, was able to attain power with the support of the leaders of the people, the ʿUlamāʾ. Once in power, his aim was to create a viable and strong state in Egypt built

on the pattern of Western Europe. In order to achieve his aim M. ʿAlī had to revolutionise "the whole economic and social structure of Egypt." At first he "leaned heavily on foreigners" to "manage his new enterprises, run his administration," and staff his new technical schools.[24]

In order to replace this personnel with native Egyptians he began sending missions abroad and inaugurated a translation movement which was to have a far-reaching effect in acquainting Egyptians with western thought.

The translation movement was headed by al-Shaykh Rifāʿah Rāfiʾ al-Ṭahṭāwī, Egypt's first political thinker and "the writer who first made articulate the idea of the Egyptian nation."[25]

During his 5-years' stay in Paris (1826-1831) as imām of the first substantial mission sent by M. ʿAlī, Ṭahṭāwī was deeply influenced by the thought of the French Enlightenment which he in turn conveyed to educated Egyptians by means of his books, translations, articles in the Official Gazette, and the direction of the translation movement.

Like other travellers to Europe at the time, Ṭahṭāwī noted that "the distinguishing characteristic of European governments was their constitutionalism -regardless of whether it was republican or monarchical."[26]

In his book Takhlīṣ al-Ibrīz ilā Talkhīṣ Bārīz he described at great length the French system of government so that it could serve as an example for those who wished to learn. He noted that "the French monarch is not an absolute ruler.... .and can remain king only if he acts in accordance with what is prescribed in the laws which have met with the

acceptance of the members of the various assemblies.[27] He explained how Louis XVIII had "made a covenant between himself and the French people, by their will and with their consent, and promised to follow faithfully the terms of that law. That law was the Sharṭah (La Charte)."[28]

He described with great detail the second French revolution of 1830 to which he was an eyewitness. "The French people," he said, "are divided into two factions; the one is the monarchists, the other the libertarians . . . Most of the followers of the king are clergymen and their disciples, while the libertarians include the philosophers and scientists, as well as most of the people. The first group attempts to aid the king while the other tries to weaken him and strengthen the people. Among the second group is a sizable faction which desires to place all authority in the hands of the people, dispensing entirely with the need for a king. Since all the people cannot rule and be ruled at the same time, however, it is necessary for the people to choose from amongst themselves those who will rule. This is the rule of the republic (ḥukm al-jumhurīyah) . . . From this we know that some of the French advocate an absolute monarchy, others desire a limited monarchy where the king rules according to the laws, while still others want a republic."[29]

Ṭahṭāwī then noted that no Frenchman was prohibited from expressing his opinion so long as he did not violate the laws.[30]

He gave lengthy explanations of every article of the French constitution and all the amendments introduced when Louis XVIII was dethroned and replaced by Louis Philippe. The lengthy explanations indicated that

the principles contained in the constitution were being introduced for the first time to his readers. L. ʿAwaḍ maintains that the explanations were a distinct plea that those principles and that system be adopted in Egypt.[31]

Ṭahṭāwī underlined the basic freedoms guaranteed in the French constitution. All men, whether rich or poor, were equal before the law.[32] Each man had the right "to pursue his religion under the protection of the State." "All property is sacred and cannot be infringed upon . . ." However, the law in France was "not derived from Divine Books" but was "taken from other laws." Thus, the rights claimed were "totally different from the Sharīʿah and were "known as French Rights, that is, the rights of Frenchmen vis-à-vis other Frenchmen."[33] Ṭahṭāwī recognised that "the concept of justice was the most important element in the French system," adding that "justice was the foundation of civilization."[34]

He was deeply impressed by the European emphasis on education. He noted "that European progress in political, scientific and economic affairs could not have occured without prior progress in the field of education."[35] The government, he noted, acknowledged education as "a fundamental right of all people, regardless of class."[36]

Ṭahṭāwī's comments contained "the first suggestion that Europe's technical achievements had not developed in a vacuum but were rather the by-products of an entire weltanschauung in which free inquiry and unfettered scholarship were accepted and even encouraged."[37] He repeatedly stressed "that the West far surpassed the Arab world in learning."[38]

"The aim of education," he wrote, "should be to form a personality, not simply to transmit a body of knowledge; it should inculcate the importance . . . of patriotism-ḥubb al-waṭan, the love of country, the main motive which leads men to try to build up a civilized community."[39] Throughout his books "the word waṭan and the phrase ḥubb al-waṭan occur again and again."[40] He was the first thinker in the Arab world to make a distinction between the waṭan and the ummah. In one of his books he wrote: " . . . all that is binding on a believer in regard to his fellow believers is binding also on members of the same waṭan in their mutual rights. For there is a national brotherhood between them over and above the brotherhood in religion. There is a moral obligation on those who share the same waṭan to work together to improve it and perfect its organization in all that concerns its honour and greatness and wealth."[41]

Love of waṭan, he adds, is a virtue, especially if the land of birth is the source of dignity, happiness and pride as in the case of Egypt, the most cherished of all waṭans.[42]

This waṭan is first and foremost Egyptian, not Arab. Egypt, for Ṭahṭāwī "is something distinct and also something historically continuous" from the Pharoahs to M. ʿAlī.[43] "Egypt is part of the Islamic ummah, but she has also been a separate ummah, in ancient and modern times alike, and as such is a distinct object of historical thought. Although Muslim, she is not exclusively so, for all who live in Egypt are part of the national community."[44]

Ṭahṭāwī is described by L. ʿAwaḍ as the father of modern social and political thought in Egypt, not only because he rendered constitu-

tional documents into Arabic, but also because he analysed the political and social foundations of European civilization.[45]

The notions of watan and hubb al-watan would be taken up and reiterated by several other writers and leaders including Mustafā Kāmil.

ʿAbbās I (1848-1854) and Saʿīd (1854-1863)

The reign of ʿAbbās I was a dark era for Egypt. It was marked by outright reaction against everything European and against all progress in the country.

Saʿīd was of a different calibre. He identified himself with Egypt and endeavoured to carry out reforms in the spirit of his grandfather, M. ʿAlī. His task, he told a meeting of ʾUlamāʾ, notables and army officers, was to educate the Egyptians so as to render them capable of standing on their own without the assistance of foreigners.[46] He was the first ruler to encourage the promotion of fallāh soldiers to the ranks of army officers. Ahmad ʿUrābī was a case in point.[47] However, Saʿīd encouraged the inflow of foreigners and contracted the first loan of three million pounds, inaugurating a policy that would have dire effects on the future of Egypt.

Saʿīd is also credited with having ordered the use of Arabic instead of Turkish in official correspondence.

Ismāʿīl (1863-1879)

It was Ismāʿīl who resumed, with renewed vigour, M. ʿAlī's efforts towards modernization. Once in power, his objectives were to obtain a

greater degree of independence from the Porte,[48] to build an Egyptian Empire by expanding in the Sudān, Abyssinia and Equatorial Africa and to carry out every possible reform so that Egypt would become part of Europe.

Ismāʿīl not only helped finance the Suez Canal, but also built numerous other canals and bridges, extended railway lines and telegraph cables, increased the area of cultivable land and encouraged exports. He also built an opera house,[49] a national museum and a national library. Further, he encouraged the establishment of various scientific and literary societies.

Under his rule, education was vastly expanded.[50] Dār al-ʿUlūm was inaugurated to train teachers in modern as well as traditional subjects, the first school for girls was founded, and a large number of missionary as well as communal and private schools was permitted to open.

Educational missions abroad were resumed while "the translation movement gained renewed vitality" with a new emphasis on "belles-letters, jurisprudence and social affairs."[51] The study of history and Egyptology was encouraged. Literary, scientific and political newspapers and periodicals were founded in what is described as the golden age of the official and non-official press.[52]

Ismāʿīl's reforms, bribes to the Porte, luxurious tastes and lavish spending were paid for by ruinous loans from European creditors, taxation and agrarian poverty. His "financial recklessness ended in European intervention" first in the form of control over Egypt's finances and then in the form of military occupation.[53]

"In his desire to rally popular support against the Sulṭān in Turkey and the European Powers he encouraged journalism and gave more scope to the intelligentsia, who resented his rule but violently disliked interference by the Sulṭān and the powers."[54]

Several of the newspapers and periodicals were established by Syrians who had fled from Ottoman tyranny and taken refuge in Egypt's more liberal atmosphere. "A number of gifted writers came to the poltical scene."[55] Most notable among them were Adīb Isḥāq and ʿAbdallāh al-Nadīm. Both were disciples of Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī whose eight years (1871-1879) of teaching at al-Azhar and exhortations for action to ward off the danger of European imperialism, and to curb the autocratic power of the ruler, had deeply influenced several intellectuals and future constitutionalists.[56] Al-Afghānī encouraged his students to express their opinions in writing, and "the newspaper of opinion began to play an important part in Egyptian political life," condemning European intervention and criticising the absolutist power of the Khedive.[57]

The printing press established by M. ʿAlī in Bulāq was further improved while five others were also established with Ismāʿīl's encouragement.[58] All this "stimulated the further development of Arabic into a national language shared by all." By 1869 Arabic was decreed as the official language of the country by Ismāʿīl.[59]

In 1866 Ismāʿīl established a Consultative Assembly of Delegates (Majlis Shūrat al-Nuwwāb) composed of 75 members mostly shaykhs and ʿumdahs of villages. It is often said that Ismāʿīl set up this assembly as a show-piece in imitation of civilized countries, but the

assembly soon developed into a body to be reckoned with, constituting a forum for the constitutionalists and a platform of Egyptian nationalism.

The idea of establishing such an assembly was not totally new considering Napoleon's Diwāns and M. ʿAlī's advisory council.

It is likely that Ismāʿīl set up the assembly in a bid to associate the notables of the country with his financial policies. He wished "to obtain more funds both from taxation and by the contraction of fresh European loans," and "associating representatives of the Egyptian propertied classes with his policy was a protective measure against outside objection and interference . . . ." [60]

For 10 years (1866-76) the delegates, representing the new landed aristocracy of Egypt[61] dealt exclusively with internal affairs such as taxes, property, public works and education.[62]

The following three years (1876-1879), described by Malek as a phase of liaison between the nationalist movement and constitutionalism, began with an extraordinary session in Ṭanṭā to discuss whether the Muqābalah law should be maintained or suspended.[63] A spirit of opposition was noted for the first time in the Assembly. A fuller explanation of the government's financial policy was demanded, and the right of the Assembly to investigate the government's financial policy was asserted.[64] The discussions focused more and more on economic issues and measures; and when the Khedive announced in the following session that the Muqābalah law would be maintained in conformity with the wishes of the delegates, it was an acknowledgment of the Assembly's right to participate in the direction of the affairs of government.[65]

The Consultative Assembly began to be regarded by the new élite "as a mechanism to protect its own economic gains from the caprices of the Khedive, on the one hand, and the increased and privileged European competition on the other hand."[66] In the confrontation over basically economic issues, the scales of power were increasingly tipped in favor "of the landed aristocracy who were gradually obtaining a share in the decision making power and beginning to identify with society at large."[67]

In 1879 the reply to the Khedive's opening speech in the Assembly was tantamount to a declaration of the rights of the nation. It said: "We, the representatives of the Egyptian nation and defenders of its rights and interests, which are at the same time those of the government, thank H.E. the Khedive for his goodness in assembling this chamber of delegates which is the foundation-stone of all progress and the turning-point in the achievement of our liberty without which no equality of rights is possible, equality which is the essence of justice."[68]

The phraseology reflected the influence of European political ideas, now expressed by the Assembly and not by Ṭahṭāwī alone.[69] "The chief author of this reply was ʿAbd al-Salām al-Muwailḥī," one of al-Afghānī's pupils and disciples.[70]

On another occasion, protesting a decision taken by the government without the assent of the Assembly, two of its prominent and vocal members spoke in the following terms: "Those matters affect the nation and must therefore be put to it for perusal. We consider this a pre-requisite of carrying out any legislation. As it has elected us to represent its interests and voice its feelings . . . it is the bounden

duty of the Government to submit all matters concerning the nation to us."[71]

The appointment of two European ministers in Nubār's government had aroused increasing anger on the part of the delegates; and when the Khedive, pressed by the two European ministers in Tawfīq's cabinet, decided to prorogue the Assembly, the delegates refused to disperse.

On April 2, 1879 a La'ihah waṭanīyah (National Statute) signed by 60 delegates, 60 'Ulamā', the Coptic Patriarch, the Jewish Grand Rabbi, 42 notables and merchants, 72 government officials and 93 officers was submitted to the Khedive. It contained a project for financial settlement, a demand that the organic law of the Assembly be amended in conformity with the laws governing European assemblies and the principle of ministerial responsibility before the Assembly be recognised.[72]

Ismā'īl decided to act according to the will of the delegates which conformed with his own wish to get rid of European financial control. In a letter appointing Muḥammad Sharīf as Prime Minister of an entirely Egyptian cabinet, excluding the European ministers and responsible to the Assembly, he said: "As head of state and as an Egyptian, I consider it my duty to adhere to the opinion of my country and to give complete satisfaction to her legitimate aspirations . . . The financial statement of the Minister of Finance, declaring the bankruptcy of the country has aroused national anger . . . I wish this government to be formed of genuine Egyptian elements . . ."[73]

A draft constitution submitted to the Assembly by Sharīf Pasha was never put into practice due to Ismā'īl's forced abdication on June 26, 1879.[74]

However, the constitutionalist movement went on unabated and ultimately won the support of the Egyptian army officers.

The army had been restless for some years owing to particular grievances: pays in arrears, descrimination in favour of the Circassian elements in the army, unnecessary humiliation in the Abyssinian war and reduction of the army forces.

Secret meetings of Egyptian army officers had begun at the precise moment when the constitutionalist movement was in full swing. The army's "particular grievances were intensified by the general spirit of resistance born out of the liberals' fruitless attempt to restore the Chamber of Deputies."[75]

Another secret society Misr al-Fatāt including intellectuals and writers such as Adīb Isḥāq and Nadīm was reported functioning in Alexandria in 1879.

The societies opposed "the European control over Egypt's finances and administration" and also called "for a curtailment of the ruler's powers."[76]

By the time Ismā'īl abdicated there were three overlapping movements of opposition in Egypt: the Army, the intelligentsia (notables, newspaper editors, 'ulamā' and others inspired by Ṭahṭāwī's writings and al-Afghānī's exhortations) and the members of the Assembly.[77]

"Around 1879 a number of officers formed themselves into a semi-secret party, the 'National Party' (Al-ḥizb al-waṭanī), which attracted to itself a number of civilians, and it was this group, led by Aḥmad 'Urābī Pasha, which became the core of the movement and held power in the months leading up to the occupation."[78]

In September 1881, the army's regiments of infantry, cavalry and artillery marched on the ʿAbdīn Palace to demand the convocation of the Assembly of Delegates, the ouster of the government and an increase in the armed forces.

This marked the beginning of what became known as the ʿUrābī revolt - a revolt directed against the injustices of absolutist rule and foreign intervention, and a revolt which enjoyed the support of all elements of the nation.[79]

At one point when the new Khedive Tawfīq gave way to the nationalists' pressure and promulgated a constitution on February 7, 1882, it seemed as though the country could avoid an open and bloody conflict, but the nationalist movement coincided with "the new awareness in Europe of Egypt's importance."[80] ʿUrābī was, therefore, "faced with formidable odds."[81]

"Had he been left alone," wrote Lord Cromer, "there cannot be a doubt that he would have been successful. His want of success was due to British interference."[82]

The British bombardment of Alexandria and the occupation of the whole country in September 1882 by British forces crushed the nationalist movement and restored the authority of the Khedive.

The renegades of the revolution were many. Among others they included ʿOmar Luṭfī, Adīb Isḥāq, ʿUrābī himself and Muḥammad ʿAbduh.

Thus the leaders of the nationalist movement were discredited and the country fell into a state of despair and apathy; but the nationalist

movement had in fact only suffered a temporary setback and was to revive once more under the leadership of a fiery young man by the name of Muṣṭafā Kāmil.

I. BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Muṣṭafā Kāmil was born in Cairo on August 14, 1874. His father was an army engineer, a graduate of the government schools established by Muḥammad ʿAlī. Described as a loving father who took a keen interest in the upbringing of his children, ʿAlī Effendi Muḥammad seems to have had a great influence in shaping the mind of his youngest son, Muṣṭafā. At family gatherings, after supper, he is said to have related to his 9 children tales of courage, chivalry and heroism which fired the imagination of the young boy and instilled in him an ever abiding love of history, pride in the past and an admiration for those heroes who had dedicated their lives to the service of their country.[1]

As a child, Muṣṭafā Kāmil was described as having a very inquisitive mind and a vivid imagination which led his father to predict a great future for him. Taught reading and writing and recitation of the Qurʾān by a village shaykh, he was sent at the age of seven to an elementary school founded by the Khedive's mother. Rebelling against unjust punishment by one of his teachers, he was moved to another government school where he displayed a particular interest in history.

At the age of 8 Muṣṭafā Kāmil lived through a momentous period in the history of Egypt. The year was 1882 and the date September 14 when British forces reached Cairo to begin an occupation which was to last for 72 years. Until the seventies British statesmen had been content merely to obstruct French influence in Egypt. However, British industry's need for markets, the deteriorating situation of the Ottoman

Empire, the financial crisis marking the end of Ismā'īl's rule and the development of the nationalist movement culminating in the revolt led by 'Urābī had changed the picture. The avowed object of the occupation was to restore peace and security in Egypt, to safeguard the authority of the Khedive and to protect the interests of foreign investors.[2] The occupation was declared to be temporary. Numerous pledges were made concerning evacuation. But such excuses as the Mahdī's revolt in the Sudān and the unpreparedness of Egyptians to rule themselves were given to perpetuate the occupation. For the next 24 years of Kāmil's life Egypt was to be ruled with an iron fist by Sir Evelyn Baring, later Lord Cromer.

Kāmil's father died in 1886 leaving him in the care of an elder brother. Always top of his class, he joined the Khedivial preparatory school in 1887. Loved and admired by fellow students and teachers for his industriousness, courage, intelligence, independent thinking and frankness, he sought a meeting with the minister of Education 'Alī Mubārak to protest against a decision setting a higher average for promotion to upper grades. The minister was impressed by Kāmil's arguments and invited him to become a frequent visitor in the minister's house, encouraging him to participate in the various discussions carried on by the notable guests.[3]

In his second year at the school, Muṣṭafā Kāmil founded a literary society called Jam'īyat al Salībah al-Adabīyah which, within 3 months, included 70 of his fellow students, a testimony to his popularity as a leader. He also attended and addressed weekly meetings of an organization called Jam'īyat al-I'tidāl of which little is on record.[4] Thus at this

early age Kāmil was a leader and a protester as well as an active member of several societies. These activities denoted a lively mind and a nature rebellious against injustice. Asked by ʿAlī Mubārak Pasha about his future plans, he replied that he had learnt from the stories related to him by his father and from his history lessons on the biographies of heroes and conquerors that the greatest men were those who sought the freedom of their countries from subjection and humiliation. "I shall be such a liberator who will write, make speeches and set an example to the people emphasising that freedom means dignity and life while subjection means degradation and death..."[5]

In order to become such a liberator, he chose to study law and explained his choice in these words: "I have decided to join the school of law because it is the school of eloquence and oratory and of the knowledge of the rights of individuals and nations." He also spoke of his intention of setting up a society for the revival of the _waṭan_, namely Jamʿīyat Iḥyāʾ al-Waṭan, in order to present Egypt's case to world public opinion.[6] During the first year he remained active in various societies founded by graduates of higher institutes notably from Dār al-ʿUlūm. He also met Fuʾād Salīm who invited him to his father's _salon_ which was a gathering place of Egypt's leading literary and political figures of the day.[7]

In the following year Muṣṭafā Kāmil decided to join the French school of law. He did so because he thought it to be the school of liberty since it was made in France, and because he wished to improve his French.[8] His feelings were oriented towards France from the beginning. The enemy occupying his country was Britain. France, mother of

the revolution and of the ideals of liberty and equality and a rival of British imperialism seemed logically the country most likely to assist Egypt in her bid to oust the British from her land.

On January 20, 1893 Kāmil took a leading part in a student demonstration organised by the school of law. The demonstrators attacked the building of al-Muqaṭṭam, a newspaper reknowned for its sympathies towards the British. The paper had been critical of the national rejoicing expressed by the people following the accession of ʿAbbās II to the Khedivate.[9] The year also marked the publication of Kāmil's first article in Al-Ahrām, urging the people to remain calm, to be wary of provocateurs, to remain on good terms with the Europeans residing in Egypt, and to rally round the Khedive.[10]

Muṣṭafā Kāmil must have welcomed the accession of ʿAbbās II to the Khedivate of Egypt. Unlike his father Tawfīq, the young Khedive was not ready to be subservient to British orders. Brought up at the Hapsburg Court, he wished to rule as well as reign. On his return to Egypt to succeed his father he declared that he would rather die than relinquish the least of his rights.[11] Kāmil and ʿAbbās had known one another for some time; and when the Khedive clashed with Cromer seeking to gain more authority, it seemed natural that the Khedive should lend his support to the only person actively trying to stem British authority. The fact of a common enemy formed a bond between the ruler and the young nationalist. This bond, however, would undergo many vicissitudes, and the uneasy alliance would come to an end. For the time being it gave Kāmil moral and perhaps financial support and was to make him remain silent for years on constitutional demands.[12]

On February 18, 1893 Kāmil issued a school magazine which he called al-Madrasah (the school). The monthly, for which he adopted the motto "Love of your school is love of your kinsmen and watan," was published "to serve the young generation" and not for profit or publicity.[13] Within 8 months the magazine boasted 2400 subscribers mainly from the elementary schools. However, it ceased publication a month later owing to Kāmil's ailing health. Apart from main articles which he wrote in serial form on such subjects as "Noble Attributes," "On the Organization of the Social Order," "On Methods of Learning," etc., the magazine carried many short items on various subjects such as "Effects of Smoking," "European Colonies in Africa," "The Thermometer," "British Workers' Demands," quizzes and imaginary dialogues expounding many of his views and acquainting his readers with European inventions and systems.[14] Kāmil's eyes were turned towards Europe with deep admiration for her scientific achievements and progress.

At the printing press, Kāmil met and became friends with ʿAbd-Allāh al-Nadīm, orator of the ʿUrābī revolt who was then publishing al-Ustādh. Kāmil's biographers report that from al-Nadīm he learnt details of the ʿUrābī revolt and the causes of its failure which helped to shape his own thinking and policy and led him to seek unity at all costs.[15] The influence, however, seems to be of more significance than is granted by his biographers. Many of al-Nadīm's ideas were expressed by Kāmil in later years.

Visits to Europe

Muṣṭafā Kāmil's first visit to Paris, to be followed by numerous others throughout his life, took place on June 26, 1893. He was 19

years old and had taken the trip in order to write his exams in law. He brought home with him every book he could obtain on the Egyptian question.

On his return to Egypt he wrote a play entitled "Fath al-Andalus." When it was published in December, 1894, it sold 6,000 copies. It dwelt on the ability, determination, and courage of the Arabs and the treachery of the intruders, a subject on which Muṣṭafā was to expound on several future occasions. The object of the play was to extol the qualities of the Arabs, to revive pride in Islamic conquests and to point out the dangers of the intruders "who adopt the native dress, speak the native tongue but in fact are like poison" aiming to ruin the ummah. [16]

His second visit to Paris took place in 1894 when he became acquainted with the French member of Parliament Deloncle who was supposed to introduce him to some of France's leading politicians but failed to do so.[17] From France he sent articles to Al-Ahrām and al-Mu'ayyad describing with great admiration the world exhibitions at Lyons and Envers, extolling the Western pavilions and strongly criticising Egypt's exhibits.[18]

In the same year, at the age of 20, he obtained his license in law from Toulouse. Kāmil's education was totally modern and westernised. He had at no stage of his life studied at al-Azhar or any other traditional institution.

After his graduation he launched upon the career he had charted for himself, namely to do everything possible to bring about the evacuation of the British from Egypt and to guarantee Egypt's independence.

Towards this end his activities were chanelled in two different directions: to Egypt and abroad.

In the external field he pinned his hopes on help from France, the nation which had proclaimed the rights of man, had awakened Egypt from her deep slumber, had introduced her science and art into Egypt and helped Egyptians advance along the path of progress and civilisation. Moreover, France's history attested that she had always championed the liberation of oppressed peoples.[19] His first international act, in 1895, was to present to the French National Assembly a petition asking for French help to liberate Egypt from British tyranny. The petition was accompanied by a picture of himself followed by the people of Egypt, handing a petition to the figure of France, the liberator of nations, standing beneath a triumphal arch while a British soldier and a lion stand guard over a captive maiden - Egypt - in the foreground.[20] Kāmil hoped to mobilise world public opinion including that of the British people, to bring pressure to bear on Britain to evacuate Egypt. In order to do this he found it necessary to defend Egypt against all the accusations levelled against her by her detractors. He had to convince his European audience that Egypt was a nation, that Egyptians were capable of ruling themselves, that they bore no hatred, but rather admiration for the Europeans residing in Egypt and for the Western civilisation that they represented, that Egyptians were by no means fanatical Muslims nurturing hatred for everything Christian and that Islām was no obstacle to progress.

His endeavours at home will form the subject of the following chapter.

Friendship with Juliette Adam

On one of his visits to Paris in September 1895, Kāmil sought out and was able to meet and become friends with Madame Juliette Adam, editor of La Nouvelle Revue. Her salon was frequented by scientists, men of letters, poets, writers, and politicians from all over the world. She was an ardent Republican, and her salon was a meeting place for republicans. Seeking her assistance, Kāmil summed up his feelings and aspirations in a letter saying: "I am still young but have great ambitions. I wish to awaken the young Egypt in the old one. They say my waṭan does not exist and I say it does. I feel its existence with what I sense in myself of great love for it, a love that supersedes any other love. I shall devote all my efforts for its wellbeing , redeem it with my youth and dedicate my life to it. I am 21 years old and obtained my license in law last year. I wish to write, make speeches and spread the loyalty and ardent zeal which I feel for the elevation of my waṭan. I have been told more than once that I am attempting the impossible. In truth my spirit yearns to achieve this impossible. Assist me dear madam . . ."[21]

When she agreed to meet him, Madame Adam was amazed at his youthfulness. She found that he had a precociously mature mind and had deeply pondered his future plans. She saw his objectives as both attainable and yet impossible to achieve. Even though he must rely on himself and on other young people without funds, he hoped to establish a newspaper and a school, she noted with surprise. She explains her interest in him in these words, "Owing to my great hatred for England

and love for Egypt I have been awaiting for years the emergence of a leader in the Nile valley. I believe in those exceptional men sent by God at the appropriate time to sow love in a soil that had remained barren for so long." She felt that Kāmil was such a leader. She adds that Kāmil had fathomed and understood the intrigues and ambitions of the British and had spoken of them as a seasoned politician, slowly unravelling without error, the knots that had been so cleverly interwined. "Was not assisting a young nationalist to struggle and achieve a supreme ideal one of the objectives I had set forth when I established La Nouvelle Revue," she asked herself. "So I told Muṣṭafā Kāmil to write an article on the Egyptian question and to feel free to write whatever he wished without restraint. The enthusiasm and conviction of youth did not disturb me," she added.[22]

Explaining the role she played in Kāmil's life she said: "I introduced him to prominent men concerned with the Egyptian question. I gave him the same motherly love I bestowed on Pierre Loti, Col. Marchand and Ernest Judet. I made him valuable connections in the French press and he cleverly managed to interest them in his noble cause. With great cleverness he took advantage of his position in Paris, Austria, Germany and even in England."[23] Explaining her profound friendship for the young Egyptian patriot, she wrote "Being patriotic and nationalistic renders your feelings so refined so that you actively admire the patriotism and nationalism of others. A fanatic patriot, my sentiments go to those who love their country as much as I love mine."[24] Their friendship was to last until Kāmil's death.

Muṣṭafā Kāmil's first major speech was delivered at Alexandria on March 3, 1896. Describing it, al-Mu'ayyad said "all those who heard it agreed that the orator mesmerised the audience with his eloquence, logic and moderation. It is the first speech delivered, since the British occupation, by a young Egyptian who was fully aware of his duties towards his country . . ."[25]

So far the British Agency had taken no steps to prevent Muṣṭafā Kāmil from carrying on his activities.[26] At this point, however, the authorities began to harass his brother and close friend, ʿAlī Kāmil who was serving in the army. The incident was the first indication that the British authorities were becoming aware and resentful of his activities. Still they seemed not to attach too much importance to his movement and made no attempt to molest the man himself; or, perhaps, they did not wish to make a hero of him by persecuting him, a mistake they were to commit in later years with Saʿd Zaghlūl. All they did was to attempt in November, 1896, to draft him into the army which would have quietly removed him from the scene. The plan was foiled, and Kāmil was left free to carry on his work.[27]

He continued his travels abroad which took him not only to Paris and Toulouse but also to Berlin, Vienna, Constantinople and Budapest where he sought to meet priminent politicians and obtain their moral support for Egypt's cause. His speeches and articles were widely reported in the world press. They were carried in such papers as L'Éclair, Le Journal, Le Journal des Débats, Le Gaulois, Berliner Tageblatt, Extra Tageblatt, Die Post, Frankfurt Kurier, The New York

Herald, L' Indépendence Belge, La Liberté, La Courrière and many others. Thus the Egyptian question was brought to the attention of many European and American readers through Kāmil's articles. His letters to Mr. Gladstone from whom he elicited an admission that the evacuation of Egypt was long over due, were given front page prominence by many European newspapers.[28]

Book on the Eastern Question

Kāmil's book on the Eastern Question, the first written in Arabic on the subject was published in April, 1898. The book, often described as an apologia for the Ottoman Empire, reviews relations between the European powers and the Ottomans in the 18th and 19th centuries. In the opening paragraph Kāmil gives the two then prevalent definitions of the Eastern question. Some writers and politicians have agreed, he said, that the Eastern question is the pending dispute between some European states and the Ottoman state concerning the territories under the latter's domination ; in other words, it is the question of the existence of the Ottoman state itself. Other writers from the West and the East have contended that the Eastern question is the continuing conflict between Christianity and Islâm . . . Although the second definition bears some truth, he adds, it is not quite accurate because the hostility of the countries who are questioning the existence of the Ottoman state, is not motivated by religion alone but mainly by the desire to lay hands on some of the Ottoman possessions. Many a time has religion been used as a weapon or a means whereby fundamental objectives of a different kind are attained. It is

a camouflage for various aims and ambitions.[29] The book indicated a keen perception of the problem. It was well received by the public and was translated into Turkish.

Fashodah Incident

The Fāshodah incident which took place in 1898 brought home the fact that France was not willing to launch a war against England for Egypt's sake; neither was she ready to seize the opportunity to raise the Egyptian question.[30] Kāmil turned to seek more support from the Ottomans. Our security, he wrote, lies in rallying round the banner of the Sultān and not in relying on Europe in any way. However, his hope in France was not completely shattered, for he could understand France's reluctance to wage war and would not forget the assistance given by the French to M. ʿAlī.[31]

The conclusion of the Anglo-Egyptian agreement on the Sudān in 1899 aroused Kāmil's deep resentment and intensified his campaign. He felt the Sudān to be part and parcel of Egyptian territory, and held that England should have no hand in governing it. Moreover, he argued that the Egyptian government had no right to conclude such an agreement which was a violation of the firmāns issued by the Porte to the Khedive of Egypt.[32]

The same year Kāmil devoted his energies to exhortations that new schools be opened throughout the country, wherein a spirit of patriotism would be instilled among the young generation. His efforts were crowned with success when such a school was inaugurated in 1899. Another school set up by two young men and named after him was later

handed over to him. He welcomed the move and allowed 30% of its students to enroll free of charge.[33]

Titles granted by the Sultān

In June 1899 Kāmil was granted the title of Bey by the Sultān. Two months later other medals were bestowed on him. In 1904 he was granted the title of Pasha by the Sultān. Titles and medals, however, brought no joy or pride to Kāmil's heart. In a letter to his brother ʿAlī, he said he felt they would adversely affect his endeavours, for they would give the impression that he was seeking personal glory. His enemies, he added, would hold them against him, and this saddened him. He expressed surprise that the Sultān should confer on him two orders within 2 months, an unprecedented procedure. He concluded that the Sultān wished to reward the enemies of the British occupation.[34] It did not occur to him that the Sultān may have also been rewarding him for his promotion of loyalty to the Khalīfah, a policy very much in tune with ʿAbdul Ḥamīd's attempts to promote Pan-Islamism.

Al-Liwāʾ

When al-Muʾayyad refused Kāmil space for publication of his articles, he felt the time was ripe for the founding of a mouthpiece for his ideas.[35] Thus the first issue of al-Liwāʾ (The Standard) was published on January 2, 1900. The name was symbolic. It was to be a true banner for loyal patriots and a standard for those seeking the progress of Egypt and the Egyptians, as well as a flag in the service of Islām and the Muslims. He wrote in his first editorial: "Since Egypt will

only be awakened when her sons rally round the banner of the watan and become unanimous in serving this banner and seeking its triumph, we decided to name our paper al-Liwā', hoping it would unite the Egyptians so they may fulfill their sacred duty towards the watan . . . It plans to be moderate, to seek unity and agreement between Egyptians on the one hand and between all Muslims on the other, to seek the national education of Egyptians, to promote trade and industry and to honour every person performing useful deeds for the country . . ."[36]

Muhammad ʿAlī's Centenary

As part of Kāmil's attempt to revive pride in Egypt's history he suggested holding a celebration to mark the centenary of Muhammad ʿAlī in 1902. Memories of past glories, he reasoned, may serve as incentives for new triumphs. At a meeting attended by 3,000 people from all over Egypt, he enumerated the achievements of Muhammad ʿAlī and called for the establishment of a representative assembly[37] - a call he had begun advocating in 1900.

Entente Cordiale

In 1904 the Entente Cordiale was concluded between England and France. It was considered an enormous blow to the nationalist movement. Designed to offset increasing German power, the clause concerning Egypt indicated that England had no intention whatsoever of changing the

status quo and would, moreover, be given a free hand in Egypt in return for a similar privilege for France in Morocco.[38] To many Egyptians it looked as though there was nothing more to be done now that France had accepted the occupation of Egypt. Thus the agreement brought further despair to many prominent men who as a result, became more subservient to the occupation. In a letter to Madame Adam, Kāmil expressed his utter desolation, adding that he would still carry on the struggle until his death. The Fashodah incident had already awakened him to the attitude of the French rulers, and this recent agreement was but a further confirmation of France's attitude at the time. The event served to bring maturity to Kāmil's thinking, for he realised that if Egypt were to achieve independence, it would certainly not be with the help of Europe. He admitted that all his efforts in this domain had been fruitless.[39] Nevertheless he told an audience of 4,000 that he would remain, as ever, a loyal servant of the watan, and once again he appealed to them to unite their ranks.[40]

The Rising Sun

Hope was strongly revived with the victory of Japan over Russia. The fact that an Eastern country had been able to defeat one of the world powers fired Kāmil's imagination and led him to write a book entitled Al-Shams al-Mushriqah reviewing Japan's fantastic achievements and phenomenal progress which he found to be due to the unity of the Japanese, their patriotism, and their self-confidence.

In 1905 Kāmil issued a magazine called Al-ʿĀlam al-Islāmī (The Islamic World). It carried news and articles of interest to the Islamic

countries and translations of articles published in European papers and magazines on the Islamic world.[41] Not much else is known about this magazine. Nothing is mentioned about its life span or influence.

The following year he published a collection of his speeches at home and abroad under the heading Egyptiens et Anglais. The book, prefaced by Madame Adam and printed in Paris, was distributed in all parts of the world to acquaint people everywhere with the progress of the nationalist movement.

Association of Students

As an outcome of Kāmil's campaign 200 graduates from the schools of Law, Medicine, Engineering, Languages and Madrasat al-Muta'allimīn decided to form an association of students and graduates of higher institutes. One of Kāmil's closest friends was elected president of the association. Al-Rāfi'ī reports that lectures in the various fields of science and the arts were given to the members. The association, he adds, generated a new intellectual movement among the graduates of higher institutes. It produced through the years several projects of great benefit to the resurgence of the nationalist movement. From the association ideas developed for the formation of a society for the welfare of children and the foundation of agricultural cooperatives. On its premises were held the first meetings of the constituent committee of the Egyptian University as well as the popular schools for the education of the masses, both projects advocated by Kāmil. By 1909 members of the association had more than tripled but it was ordered disbanded by the British authorities at the beginning of World War I.[42]

Student Demonstration

A huge demonstration was organized by the students of the School of Law in February, 1906, in protest against the British policy of education in general and new regulations in particular. The students had deep seated grievances against the policy formulated by the notorious British advisor, Mr. Dunlop. Commenting on this policy M. Edward Lambert, ex-principal of the School of Law and a renowned French jurist, said that as a result of Dunlop's policy of vile persecution and regimentation, a feeling of hatred towards the British administration had developed among a group of highly educated young men. The school of law, he added, had become a bastion of the nationalist movement so that of 400 students there were hardly 10 who did not believe wholeheartedly in the principles of Muṣṭafā Kāmil.[43] The demonstration marked the beginning of student participation in politics and of the significant role they were to play in Egyptian politics until 1952 and once again after the 6-day war with Israel in 1967.

Dinshwāy

Kāmil's movement was to gain further momentum the same year following the Dinshwāy incident.[44] The summary trial, the brutal sentences passed by the Special Tribunal set up for this purpose, and the monstrous way in which the sentences were carried out greatly antagonised the masses of the people and finally destroyed the British claim that the peasants - al- jalabīyah al- zarkā' - were happy under British tutelage. The event with its tremendous impact on the people marked the beginning of a new phase in the nationalist struggle against the

occupation. The movement so far had been called an effendiat movement comprising only middle class intellectuals, professionals and students; but now it could enlist the support of the peasants who had become aware of the humiliation of being under foreign occupation and had realized for the first time how ruthless the occupying authorities could be. Thus in 1919 when the Egyptian people rose in revolt against the occupation the peasants played a prominent part in the uprising.

Kāmil was in Europe at the time of the incident. He immediately took up his pen to arouse world public opinion against the occupation. Writing in Le Figaro, under the heading "To the British people and the civilised world" he said that such resentment and anger as was felt by the people could not have been fostered by the enemies of England within 50 years, and yet they had been created by the British themselves. He called on all humanitarians to protest against the monstrous deed which tarnished European civilisation in the eyes of the entire world.[45]

Although Cromer, too, was not in Egypt at the time of the Dinshwāy incident, his position in Egypt was becoming more untenable day by day. Both the method of the trial and the verdict were criticised and condemned by various speakers in the House of Commons. A year later Cromer's rule in Egypt came to an end, and he was replaced by Sir Eldon Gorst. Lord Cromer's resignation was scored as a great victory for the nationalist movement.

The Standard and L'Etendard

In March 1907 Kāmil began publishing a morning newspaper in English, The Egyptian Standard and an evening one in French L'Etendard

Egyptien for which he selected experienced writers from Europe. In a speech to mark the occasion he said: "Our aim is to acquaint the civilised world and all those who are interested in Egypt's affairs, with our nationalist plan which has been distorted by our enemies. We have been mostly represented as enemies of Europe whose aim is to unite all Muslims against Europe thereby causing a general upheaval. Our enemies have depicted us as apostles of hatred and religious fanaticism. Today we have come to deny categorically all those despicable accusations and to prove to the world that our sole demand is that Egypt obtain a position in the world worthy of her history, her past and her prestige. All our efforts are channelled towards this end."[46]

Al-Hizb al-Waṭanī

For a long time Kāmil had had doubts about the benefit of organising his followers into a political party on the lines of European political parties. He had seen in the formation of numerous parties "a national warfare that cannot be avoided and such a war would impede, even for a time, the attainment of independence and freedom and would strengthen the position of the occupation."[47] He had toyed with the idea, however, since 1900. The turn of events finally led him to organise his followers since 1894 who had been loosely called the nationalist party into al-Hizb al-Waṭanī.[48] He explained his decision in this way: "the emergence of the Ummah party formed of supporters of the occupation in accordance with what they term a policy of leniency and gradualism, is known to us and what I learnt of the intention of the owner of al-Mu'ayyad to form a party called Hizb al-Iṣlāh to serve the palace policy

- these two factors impel us, against our will, to show our nationalist party in its true light. Thus the whole world will know that Egypt has a party which determinedly demands evacuation and a constitution and that it neither accepts the rule of a foreigner or that of a despotic ruler, that it seeks the independence of Egypt and the freedom of the Egyptian people...."[49]

At a meeting held in Alexandria and attended by some 7,000 people he announced his decision and urged them to join his party, which was also to become known as the Party of Evacuation. A general assembly held on December 27, 1907, was attended by 1019 people representing notables and farmers, lawyers and engineers, employers and workers.[50] The party's programme demanded the autonomy of Egypt as stipulated in the London agreement of 1840. Relations between Egypt and the Porte were to be strengthened. A constitution was demanded so that the executive would be responsible to parliament. International and financial agreements were to be honoured and financial control such as the Dual Control accepted so long as Egypt remained in debt. Education was to be expanded so that the poorer classes could reap some of the benefits. Industry and commerce were to be developed. A sentiment of nationalism was to be promoted among Egyptians, a spirit of unity was to be fostered between its two elements and esteem for foreigners encouraged.[51] "The programme was mainly political and constitutional, showing a lively concern for education, but with little attention to economic matters and practically no mention of social problems."[52]

The party, however, was well organised and closely knit. Its members were "relentless in their fight against the occupation. They formed the hard core of that section of the population which stood to gain nothing from peace with the present government of the country."[53]

Four months after its foundation the nationalist party lost its dynamic leader who died on February 10, 1908 at the age of 34 from tuberculosis. He had been suffering from the disease for years but would not allow himself time for rest. Regardless of sickness he worked with unrelenting zeal for the achievement of his objectives.

Symbol of Egypt's hopes and aspirations, he was deeply lamented by friend and foe.[54] His funeral was attended by young and old. "Twice only have I felt the heart of Egypt throbbing: at Dinshwāy and Muṣṭafā Kāmil's funeral," wrote Qāsim Amīn.

Attended by some 250,000 people, the funeral was a manifestation of the growing nationalist spirit which Muṣṭafā Kāmil had worked so hard to generate and promote.

II. NATIONALISM

Muṣṭafā Kāmil was only eight years old when the British occupied Egypt, he could not really remember what Egypt had been like before their arrival.[1] Even though Cromer had improved the finances of the country, developed the irrigation system and claimed to have abolished the corvée and the courbāj,[2] Kāmil, unlike men of an older generation, would not concede that Egypt under the British was in any way better than Ismāʿīl's Egypt. Unlike other educated men of his time he had no feeling of weakness or helplessness vis-à-vis the Great Powers; neither had he been discredited for having taken part in the ʿUrābī revolt. Thus, he emerged an untarnished, youthful and dynamic leader of a new phase of nationalism pitted against the British occupation of Egypt. He came forward to fill a vacuum created after the exile of the leaders of the ʿUrābī revolt and the submission of several others. For him, the occupation was the main obstacle to every reform or progress in Egypt. Thus England was the unquestioned enemy, and he set out with all his youthful ardour to work towards the emancipation of his country from the grip that was holding it back.

In this connection he stood at the opposite pole from Muḥammad ʿAbduh and his followers.

ʿAbduh had played an important role in the events leading to the ʿUrābī revolt. Although he had disapproved of the methods of the military, al-Afghānī's influence and the worsening situation of Egypt in the last years of Ismāʿīl's rule had drawn him into opposition to the autocracy of

the Khedive and to foreign intervention. As one of the editors and later on as editor-in-chief of the Official Gazette, al-Waqāʾiʿ al-Miṣrīyah he had written "a series of articles on the social and political order, and in particular on national education."[3] He had also helped draw up a programme for the nationalist party. Sentenced to exile for 3 years and 3 months, he had joined al-Afghānī in Paris where they had formed the society of al-ʿUrwah al-Wuthqā and had published 18 issues of a periodical of the same name. Examining the causes of the decline of the Muslim countries and their fall under European domination, the periodical had urged Muslims throughout the world to forget their differences and to unite their ranks in the face of the common enemy. Al-ʿUrwah al-Wuthqā "stirred Muslim consciousness as perhaps no other paper had done before or since."[4] After it expired, ʿAbduh had gone to Beirut and then returned to Cairo where he had been appointed judge in the Courts of First Instance and later on (1899) Muftī of Egypt and member of the 30-member advisory Legislative Council established in 1883.

"The most important of all Muḥammad ʿAbduh's activities, in his own view were directed towards achieving a reformulation of the Islamic faith which would be in harmony both with the beliefs of the early Muslims and with the teachings of modern thought . . . In his earnest search for this sythesis, he was led to take up positions which aroused much hostility."[5] The opposition came from two sources: the conservative school of al-Azhar and the nationalists of the party of Muṣṭafā Kāmil.

The latter opposed him mainly for political reasons. On the importance of education, the necessity of uniting the ranks of the people

and the futility of violent upheavels, the great Islamic reformer and the nationalist leader could not have found cause for dissent. It was their attitude towards the British occupation that formed the main bone of contention.

ʿAbduh's past experience, gradualist attitude and pragmatic nature had led him to believe that there could be no short cut to independence. He and his followers had decided, since the British could not be driven out of Egypt, that they must try to profit from the British presence and carry out the necessary reforms in partnership with them.

Kāmil was intransigent on this point. For him, there would be no compromise and no cooperation in any way whatsoever until evacuation was effected and Egypt's independence secured.

"In the years before 1914 his followers and those of ʿAbduh divided between them the minds and allegiance of educated Egyptians."[6]

To achieve his objectives Kāmil felt his task at home was to dispel the prevailing feeling of despair, to generate and develop a spirit of patriotism, to foster the unity of all elements of the nation, to provide education for the masses of the people, to teach them their rights and duties and later in his life to seek the sovereignty of the people.

Dispelling the Feeling of Despair

A lively description given by Aḥmad Amīn portrays the feeling of the masses of the people after the occupation. They were resigned to their fate, he writes. The occupation was the Will of God- an indication of his anger because Egyptians had oppressed other Egyptians. This

calamity would never come to an end unless they were to follow the right path and obey God's commands. And since this was the Will of God neither the ruler's conduct nor the wisdom of British policy were to be questioned or criticised.[7]

On the other hand the self-confidence of the educated class was also shattered. Some withdrew from public life while others cooperated with the British.

This state of apathy persisted for some ten years following the occupation until Kāmil emerged on the scene to attempt to dispel this mood, instil new hope and awaken dormant spirits.[8]

He described despair as death itself, and loss of hope in Egypt's future as sheer folly. Both were great crimes against the watan and the people. Despair must be overcome because Egypt has always been the graveyard of oppressors such as the Romans, the Greeks and all the tyrants who have governed Egypt with an iron fist. The Prophet had said that Egypt is the arrow of God on earth and that whosoever wishes her evil would be annihilated by God. Life and despair are incompatible and cannot exist side by side.[9]

Stressing Egypt's permanence and continuity, Kāmil pointed out that even though Egypt had been invaded a hundred times she had preserved her nationality, physiognomy and race, and had mortally hit her enemies, all the while remaining alive and conscious of her being.

Despair was detrimental because it led some people whose loyalty was beyond doubt to remain inactive. Egypt's case is not unique. History is full of stories about countries that had been ruled by

foreigners, had risen to demand their rights and had ultimately been able to expel the enemy from their territory. There must be hope so long as blood flows in the veins.[10] Hope was the remedy for Egypt's ills and should be felt by everyone under all circumstances even if hands were cut off by swords and hearts pierced with spears.[11] A people who believes in its power and the will of its sons is able to overcome all difficulties and surmount all obstacles.[12]

Generating and Developing a Spirit of Patriotism

But Kāmil's efforts were not merely aimed at dispelling the widespread feeling of despair but more positively directed towards generating a spirit of patriotism - ḥubb al-waṭan - among his countrymen.

Distinguishing among three types of nationalism that existed in the Middle East before 1939, Hourani points out that "territorial patriotism, a sense of community with all who shared the same defined piece of land, rooted in love for that land itself . . . was strongest in those parts of the Middle East where a settled community had lived for a long time in the same region, and where that region had relatively clear boundaries and an unbroken tradition of separate administrative or political existence . . ."[13] Egypt was a case in point.

Kāmil felt that this love for the land of Egypt was dormant, and he wrote to Madame Adam saying "Through the spoken word and the schools, through newspapers and books, I shall strive to awaken my countrymen's patriotism, so as to restore the Egyptians to Egypt, and Egypt to the Egyptians."[14]

In his school magazine al-Madrasah he described the watan as the sum of all the families (a family being formed of father, mother, brothers, relatives and servants) living in Cairo, Alexandria, Dimyāṭ, Rashīd, Manṣourah, Ṭanṭā and Asyūṭ. They breathe the same sir, eat the same food, drink the same water of the Nile, rejoice at each other's happinesses and lament each other's misfortunes. They are like brothers whose mother is the watan.[15]

Kamil was promoting a loyalty "qualitatively different from the love of family or home surroundings," a feeling experienced by most people. This was a loyalty that encompassed all families, regardless of their origin, so long as they lived in the land of Egypt and shared the same joys and miseries. It was an "identification with the life and aspirations of uncounted millions " unknown to each other and with a territory which many individuals perhaps would "never visit in its entirety." [16]

He urged these families or this ummah (the ummah being the sum of all individuals living in Egypt) to identify themselves with this land whose air they breathed.[17] The focus of their love must, therefore, be the territory of Egypt, for it was the territory, above all, not religion although it played an important role, nor language nor ethnic or racial origin which united them; and love of that territory constituted the strongest bond among them. Religion, or more specifically Islâm, was important for inculcating values and principles, but was not the main determining factor. Language was of importance as the vehicle of culture but did not form a bond of a special kind among the people

who spoke it. Kāmil, not only condemned the first stirrings of Arab nationalism, but also failed to identify with other Arabic speaking peoples such as the Algerians or Tunisians who were suffering under the yoke of other colonialisms.

Ḥubb al-waṭan, he declared, was the noblest of all human obligations.[18] It was the solid foundation upon which great and mighty kingdoms were built. All that exists in Europe of justice, order, freedom, independence and great prosperity is the outcome of this noble feeling which leads the members of an ummah to work towards a common objective.[19] For patriotism is a noble and powerful sentiment which, once in posession of a man's heart, impels him to sacrifice his life for the welfare and grandeur of his country, particularly in its hours of stress rather than in its moments of triumph.[20] It was a sentiment respected by all nations and communities because it was the feeling of the value and dignity of man and the essence of existence itself.[21]

This patriotism was the element of subsistence which Egypt needed above all else for it was the source of all miracles and the basis of all progress, forming the blood stream of all nations and the life of all living things.[22]

Muṣṭafā Kāmil used every superlative to describe this sentiment of patriotism. His appeal was extremely emotional, and love of Egypt was for him as powerful a feeling as love of God may be for others. His zeal was that of a prophet teaching a new gospel. Yet the message was not new, for the concept of waṭan had been known to educated Egyptians through the writings of Ṭahṭāwī.[23]

In Ṭahṭāwī's writings "ḥubb al-waṭan acquires the specific meaning of territorial patriotism in the modern sense," writes Hourani, "and the mother-country - 'la Patrie' - becomes the focus of those duties which, for Islamic jurists, bound together members of the ummah and that natural feeling which, for Ibn Khaldūn, existed between men related to each other by blood."[24] By the time of his death, adds Hourani, "the concept of 'la Patrie' had conquered without a struggle."[25] Other writers such as Ḥusayn al-Marṣafī, Adīb Isḥāq and ʿAbdallah al-Nadīm had further expounded on the subject.

Kāmil's achievement lay in instilling new life into these words at a time when they appeared forgotten or dead and his message had more poignancy since the waṭan was occupied by an alien force. Moreover, Kāmil could reach a larger audience than his predecessors through his books, articles and speeches; and his audience, educated in the schools established by M. ʿAlī and Ismāʿīl, could grasp and understand what he said.

He urged Egyptians to identify themselves with Egypt which he likened to a sick mother in great need of the love and devotion of her children.[26] Moreover, she is worthy of this love because she is the most beautiful of all countries. She is the paradise of this world, and "the people which dwells in her and inherits her is the noblest of all peoples if it hold her dear, and guilty of the greatest of crimes against her if it hold her rights cheaply and surrender control of her to the foreigner."[27]

Kāmil evoked memories of Egypt's past glories and achievements and spent the greater part of his life instilling in his countrymen a

feeling of pride in belonging to Egypt. His pride, like Ṭahṭāwī's was not limited to Islamic Egypt but also embraced what had preceded Islām. He spoke of his vision of an Egypt that would once again be great and mighty, an Egypt wherein the light of the sciences and the arts would shine from Alexandria to the source of the Nile, an Egypt resplendent like the sun, whose rays of civilisation would flood all the east, a land for competitive industry and commerce, a hospitable centre for foreigners and a peaceful centre for the whole world, an Egypt that would make an Egyptian proud to proclaim that he is Egyptian.[28]

This Egypt would come into being through the efforts of rich and poor alike since one and all were responsible for Egypt's destiny. Every Egyptian, he emphasised, had the right and duty to serve Egypt. No one was too small or insignificant to defend Egypt, demand her freedom and and seek her happiness. All Egyptians were equal before Egypt.[29] Every Egyptian was a man and had the rights of a man. Every peasant is a human being given the same rights by God as the most eminent person and was not born to serve others but rather to serve the <u>waṭan</u> and himself.[30]

<u>Fostering the Unity of all Elements of the Nation</u>

This <u>waṭanīyah</u> which included rich and poor also included the Christians of Egypt, namely the Copts.

Muslims and Copts have lived together for many centuries in the greatest unity and harmony. They are one people bound by patriotism, customs, mores, morals and means of livelihood and can never be divided.[31] There should always be complete understanding among them. The Copts are the descendants of the Pharoahs and have always been in Egypt, but they

must concede and understand that the Muslims have the same claim on Egypt as their own. To begin with, Islām did not transform Egyptian blood and Egyptian nationality. The greater majority of Muslims are descendants of ancient Egyptians; otherwise how could the ancient Egyptian ummah have vanished leaving only half a million people? Even if the Muslims are not descendants of the ancient Egyptians, the fact that they have lived and reared their children in Egypt for centuries entitles them to Egyptian nationality, he emphasised.[32]

Kāmil warned the Copts against the Syrian intruders -al-dukhalā'- who were doing everything possible to sow dissension between Copts and Muslims, that is between brothers united by the bond of the beloved waṭan. The intruders were excluded from the bonds of waṭanīyah no matter how long they had lived in Egypt. They were the exception to Kāmil's theory and time and again were the objects of his vehement criticism.

Cordial relations, however, had existed between Egyptians and Syrians before the British occupation. The first journalists in Egypt such as Adīb Isḥāq had been Syrian, and the founders of al-Ahrām had made it the mouthpiece of early Egyptian nationalism and had given space in its columns to Kāmil's first articles.[33] "After the British occupation a new type of Syrian had come" to Egypt. These Syrians "competed with Egyptians in the government service, where they were favoured because of their superior education and standards of work. Some entered the world of business and succeeded as well as the Europeans."[34]

"In almost every village in Egypt," writes Lord Cromer, "a usurer is to be found who, if he is not a Greek, is a Syrian . . . The Syrians

occupy to a great extent in Egypt the positions held by the Jews in many countries of Europe . . . The Syrian moneylender has the reputation of being singularly grasping and merciless."[35] "In 1890", he adds, "Riza Pasha proposed to issue an edict, which virtually prohibited all Syrians from entering the Egyptian service." As a compromise, "Syrians who had lived 15 years in Egypt were admitted to public service."[36]

Hated by the villagers, the Syrians also constituted an economic menace to the educated Egyptian middle class. Their economic interests being closely connected with the maintenance of the British occupation, they were regarded as collaborators with the enemy by the nationalists. Moreover, their newspapers adopted an openly hostile attitude towards the nationalist movement, and frankly supported British policy.[37] They also attacked the Ottoman Empire, foretold its end and the dethronement of the Khalīfah. They found themselves in "acrimonious dispute with new journals" owned by Egyptians.[38]

"There are two occupiers in Egypt," wrote Mustafā to his brother ʿAlī, "the British and the intruders. The latter should be fought twice as vigorously because an intruder claims to be one of us. The Englishman, however, does not change his nationality, religion or customs because he finds honour and pride in his own."[39]

Kāmil despised the Syrians on two counts: for having relinquished their own nationality, and for being traitors to their adopted fatherland. They are khawārij with no conscience, he said. They are like poison pretending to bear love for Egypt while in fact seeking the destruction of the watan. Yet Kāmil made a distinction between those khawārij and the

Syrians who had defended Egypt in various speeches and articles. To be specific, he explained, the dukhalā' were a group of people who had renounced their homeland and had come to Egypt in search of livelihood. They have been met with great hospitality but had returned Egypt's generosity with ingratitude and venom. They had hurled insults at every loyal patriot, at the sovereign of the country and the Egyptian nation. They had regarded every loyal Egyptian as a madman and had regarded Egyptian nationalism as an unforgivable crime.[40]

Kāmil exhorted the Copts to foil the divisive attempts of the intruders and to demonstrate to the world that the ummah is solidly united against the enemy.

The solidarity of all elements of the nation was of prime importance in facing the enemy. The British could not have occupied Egypt had there been no split in the Egyptian camp. ʿUrābī and his officers should not have rebelled against the Circassians who should have been considered Egyptian since they had lived in Egypt for so long.

The basic problem facing the nation is its lack of unity. The problem of the British occupation is secondary to this more basic problem. The ignorance and disunity of the nation continually expose her to all kinds of dangers. "Human society," he wrote in al-Ahrām, "is like a compound body formed of several parts and various elements which, although dissimilar, are united in their movement and harmonious in their action, resulting in the maintenance of this body and the safeguarding of its life . . . Every nation is a separate body which remains wholesome so long as none of its parts, no matter how disparate, remains paralysed . . . Each part of the body performs an essential function in protecting the

body from potential harm . . . Every element of the nation must put the interest of the nation above its own private interest . . . The history of mankind indicates that the downfall of any great nation was brought about as a result of the division of its parts which weakened its power, prevented it from progressing, and gave the intruders the opportunity to control it. Once this takes place the situation becomes almost beyond remedy. Therefore, it should be avoided . . . Egyptians should unite to save Egypt from the abyss wherein she has fallen."[41]

The United States has won her freedom and attained happiness owing only to the unity of the American people and their love for their homeland. Unity is the greatest weapon with which a people seeking freedom can arm itself. The Egyptian people must lay aside their differences and unite in serving and loving Egypt, for she is in danger, threatened by enormous intrigues on the part of the enemy. Egyptians must cease to be solely concerned with their individual probiems and perceive the calamity befalling the ummah as a whole.[42]

While exhorting Egyptians to unite and emulate the solidarity of the American people, Kāmil stressed that he was not urging them to stage a bloody revolution like the Americans.

On this issue Kāmil was decidedly on the side of moderation and was in agreement with ʿAbduh and his followers. He hoped that Egypt would obtain her usurped rights by peaceful means. He, therefore, emphasised that any disturbance would jeopardise Egypt's cause.[43] A revolt would give the British a God-sent pretext for prolonging the occupation, for Britain could then show Europe that Egypt was in turmoil and, there-

fore, in dire need of her presence.[44]

Kāmil had always condemned the ʿUrābī revolt as a grave error which had led to the occupation of Egypt. That British interests had dictated the occupation of Egypt at that stage and that a pretext for the occupation would have been found regardless of ʿUrābī's actions had not occurred to him. Thus when a letter signed by 31 officers stationed in the Sudān reached him, containing expressions of support, he urged them "to read but not to write" and wrote to his brother saying: "I do not wish the officers to enter our movement in a manifest way because this would greatly harm the Egyptian question, giving the occupation a justification, namely that Egypt is revolutionary."[45]

Moderation, however, did not mean renouncing everything that could be of service to the country. Nor did it imply neglect or indifference, he stressed.[46]

The fact that Kāmil and ʿAbduh were in agreement that a revolution would be harmful was due to the failure of the ʿUrābī revolt and their conclusion that violent methods would be ineffective against a superior power like Britain's. Both Kāmil and ʿAbduh represented the emerging middle class of Egypt. In Europe, the middle classes were most dynamic when they "had concentrated most of the wealth in their hands."[47] The development of the middle class in Egypt had taken a course different from that of Europe owing to M. ʿAlī's monopolistic policy and European infiltration which had led to concentration of wealth in the hands of the foreign community. Therefore. the middle class in Egypt was not yet ready to perform the revolutionary role played by the bourgeoisie of the West.

As part of his endeavours to achieve the unity of all elements of the nation, Kāmil welcomed an alliance with the Khedive ʿAbbās II. Had the people been loyal to their Khedive in 1882, the British could not have claimed that the occupation was justified in order to secure the throne of the ruler, he maintained. However the alliance between the Khedive and the nationalist leader was shaken following the Fāshodah incident and severed in 1904 after conclusion of the Entente Cordiale. The breach was publicly announced by Kāmil in his newspaper al-Liwā'.[48] In a letter to the Khedive, Kāmil said: "It gives me great satisfaction to serve, until I die, those lofty nationalist ideals which you were the first to advocate. The gap is widening between me and those who pretend to be serving the waṭan while in fact they only serve their personal interests and have unashamedly turned against the waṭan."[49]

The criticism, although seemingly meant to be directed against the Khedive's entourage, was evidently aimed at the Khedive himself.

A temporary reconciliation took place after Dinshwāy. Furious that his name had been used when the flogging and hanging were carried out at Dinshwāy, ʿAbbās drew close to the nationalists once more and pressed several notables to make contributions towards the establishment of Kamil's L'Etendard Egyptien and the Egyptian Standard.[50] But Kāmil had no more illusions concerning ʿAbbās, and he confided to Blunt that he had been taken back in favour because of his possible usefulness. "All the same", he added, "he and his branch of the family of Muḥammad ʿAlī are worthless. They ought to be eliminated from the succession."[51]

Opportunistic on both sides, the reconciliation could not last for long, and ʿAbbās was completely won over by Sir Eldon Gorst's policy

of conciliation in 1907.[52] Each had sought to benefit from the other to serve his own ends. The alliance was uneasy and, therefore, doomed to failure. The interests of the Court and the nationalists could hardly coincide.[53]

It was only in 1900 that Kāmil began to couple his agitation for independence with a demand for a constitutional government.

A Legislative Council and a General Assembly had been created by the British occupation on the basis of Lord Dufferin's recommendations and they remained in existence from 1883 until 1912. The Legislative Council, composed of 30 members, 14 of whom were nominated, had a purely consultative function and inspite of its name, no legislative powers. Its advice on new laws and the budget was not binding on the government.[54] The General Assembly was an 82-member body including the Ministers of the Khedive's Council, members of the Legislative Council and 46 delegates elected for 6 years. The Assembly met every two years to vote new taxes. Otherwise, its powers were mainly advisory.

Kāmil's belated agitation for a constitutional government is usually traced to his disenchantment with the Khedive.[55] In addition to this factor he was probably influenced by the movement of the "Young Turks" which was at the time waging a campaign for the restoration of the constitution prorogued by Sulṭān ʿAbdul Ḥamīd in 1879.[56]

During the early part of his career Kāmil had argued for national independence while defending the prerogatives of the Khedive. Now he demanded a constitution "so that liberty and justice would be based on solid foundations that no human hand, whether British or Egyptian, could harm."[57]

The constitution, he explained, means granting the people freedom of speech and thought, the right to supervise all matters and to control all government actions and the right to change the government if it should misuse its authority. Having a constitution means that no person, however important, could effect any change in the law or statutes of the country.[58]

After describing the failure of the occupation authority in the sphere of internal administration and education, he said: "All these evils point to the great need of the country for a representative assembly which would have supreme legislative authority . . . Else the concentration of absolute power in the hands of one person whether an Egyptian or a foreigner, will cause great harm to the country and bring calamities upon it."[59]

The people, he said, are the only true force or the authority to whose will great men should submit.[60]

In an article in al-Liwā' he wrote: "Every patriotic Egyptian will never accept that Egypt be ruled by the Khedive alone or by the British Commissioner, or by both of them. He demands that his beloved waṭan be governed by the talented and sincere among its children and that the system of government be constitutional and representative."[61] And in an open letter to the British Prime Minister, Mr. Henry Campbell Peterman, in Le Figaro of September 14, 1907 he said: "We shall never accept government by whim or tyranny. The only will to which we want to submit is the will of the ummah."[62]

Providing Education for the People

The Egyptian people were backward and unaware of their rights and duties because they lacked education in general and the right kind of education in particular. The problem had to be dealt with immediately for "ignorance was a menace" even if the British were to evacuate Egypt. The nationalist plan, wrote Kāmil, in Le Figaro of July 11, 1906, is to regenerate the people and acquaint them with their rights and duties by means of education.

This education was evidently to be a Westernised education, for he adds: "We have known for more than a century now that no ummah can lead a dignified life unless it follows the path of Western civilisation. We were the first Eastern people to come in touch with Europe and we are continuing along the path we have started. With education, progress, moderation and elevated liberal thinking we shall obtain the respect of the world and Egypt's freedom . . ."[63]

The British occupation had done little for education and "the little that was done was ill done."[64] Unwilling to spend funds on education even when the country had become solvent and prosperous, the main objective of the educational policy of the British in Egypt was to increase the number of kuttābs on one hand and to produce young men fitted for nothing else but to be government officials on the other hand. Mr. Dunlop, the British advisor to the Ministry of Education, admitted in 1906 that the system of education in government schools had not been conceived with the object of meeting the needs of the country in basic instruction and cannot be considered as such.[65] Free education had been

abolished.[66] Missions sent abroad since the time of Muḥammad ʿAlī were cancelled and only partially restored through the efforts of the newly appointed Minister of Education, Saʿd Zaghlūl in 1906.

The failure of this policy was admitted and criticised by the various British Civil servants posted in Egypt. To quote a few, Lord Lloyd says: "An infinitesimal percentage of the revenue was yearly allocated to the department of education and the amount given to primary education was more pitiably meagre still . .·. qualified applicants were being turned away in large numbers from the higher specialised schools, simply because no facilities could be provided for training them there. Elementary education was not expanding because utterly inadequate facilities were provided for training teachers."[67]

George Young comments that the first result of British intervention was the complete disappearance of what remained of Muḥammad ʿAlī's educational enterprises. He adds that the British convicion that an Egyptian intelligentsia could only be an embarrassement caused them to overlook what they should have realised was their main responsibility.[68] And Chirol says: "By whatever standard we judge the educational system devised for the youth of Egypt under British control, it has tended not at all to the salvation of the State. It is unquestionably the worst of our failures."[69]

For Muṣṭafā Kāmil the problem was of even greater importance than withholding funds from the department of education. There were more fundamental issues at stake, for the content of the education given at government schools did not attempt to promote a spirit of patriotism but

was rather geared to kill every nationalist sentiment. The history of Egypt was not taught at these schools, resulting in the young generation's lack of pride in the achievement of their ancestors.[70] The same was true of Arabic literature. The youth of Egypt were taught that Egyptians had always been oppressed and will always remain so. Egypt, they were told, was an agricultural country and was destined to remain thus forever with no hope of industrialisation. Arabic, the language of the country was not developed but replaced by either French or English.

Quoting Danton's saying that after bread education constituted the primary need of the people, Kāmil recalled how the propagation of education had been the source of the power and might of the khulafā' in the past.[71] "At that time", he said, "every means was used to propagate education. Schools were set up, scientific books were translated from various languages and people encouraged to read which resulted in the flourishing of the arts and sciences. This policy - the choice of the ablest men to assist them in the administration - rendered the khulafā' most powerful in less than a generation, propagating their faith, language, learning and policy far and wide, in the East and the West . . . But when learning became limited to the upper classes who used it for purposes for which it was not designed, both education and the might of the millah collapsed. Dissension reigned in the Eastern countries, and ignorance prevailed. And whatever remained was absolutely destroyed by the emergence of the European countries and European civilisation. These were founded on bases guaranteeing their continuity, notably the universalisation of education leading to the propagation of scientific principles among all classes of the nation and their participation with the government in every

action for the benefit of the nation . . ."[72]

Kāmil urged the wealthy class in Egypt to contribute towards the establishement of national schools free from government control. It was their national duty to do so. Every stone laid towards this goal is equal to all the gold and silver in the world, he affirmed.

He fully realised that the youth of Egypt educated in the then existing French, Italian, English and German schools and brought up to appreciate the cultures of these countries could not share the same hopes and aspirations.[73] Therefore, it was a sacred duty to attain a general unification of popular education so that the men of the future would be soldiers of the same army having the same valour and the same heart.[74]

Education in the national schools would first and foremost instil a spirit of patriotism and unity in the youth of Egypt. Such a spirit would be able to move mountains. It would create a strong bond among individuals so that the ummah would rise as one man whenever faced with danger. It would teach the people that theirs is the supreme word in the country and that government officials are there only to serve the interests of the people and could retain their posts only if they were acceptable to the ummah. Thus justice would be established and the rulers would be prevented from becoming despots. For knowledge is a light; once lit it cannot be dimmed, and in its wake every shadow of despotism disappears. For despotism is but a thief which usurps the rights of people living in the shadow of ignorance.[75]

The history of Egypt would be taught in the national schools. For history is the great university where princes, ministers and learned men seek advice. History will teach the students that Egypt has preserved

her national characteristics, features and race even though she has been invaded a hundred times.[76] The study of history would foster pride in the centuries-old civilisation of Egypt admired by foreigners from the farthest lands.[77]

Kāmil warned, however, that education without moral values is useless. Development of character is as important as development of the intellect. It is not sufficient to teach boys and girls the arts and sciences. Their spirit must be cultivated and developed.[78] Thus religion, the means whereby the soul is shaped, must form the basis of all education. It is through religion that one avoids base deeds and becomes virtuous. Muslims must seek the truth in Islām and try to follow its precepts and obey its commands.[79] Islām is unjustly calumnied as a religion of ignorance and decadence, of laziness and immobility. In fact it is the religion of virtue, morality, and truth and enjoins Muslims to avoid evil and vice. It commands unity, love of one's country, justice, equality, struggle and activity, kindness and tolerance. It leads to progress and civilisation. Muslims are backward because they have neglected the principles of Islām and worked against its spirit and law.[80]

It is interesting to note that Kāmil himself had had no traditional education whatsoever, but Islām is part and parcel of the national consciousness of every Muslim. He does not, however, indicate the values to be taught the Coptic students enrolling in such schools, although one would assume he would have expected them to be taught the moral values of their own religion.

Although Kāmil's attitude towards women was traditional, and in

opposition to Qāsim Amīn's with whom he entered into a debate advocating the maintenance of the veil, he stressed the need for the education of girls. They were to be educated because, as future mothers, their main task would be to inculcate a spirit of patriotism in their children.[81] Yet they must not be given a totally European education, for this would be dangerous for the future of the country. Egyptians must remain Egyptian, and foreigners must not be blindly emulated. Only the virtues of the West must be adopted while the best in Egyptian character must be maintained, he stressed.[82]

Kāmil urged the founders of national schools to direct the youth towards the free professions, trade and industry so that Egypt's riches would not be lost.[83] He urged them not to seek government posts for their sons but to encourage their sons to serve the country outside the orbit of officialdom because they would not be able to lead the country unless they enjoyed a free life. Being government officials, and earning a fixed salary would kill their independence and personal freedom, he pointed out. Moreover, without the free professions and the development of commerce and industry, Western civilisation would not have progressed, and the European nations would not have developed in such an amazing way.[84] He urged them to send their sons abroad to study commerce and industry so they could establish factories and laboratories.[85]

Although, as noted above, Kāmil felt no special affinity with Arabic speaking peoples elsewhere, Arabic as a vehicle of culture was of paramount importance in his thinking.

He emphasised that the medium of instruction in the national schools must be Arabic.[86] He deplored the policy advocated by the occu-

pation namely to make Arabic a stranger in its homeland.[87] Other countries have progressed by developing their native tongues, for language is a factor of prime importance in the lives of nations and their independence.[88]

Summing up the object of the policy advocated by Cromer and Dunlop, Abdel-Malek says it aimed at eliminating the nationalist content of education as well as its rational and scientific character because these factors were likely to bring forth new elites capable of assuming leadership of the nationalist movement and of providing the independent nation-state with modern cadres such as happened at the time of Muḥammad ʿAlī and Ismāʿīl.[89]

Attitude Towards Foreign Residents

Kāmil adopted a friendly attitude towards the European residing in Egypt and tried to win their support for the nationalist movement. He argued that Egyptians and foreigners had the same interest in preventing the British from taking everything into their own hands. To him, the foreigners were the vanguard of the Western civilisation for which he had such great admiration. His struggle against the British occupation did not diminish his wish to emulate what he considered of value in Western civilisation such as Western industrialisation, universal education, constitutional government - but not Western standards of morality.

He made a distinction between the group of individuals who were seeking to perpetuate the occupation of Egypt to serve their own ends, and the bulk of the English people who had been deluded concerning the true sentiments and aspirations of the Egyptian people.[90] His antagonism was

directed only to the small group of people advocating the occupation of Egypt and not to all Englishmen. In fact he hoped to win the liberal conscience everywhere in his struggle for independence.

The support of world public opinion, pressure from the Ottoman Empire and an Egypt whose people would be educated, united and animated by love of country, would eventually compel the British to honour their reiterated pledges that evacuation would be effected once order was established in Egypt and the power of the Khedive restored.

Many of Kāmil's ideas echoed the thoughts first formulated by Ṭahṭāwī. Like Egypt's first political thinker, Kāmil believed that the national bond was above the religious bond; that this bond included men other than Muslims; that Egypt's past was a source of great pride; that Egypt's history was "distinct and historically continuous";[91] that unity and education were of paramount importance and that hubb al-waṭan was "the main motive which leads men to try to build up a civilised community."[92] But, as Hourani points out: "Ṭahṭāwī lived and worked in a happy interlude of history, when the religious tension between Islām and Christendom was being relaxed and had not yet been replaced by the new political tension of East and West."[93]

Kāmil lived at a critical time when the Islamic countries were being assaulted by the European colonial powers and when Islām was being widely criticised by European thinkers and his thoughts were also influenced by al-Afghānī who was searching for ways and means to counter this assault.

III. PAN-ISLAMISM

Mustafā Kāmil saw no contradiction between nationalism and Islām. He "believed sincerely . . . that nationalism and Islām are in fact complementary."[1]

"There are some", he said, "who may think that religion opposes nationalism, or that the call of religion has nothing to do with nationalism. But I believe that religion and nationlism are inseparable twins and that he whose heart is possessed by religion would love his fatherland and sacrifice his goods and life for it. I do not rely in what I am saying on the teaching of the ancestors whom the men of the modern age may accuse of ignorance and fanaticism, but I call upon Bismarck the greatest leader of our time . . . to testify to the truth of this principle. This great man proclaimed, indeed with a mighty voice: 'if you tore faith from my heart, you will have torn with it my love of the fatherland.' "[2]

Kāmil believed that every ummah had two great tasks, one towards its religion and the other towards the watan. The more a country is civilised and advanced in knowledge and perfection, the more it venerates its religion and watan. Contrary to what Easterners believe, he said, the Western countries who have attained the peak of civilisation, greatly respect their religion. If the westerners whom we emulate in several matters consider religion the basis of civilisation, why should the Muslims not do likewise and uphold their religion, openly and secretly, since it is a religion of noble traits and right guidance, he wondered.[3]

Replying to the attacks levelled against Islām, he asserted that Islām was not an obstacle to civilisation. In fact it is formed of truths easily acceptable to the mind and suitable for every place and time. He expressed amazement at the claim made by some people that religion and politics were two different spheres, adding that it was an uncontested philosophical theory that the upholding of religion and watan was the cause of the regeneration of nations and the reverse the cause of their degeneration.[4] "Religion", he said, "is the basis upon which true independence and eternal glory are founded. Nationalism cannot be genuine nor powerful unless it is the outcome of adherence to religion. Human nature, however elevated, is unable to draw strength from its inner sources and is, therefore, in need of a higher power emanating from the Creator to guide it in the right path. People with sound beliefs and a living faith are afraid of nothing and do not know the meaning of despair. The cause of the Muslims' victory in the past and the safeguarding of their state from all menace was due to their genuine adherence to Islām", he asserted. Their decadence and loss of grandeur were due to the fact that they did not follow the true precepts of Islam.[5]

Kāmil recalled that Muhammad ʿAlī had reconciled the principles of modern civilisation with the precepts of Islām and had therefore been eminently successful. He suggested that Egypt follow his example, depending on Islām but adopting from Western civilisation whatever was good and beneficial.[6]

Kāmil had always stressed the importance of Islām as a source of moral values; however, he seemed to be more emphatic on the subject in

the wake of his diappointment over France's humiliation in the Fāshodah incident and her failure to seize the opportunity of raising the question of Egypt in the world sphere. It could also be said that since the majority of Egyptians were Muslims, he realised that unless the waṭanīyah were made to seem consonant with Islām there was no prospect that it would acquire any followers. But such a note of opportunism is hard to detect in the thoughts and acts of the young nationalist leader.

Pan-Islamism

Was Muṣṭafā Kāmil a Pan-Islamist? What seemed an ambiguous attitude at the time has baffled many writers who have held divergent points of view on his attitude. Some maintain he was a genuine Pan-Islamist while others claim that he was an opportunist who made use of the idea to win the support of the masses for the attainment of his objectives, and still others argue that he was a politician who completely ignored the entire concept.

"The nationalist followers of Muṣṭafā Kāmil . . . were deeply stirred by Pan-Islamism," writes J. Ahmed.[7] Quoting Foreign Office records, Landau says Kāmil was connected with certain semi-secret Pan-Islamic societies in Egypt such as Shams al-Islām[8] and Makarim al-Akhlāq.[9]

On the other hand Hans Kohn comments that Kāmil "was clever enough to exploit Pan-Islamism for his own ends."[10] In the same vein Lord Lloyd writes that Kāmil preached the doctrine of Pan-Islamism "not with the old devotion but in the new opportunist spirit which inspired the Committee of Union and Progress." "Egyptian nationalism," he adds, had never been very strongly pro-Turkish in its sympathies, although it

was always prepared to range itself beside Turkey in any dispute with Christian powers . . ."[11]

Chirol also expressed the same viewpoint. He says the nationalist leaders thought "they could safely use the religious sentiment . . . to obtain popular support for a campaign against British control, which as a mere agitation on the part of the educated classes for self-government and for the elimination of British influence from the administration of the country, left the masses at that time more than cold . . . the cry of Din ! Din ! . . . is always a potent cry in all Mahomedan countries, even in Egypt, where there is probably less religious fanaticism than in most . . ." He adds that "Pan-Islam in its larger aspects was not likely to get a permanent hold of Egypt, nor did Egyptian Nationalism as a whole come under its influence . . . "[12]

Finally P.G. Elgood maintains that Muṣṭafā Kāmil held the view that Pan-Islamism was "unlikely to appeal to Egyptians as a means of freeing their country from British domination." He adds that Kāmil, "in attempting to unite all classes of Egypt into one political party discarded appeals to Islām as his principal argument."[13]

An attempt will be made to delineate Kāmil's attitude from his various declarations and writings. However, it must be recalled that he lived at a time of confusion and contradiction. By 1882 all the Muslim countries except for Turkey, Persia, and Morrocco had come under foreign control. The end of the nineteenth century saw the virtual political and economic subjugation of the Islamic countries by British, French and Russian imperialism. "This encroachment, came in part, in the form of a new Crusade."[14] Not only had the Powers, by various treaties become

protectors of Christian interests within the Ottoman Empire as a means of interfering in Ottoman internal affairs, but Islām itself was being severely criticised and generally described as a religion of backwardness. Muslim peoples were written off as people who could not aspire to rule themselves or ever attain the civilised status of Western countries. Their religion was regarded as a religion of ignorance, decadence, laziness and inactivity. In the battered and bewildered Muslim world, thinkers debated and questioned the cause of their backwardness and sought ways and means of reviving Islām's former glory and restoring some form of unity among Muslims to face this menace threatening the future of Islām and the political independence of Islamic countries.

Most notable among those thinkers was Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī. He called for Muslim unity and solidarity to counter European encroachment. He emphasised that political factions and dynastic interests among Muslims should not be allowed to stand in the way of this unity. Islām was the essential bond between Muslims, regardless of their country of origin, for Muslims have rejected any other ʿaṣabīyah such as a racial or ethnic ʿaṣabīyah and have retained only that of Islām.[15]

"If this bond could be strengthened, if it were to become the spring of their lives and the focus of their loyalty, then prodigious forces of solidarity would be engendered to make possible the creation and maintenance of a strong and stable state."[16]

However, al-Afghānī thought it "neither possible or necessary to impose the rule of any one monarch upon the rest. There is no sign that he had it in mind to create a single Islamic State or to revive the united caliphate of early times."[17] All he urged was that every Muslim ruler

should do everything possible to safeguard another Muslim ruler, since the existence of either of them depended on the survival of the other, adding that this mode of action was not only dictated by their religion but also by present circumstances.[18]

But while advocating Islamic solidarity as an essential factor for progress and maintaing that it was far more effective than national solidarity, al-Afghānī did not deny the importance of other ties such as language. Moreover, he maintained that a religious link did not exclude nationalist links with men of different faiths pointing out that the _ʿUrwah_, while defending the rights of Muslims, had no intention of sowing dissension between Muslims and those who shared the same interests with them in what pertained to the welfare of their country.[19]

Muṣṭafā Kāmil was a boy of five when al-Afghānī left Egypt in 1879. However, he is said to have become familiar with al-Afghānī's thoughts and views through ʿAbdallāh al-Nadīm, one of al-Afghānī's most articulate disciples and a friend of Kāmil's. Moreover, although _al-ʿUrwah al-Wuthqā_ had been banned from Egypt and India, it was widely circulated, and copies of it may have been read by Kāmil, although this is not indicated by his biographers who give scant information about his readings. Some of Afghānī's views, particularly those pertaining to the solidarity of the Muslims, were reflected in Kāmil's thoughts. Like other thinkers, he was fully aware of the assault on Islamic countries particularly of the encroachment on Egypt's independence, and he, too, sought ways and means of countering the infringement on his country's sovereignty.

Kāmil saw no contradiction between his nationalism and his call for an ittiḥād Islāmī. He believed the second was necessary to safeguard the first. Prompted by his love for Egypt, he actively promoted solidarity between Egypt and the Ottoman Empire.

Seeking Solidarity with the Ottomans

It was lack of solidarity and the conflict between Sulṭān and Khedive that had facilitated the British occupation of Egypt. Both had fallen prey to British intrigues. The Sulṭān had been made to believe that the Khedive was seeking the Khilāfah while the Khedive had been persuaded that the Sulṭān was not only lending his support to ʿUrābī but was also seeking Europe's support to abrogate the rights of the Khedivial family and to convert Egypt once more into a wilāyah like Syria and Tripoli.[20]

The same intrigues, warned Kamil, were being concocted once more by the British lackeys who were reporting to the Sulṭān a falsehood, namely that ʿAbbās was seeking the Khilāfah and plotting to obtain it.

Nations, like individuals, declared Kāmil are bound by common interests.[21] Both Egypt and the Ottoman Empire have one and the same enemy namely England.

Arab Khilāfah: a British Plot

The attempt to create an Arab Khilāfah was condemned by Kāmil as a British plot aimed at destroying the Ottoman Empire and placing the Khilāfah in the hands of a British stooge.[22]

The Ottoman Empire was the only Islamic state whose power and influence were feared by Europe, he pointed out. The enemies of Islām

ardently wished her name to be wiped out of existence so that the power of Islām would wither away and its political authority be buried. The Khilāfah gave the Ottomans great authority among Muslims in general and throughout the whole world; therefore, the enemies of Islām have been seeking ways and means of removing the Khilāfah from the Ottoman Sultanate and handing it over to a Muslim devoid of religious and Islamic feelings.

Kāmil went on to say that the question of the Khilāfah was not new and dated from the eighteenth century when Napoleon had contemplated becoming a Muslim and establishing himself as the Khalīfah of the Muslims. Diplomatic memoranda in Europe's foreign offices indicated that the European powers had for long debated the enormous moral influence which the Khilāfah conferred on the Sulṭān. The enemies of Islām are fully aware that Muslims throughout the world are distressed whenever the Ottoman Empire is attacked. They realise that the elimination of the Ottoman state, the seat of the Khilāfah, would lead to general disturbances throughout the world and would be the cause of an unprecedented bloody war. Therefore, they imagine that once the Khilāfah is removed from the Sultanate, the Turks would be immensely weakened and their influence among Muslims wiped out. They would become like any ordinary Muslim country for whom Muslims would not sacrifice their lives, no matter how great their calamity.[23]

The plan to separate the Khilāfah from the Sultanate was more harmful to the Ottoman State and Islām than any other menace, he declared. British statesmen have shown an interest in carrying out this plan ever since England was preparing to occupy Egypt because they realised that

the Sultān would never give his consent to a permanent occupation of Egypt.[24]

Dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire Disastrous

Kāmil felt that it would be an unqualified disaster for Egypt if the British were successful in undermining the authority of the Khalīfah, in weakening the Empire, and bringing about its dismemberment. For then England would lay hands permanently on Egypt. So long as Egypt remained part, even a nominal part, of the Ottoman Empire the British occupation of Egypt would have no legal basis. International agreements concluded between the Ottoman Empire and the European states guaranteed Egypt's status and Egypt was anxious to maintain these agreements as a basis for her argument against the occupation.[25] If the Ottoman Empire were dismembered, international agreements would be of no consequence, and Egypt would no doubt be lost.[26]

Kāmil also feared that the British might seek an agreement with the Ottomans along the same lines as the Anglo-French agreement of 1904, and this would lead to Egypt's complete abandonment and eventual absorption in the British Empire.[27]

He, therefore, warned the Egyptians that it would be a sign of immaturity and diplomatic folly to vilify a state which is their suzerain adding that a negative attitude toward the Ottomans could harm them in connection with the British occupation lurking in their midst ready to devour them.[28]

At the same time he marshalled arguments to convince the Ottomans that Egypt must not be given up. Egypt, he said, is the centre of the

Islamic world and the meeting place of all Muslims in view of her geographic position and the culture of her people. Because of her progress and civilisation Egypt constitutes a school for all Muslims. Students from all over the Orient converge on her. The cause of Egypt is the cause of Islām.[29] "After Hijāz, Egypt is the country most visited by Muslims. She was mentioned in the Holy Qur'ān thirty three times as an indication of her special importance among Islamic countries. The Prophet called her al-ribāt al-akbar because through Egypt, the Islamic Khalīfah can defend the holy cities of Jerusalem, Mecca and Medina."[30]

Abandoning Egypt to the British is tantamount to submitting all Islām to British control, he added.[31]

Muslims' Love for One Another

In addition to their common interests there were also emotional ties binding Muslims to each other such as the ties existing among Christians.

Christian countries always hasten to the assistance of other Christian nations. For example, the Italians and other Europeans volunteered for service in the ranks of the Greek army fighting against the Ottomans. It is one of Europe's fundamental principles to assist, by every possible means, all Christians living in the East.[32] Christians give all kinds of gifts and donations to their Pope on his anniversary; yet when Muslims do likewise for their Khalīfah, they are accused of fanaticism. In effect, argued Kāmil, Muslims are much more tolerant than Christians. While Christians hold prominent posts in the Ottoman government, the Dutch are persecuting the people of Goa, the Austrians

are confiscating religious foundations in Bosnia, and the Russians are doing the same in Kazan.[33]

Kāmil affirmed that it was the Christian world that was so hostile and fanatical in its attitude towards the Muslims. Europe, he noted, is jubilant whenever an Islamic country is defeated by a Christian country and outraged when the reverse takes place such as when the Ottomans defeated the Greeks.[34] Statements made by the British Prime Minister and other European statesmen indicate that Christian Europe would never restore an inch of land to a Muslim government. The question of Tsalia confirms this attitude, for while Europe unanimously demanded the withdrawal of Ottoman forces from Tsalia, the European states could not reach agreement on measures to compel Greece to withdraw from Crete.[35] It is impossible to convince any Muslim that Europe is not prejudiced against Islām, he asserted. It is Europe's repeated acts of hostility against the Porte and the fact that Europe has always addressed Muslims in the name of Christianity and not in the name of civilisation which compels us to unite and support the Khalīfah, declared Kāmil.[36]

Thus Kāmil explains the search for solidarity among Muslims as a reaction against Europe's hostility towards the Islamic world. The battleground was defined by the West and not the Islamic world.

He quotes the Sultān as having told an Austrian correspondent that Europe was waging a crusade in a political form, adding that this statement expressed the feelings of all Muslims throughout the world.[37]

Unity also Indicated by Islām

However, Kāmil found that unity among Muslims was not only sought

as a reaction against Europe's hostility but also because the precepts of Islām dictated it. "Our religion," he said, "rules that we should be like a compact building the stones of which support each other."[38] The first task imposed upon us by Islām is to join together the forces of all Muslims."[39] Thus when the religious bond is added to mutual political interests and Europe's equal antagonism towards all Muslims, the necessity of joining the forces of the Muslims becomes evident and people should understand why we call for an ittiḥād islāmī," he said.[40]

Kāmil like Afghānī before him was not clear as to how these forces were to be joined, apart from the moral and financial support to the Khalīfah which he advocated on every occasion. However, he suggested a meeting of a Muslim élite of one or two representatives of each Islamic ummah to study at length the condition of each of the Muslim countries, the cause of its malady and the remedies for it. "Such a jam'īyah (assembly)," he said, "would serve the Islamic countries and lay the basis for their unity and progress."[41]

Neither sure nor clear as to the form of the unity that should bind the Muslims, Kāmil was positive however, that if the Muslims were to form a political union, it would be directed against the British alone in view of their intrigues against the Khilāfah and their endeavours to oust the Khalīfah.[42]

The conditional clause in his speech indicates that he had doubts such a political union could be effected.

He was convinced, however that the Islamic world should not unite against the Christian world as a whole in a way leading to bloodshed.

"There is not a single enlightened Muslim," he said, " who thinks for a moment that it is possible to join the Muslim peoples in a league against Europe."[43] His ardent hope was that the Islamic world would march along the path of enlightenment and knowledge and rally round the great Khilāfah to repel the Khalīfah's enemies and aggressors.

Egypt's Independence to be Maintained

At no point, however, did Kāmil envisage that any union or federation would bring about the loss of Egypt's independence and the replacement of British subjection by a Turkish yoke.

We aspire to achieve complete independence at home and abroad, he told the British Prime Minister Mr. Campbell Bennerman, in reply to a question as to whether Egypt would accept secession from Turkey.[44] We want Egypt for the Egyptians, he said on another occasion. This is a call I have advocated for the past twelve years, and I defy anyone who could quote one sentence or one word that I may have uttered to prove the contrary. Egypt is to be for the Egyptians with no foreign occupation or subjection. Those who believe that the Egyptian people resent England because she is a Christian country are totally wrong. Egypt would have had the same feelings towards any other country occupying the country. For loss of independence is unbearable. There is not a single Egyptian worthy of that name, he said, who would accept the loss of Egypt's sovereignty as recognised by Turkey and guaranteed by Europe.[45]

It was slanderous to be accused of wishing to hand over Egypt to the Ottoman Empire, as one of its ordinary provinces. "This accusation," he said, "was but a declaration that the Western sciences and arts

brought into Egypt a century ago had only made the Egyptians attached to slavery and humiliation and that their knowledge of the nations' rights and duties had only entitled them to be slaves."[46]

Thus Muṣṭafā Kāmil, while attempting to generate a nationalist spirit among his countrymen, was also promoting the Pan-Islamic idea. Yet his statements do not indicate much concern for Muslims of other lands. What really concerned him was the maintenance of solidarity with the Ottoman Empire with one object in mind, namely, to secure Egypt's independence from British domination.

It was a religious task to seek unity among Muslims for the regeneration of Islām, he said. But the patriotic duty was to seek complete unity between Muslims and Copts and all those for whom Egypt is a watan so as to serve our country and seek its independence and freedom. The blood flowing in the veins of most Muslims is the same as the blood flowing in the veins of Copts, and this is the meaning of racial unity (ittiḥād jinsī) and national entente (ittifāq waṭanī).[47]

He summed up his attitude in these words: "We aim first and foremost at the unity of all Egyptians as an ummah which has a watan, and this does not contradict our Islamic call and endeavours to promote our religion. Serving Islām or calling for the unity of Muslims (ittiḥād al-muslimīn) bears no trace of religious fanaticism or opposition to genuine patriotic principles.[48]

On another occasion he said: "There are two distinct and separate feelings in Egypt, a nationalist feeling shared by Muslims and Copts leading them to work side by side to raise the watan and demand its

freedom and independence, and the religious feeling which plays a prominent part and is denied by no one because the majority of Egyptians are Muslims. The interest of Egypt should be our guide for it is above every other interest,"[49] he stressed.

As Berkes notes: "What appeared on the surface as a drive for Muslim unification was in reality a drive for freedom and independence."[50]

CONCLUSION

Mustafā Kāmil "left behind him an ambiguous reputation." Like all leaders, he had staunch supporters and admirers, as well as virulent critics. "'Abduh and his friends thought of him as an empty demagogue" and felt his methods 'would produce either no results at all or results which would not be lasting.'"[1]

"The leader of a short-lived 'Liberal Party' called him 'a vile imposter . . . a traitor to your country, an enemy to your fellow countrymen, urged on by evil, paid to praise the methods of slavery, despotism, decadence, and worse ills, which you cloak beneath the names of freedom and faith.' "[2]

R. Storr, the Oriental Secretary of the British Agency called him "a charlatan of the first order, discreditable in his private life and bakshished up to the eyes by all parties . . ."[3]

On the other hand, W. S. Blunt wrote in his Diaries "He is enthusiastic and eloquent and has an extraordinary gift of speech . . . a man with perfectly clear ideas . . . and a knowledge of men and things really astounding. I take him, too, to be quite sincere in his patriotism, and I could not detect throughout the whole of his talk today a single false note. He also has great courage and decision of judgement, not scrupling to disagree with any opinion expressed in conversations where his own differs."[4]

Another English writer described him as follows: "Of attractive personality and filled with the fire and enthusiasm of youth, Mustafā

Kāmil exercised a remarkable influence over his fellow countrymen. A brilliant orator, and no less brilliant a writer, he cast a spell."[5]

One can go on endlessly quoting either admiration or disparagement of the young nationalist leader, depending on whether the writer or speaker was a supporter or an adversary. Many of these assessments could have been built on a subjective basis. Of more significance than his personal defects and qualities is the role he played in the development of the nationalist movement in Egypt.

When Muṣṭafā Kāmil emerged on the scene of Egyptian politics, he did not spring from a vacuum. What he advocated was not totally new. His ideas and objectives were a link in the chain of development of such notions as <u>waṭan</u> and nation and a continuation of the struggle for independence and a constitutionalist system of government.

His significance lay in the fact that he alone had the courage to step forward and proclaim that Egypt was a nation worthy of independence, at a time when other leaders had been cowering in silence following the defeat of the ʿUrābī revolt and the British occupation of Egypt.

His undaunted courage in the face of a powerful enemy helped restore the self-confidence of the Egyptian people while his speeches and writings inspired them with patriotic ideals. He could well be described as the "reviver of the nationalist movement" as al-Rāfiʿī calls him, for the country had remained rudderless for some ten years following the British occupation, until he came forward to provide his disillusioned and humiliated countrymen with guidance and leadership.

Aware of some of the maladies affecting the society in which he

lived, he sought to find a cure for them. He succeeded in goading the wealthy class to open national schools where the history of Egypt could be taught and love of country inculcated in the new generation.

Despite his Pan-Islamist ideas he was able to win the support of the Copts although they were soon to be alienated by the aggressive Pan-Islamist policy advocated by Shaykh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Shawīsh, who took virtual control of the Nationalist Party after Kāmil's death and Muḥammad Farīd's voluntary exile.

Muṣṭafā Kāmil may not have been realistic when he thought that either France or the Ottoman Empire would bring pressure to bear on Britain to end the occupation of Egypt, but experience and maturity made him realise that Egypt could achieve independence only by her own efforts.

Experience also taught him that an alliance with the Khedive could not be lasting and that autocratic rule had to be replaced by a parliamentary government.

He may have seemed paradoxical when he advocated nationalism and pan-Islamism at one and the same time but it was evident that Egypt's independence was paramount in his thoughts and allegiance to the Khalīfah was but a means to safeguard this independence.

He was largely successful in drawing the attention of the world to Egypt's plight through his contacts in Europe and the various articles he contributed to European and American newspapers.

He may not have drawn up a concrete programme of social reform but his whole energy was devoted to mobilizing his countrymen against the occupation. It seemed that apart from the need for education and a

constitutional government, everything else could wait until independence was achieved.

He proved prophetically correct when he told a friend in France: "I fear my life will be short and I shall not live to see the liberation of my country, but it is of no consequence for the Egyptians will not abandon the struggle when I am dead."[6]

The outpouring of grief expressed by the Egyptian people at the death of the man who was a symbol of their hopes and aspirations[7] has been surpassed only at the funerals of Jamāl ʿAbd al-Nāṣir and Umm Kulthūm.

But the struggle, as Muṣṭafā Kāmil had predicted, would go on. Muslims and Copts, rich and poor would unite under the leadership of Saʿd Zaghlūl to wage a antionalist movemement of nation-wide dimension against the British occupation. Independence would be ultimately won and Muṣṭafā Kāmil's slogan for total evacuation would be adopted by the Free Officers who overthrew King Farūq and the Muḥammad ʿAlī dynasty. His ideas would influence Egypt's new leader ʿAbd al-Nāṣir who read his books and articles as a student in high school and later on quoted one of his sayings which best expressed Kāmil's integrity and unflinching determination: "If my heart were shifted from left to right or the Pyramids moved from their permanent place, none of my beliefs would change. Patriotism would remain my goal and guide, the watan my Kaʿbah and its glory my ultimate aim."[8]

Footnotes-Introduction

1. Nadav Safran, Egypt in Search of Political Community (Cambridge, 1961), p. 26.

2. Ibrahim Abu-Lughod, Arab Rediscovery of Europe (Princeton, 1963), pp. 12-13.

3. Ibid., p. 17.

4. Ibid., p. 18.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid., p. 19.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid., p. 20.

9. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Rāfiʿī, Tārīkh al-Ḥarakah al-Qawmīyah fī Miṣr (4th ed.; Cairo, 1955), I, 88. For text of proclamation and discrepancies in French and Arabic versions see Ibid., pp. 84-88; Abu-Lughod, op. cit., pp. 12-20 and L. ʿAwad, Al-Muʾathirāt al-Ajnabīyah fī al-Adab al-ʿArabī al-Ḥadīth (2nd ed.; Cairo, 1966), II, 57-64.

10. See Rāfiʿī, op. cit., I, 93-114, ʿAwad, op. cit., II, 68-79 and 82-103 for composition, role and development of councils under French rule.

11. See Rāfiʿī, op. cit., I, 266-275 for causes leading to the revolt.

12. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Rāfiʿī, Tārīkh al-Ḥarakah al-Qawmīyah fī Miṣr (3rd ed.; Cairo, 1958), II, 118.

13. Ibid., p. 147.

14. ʿAwaḍ, op. cit., II, 105 who also gives biographical notes on Yaʿqūb.

15. This plan is known from letters sent by Captain Joseph Edmonds to the First Lord of the Admiralty, Earl Saint Vincent. The letters included notes submitted by Lascaris to Captain Edmonds after Yaʿqūb's death. Lascaris was the translator of the conversations between Yaʿqūb and Edmonds. Text of letter and notes in ʿAwaḍ, op. cit., II, 112-120.

16. See Anouar Abdel-Malek, Idéologie et Renaissance Nationale (Paris, 1969), p. 219.

17. ʿAwaḍ, op. cit., p. 116.

18. Ibid., pp. 116-7.

19. Ibid., p. 118.

20. Ibid., p. 119.

21. Ibid., p. 122.

22. It is interesting to compare Yaʿqūb's plan and attitude with that of the ʿUlamāʾ who wrote a letter of subservience to Napoleon. Abdel-Malek, op. cit., pp. 233-4.

23. ʿAwaḍ, op. cit., II, 123.

24. Safran, op. cit., pp. 30, 31.

25. Albert Hourani, Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age 1798-1939 (London,1962), pp. 68-9.

26. Abu-Lughod, op. cit., p. 88.

27. Ibid., p. 89.

28. Ibid., p. 90.

29. Ibid., p. 91.

30. Ibid., p. 92.

31. ʿAwaḍ, op. cit., II, 181.

32. ʿAwaḍ points out that Egyptians knew that men were equal before God from their Islamic traditions, but equality before the law was totally new. Ibid., II, 184. It will be recalled that Napoleon had spoken of equality in his proclamations but Ṭahṭāwī gave detailed explanations of what this equality implied.

33. Abu-Lughod, op. cit., pp. 93-4. ʿAwaḍ points out that Ṭahṭāwī was living and writing in an Ottoman province at a time when the law of the Ottoman Empire was that of the Sharīʿah, hence the significance of his statements. He considers Ṭahṭāwī's explanations as the first call for the separation of religion and state, op. cit., II, 188.

34. Abu-Lughod, op. cit., p. 94.

35. Ibid., p. 115.

36. Ibid., p. 119.

37. Ibid., p. 120.

38. Ibid., p. 139.

39. Hourani, op. cit., p. 78.

40. Ibid.

41. Quoted in ibid., p. 79.

42. Quoted in Abdel-Malek, op. cit., p. 228.

43. Hourani, op. cit., p. 79.

44. Ibid., p. 80.

45. ʿAwad, op. cit., II, 175.

46. M. Sabry, La Genèse de l'Esprit National Egyptien (Paris, 1924), p. 99.

47. ʿUrābī writes in his memoirs that Saʿīd spoke to him with bitterness concerning the ease with which the French forces were able to occupy Egypt, stressing that Egypt must be protected against foreign encroachment. Ibid., p. 98.

48. By June 8, 1973 Ismāʿīl was able to obtain a firmān designating Egypt as a state and not as a province of the Ottoman Empire.

49. Verdi's Aida was commissioned by Ismāʿīl for the inauguration of the Opera House during celebrations marking the opening of the Suez Canal.

50. 4,632 schools were established. The number of public schools increased from 3,000 under M. ʿAlī to 60,000 under Ismāʿīl and to 89,893 by 1873. See Sabry, op. cit., p. 90.

51. Abu-Lughod, op. cit., pp. 44, 45 who notes that the translation of complete European legal works were undertaken owing to the establishment of the Mixed Courts in 1876.

52. Although Ismāʿīl gave the political newspapers great freedom and encouraged their criticism of the increasing foreign intervention, he did not approve of papers that criticised him personally such as Sanuʿā's satirical paper Abu Nadhārah. See Rāfiʿī, ʿAṣr Ismāʿīl (Cairo, 1932), I, 264.

53. J. M. Ahmed, The Intellectual Origins of Egyptian Nationalism (London, 1960), p. 15.

54. Ibid.

55. Ibid., p. 18.

56. Al-Afghānī's views on the need for cooperation among the Muslims are described in Chapter 3.

57. Hourani, op. cit., p. 195.

58. The French expedition had first introduced a printing press in Egypt but it was taken away by the departing French forces.

59. Ibrahim Abu-Lughod, "The Transformation of the Egyptian Elite: Prelude to the ʿUrābī Revolt", Middle East Journal, XXI, No. 3 (1967), p. 339.

60. P. J. Vatikiotis, The Modern History of Egypt (London, 1969). p. 129.

61. See Abu-Lughod, "The Transformation . . ." for formation of this élite, pp. 325-44.

62. Jacob M. Landau, Parliaments and Parties in Egypt (New York, 1954), p. 12. This phase is described by Abdel-Malek as a phase of apprenticeship in parliamentary life. Idéologie . . ., p. 269.

63. The law promulgated in 1871 had given landowners exemption from one half of all future land tax levies in return for the pre-payment of the land tax for 6 years.

64. Rāfiʿī, ʿAṣr Ismāʿīl, II, 180.

65. Ibid., p. 182.

66. Abu-Lughod, "The Tranformation . . .", pp. 341-2.

67. Ibid., p. 343.

68. Ahmed, op. cit., p. 23.

69. Abdel-Malek, op. cit., p. 272.

70. Ahmed, op. cit., p. 23.

71. Quoted in Ahmed, op. cit., p. 24.

72. Rāfiʿī, ʿAṣr Ismāʿīl, II, 217.

73. Ibid., pp. 221-2.

74. Ismāʿīl's support and acceptance of the nationalists' demands and his endeavours to stop foreign intervention in Egypt's affairs had caused the interested European Powers great concern.

75. Ahmed, op. cit., p. 24.

76. Vatikiotis, op. cit., p. 138.

77. Ibid., p. 139.

78. Hourani, op. cit., pp. 194-5.

79. See Rāfiʿī, Al-Thawrah al-ʿUrābīyah wa-al-Ihtilāl al-Injilīzī (3rd ed.; Cairo, 1966), pp. 75-87 for an analysis of the economic and political causes of the revolution.

80. Ahmed, op.cit., p. 26.

81. Ibid. See Ahmad ʿAbd al-Raḥīm Mustafā, Miṣr wa-al-Mas'alah al-Miṣrīyah (Cairo, 1965), pp. 93-107 for a detailed analysis of the European political scene preceding the ʿUrābī revolt.

82. Lord Cromer, Modern Egypt (London, 1908), I, 334.

I Biography and Historical Background

1. ʿAlī Fahmī Kāmil, Muṣṭafā Kāmil fī 34 Rabīʿan (Cairo, 1908), I, p. 60. Henceforth reference to this work will be by the author's initials.

2. Juliette Adam, Injilterrā fī Miṣr, trans: A. F. Kāmil (Cairo, 1922), p. 127.

3. AFK, I, 118-123 describes the meeting between Kāmil and the minister; ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Rāfiʿī, Muṣṭafā Kāmil Bāʿith al-Ḥarakah al-Waṭanīyah (4th ed.; Cairo, 1962), p. 23.

4. AFK, I, 125.

5. Ibid., I, 131-2.

6. Ibid., I, 137.

7. Arthur Goldschmidt Jr., "The Egyptian Nationalist Party: 1892-1919" in ed. P. M. Holt, Political and Social Change in Modern Egypt (London, 1968), p. 311.

8. AFK, I, 144-5.

9. Ibid., I, 145-6.

10. Article reprinted in ibid., I, 146-9.

11. Adam, op. cit., p. 141. ʿAbbās was not that courageous after all.

12. Accounts differ on the time and place of the first meeting between ʿAbbās and Kāmil. Aḥmad Shafīq, Mudhakkirātī fī Niṣf Qarn (Cairo, 1936), II, i, 50 says they met when the Khedive paid a visit to the School of Law and heard a welcoming speech by Kāmil. On Kāmil's return from Toulouse, he adds, they secretly met at a mosque at Qubbah and pledged to seek Egypt's salvation. Wilfred Scawen Blunt, My Diaries, 1888-1914 (London, 1932), P. 564 says Kāmil told him that he had seen much of ʿAbbās while they were both being educated in Europe. Aḥmad Rashād, Muṣṭafā Kāmil: Ḥayātuhu wa Kifāḥuhu (Cairo, 1958), p.38 says the two young men were introduced in March 1892 by Shaykh ʿAlī al-Laythī who frequented Laṭīf Salīm's salon. Writers also differ on whether Kāmil received financial support or not although al-Rāfiʿī, op, cit, p. 343 says the Khedive gave financial support to the nationalist movement.

13. AFK, I, 184, 186.

14. Ibid., I, 185. Articles from the magazine are reprinted in ibid., I, 187-328.

15. According to Jurjī Zaydān, Tarajim Mashāhīr al-Sharq fī al-Qarn al-Tāsiʿ ʿAshr (3rd ed.; Bayrūt, 1970), I, p. 399 al-Nadīm sought out Kāmil and advised him not to repeat the errors of the ʿUrābists, namely their opposition to the Khedive and their reliance on the strength of the Egyptian army rather than that of public opinion. A. Goldschmidt, "The Egyptian Nationalist . . .", p. 312 comments that this advice summed up the difference between ʿUrābī and Kāmil.

16. AFK, II, 257. Play reprinted in ibid., 167-240.

17. Details on Deloncle's attitude and jealousy of Muṣṭafā Kāmil are well documented by Arthur Goldschmidt Jr., "The Making of a Natioanlist Leader: Muṣṭafā Kāmil", paper read at MESA meeting, November, 1969, pp. 8-9.

18. Articles published in al-Ahrām, July 20 and July 21, 1894 describing Lyon's exhibition are reprinted in AFK, II, 71-87. Article on Envers' exhibition reprinted in ibid., II, 100-115.

19. Muṣṭafā Kāmil, Egyptiens et Anglais (Paris, 1906), pp. 43, 46.

20. See Rāfiʿī, op. cit., p. 53 for a reprint of the picture and pp. 52-4 for text of petition.

21. Rāfiʿī, op. cit, pp. 59-60. Juliette Adam's interest in Egypt dated from 1880. Her articles on foreign policy in La Nouvelle Revue were devoted to news of Egypt. She was very critical of the British occupation.

22. Ibid., p. 61.

23. Ibid.

24. Ella-Rachel Arié, "Juliette Adam et le Nationalisme Egyptien de 1880 à 1924", Orient, no. 20 (4ème trimestre, 1961), p. 119.

25. Quoted in Rāfiʿī, op. cit., pp. 69-70.

26. "It was considered that the politique du ventre plein would satisfy the large landowners and peasants and that the urban middle class could be ignored. So much reliance was placed on the efficiency of these methods that until 1910 no attempt was made to silence the very vituperative press or persecute the nationalist leaders." Charles Issawi, Egypt at Mid-Century (London, 1952), p. 44.

27. Details of the attempt to draft him in AFK, V, 186-193.

28. Text of letters in Rāfiʿī, op. cit., pp. 64-7, 78-9.

29. Muṣṭafā Kāmil, Al-Mas'alah al-Sharqīyah (Cairo, 1898), p. 5.

30. Yet in a letter written as early as September 18, 1895 to ʿAbd al-Raḥīm Aḥmad Bey, Kāmil wrote: "No matter how much loyalty the French show towards us they are like the British seeking their own interests. If we chose to draw closer to them it is a policy, dictated by circumstances, which we are adopting to make use of them and to transform their hostility into love, even momentarily . . ." In Muhammad Anīs, Safaḥāt Maṭwīyah min Tārīkh al-Zaʿīm Muṣṭafā Kāmil (Cairo, 1962), p. 11. The letter also indicates that Kāmil, although aware of France's ambitions, nevertheless, hoped to gain from Anglo-French rivalry.

31. Kāmil, Egyptiens . . ., p. 212; Rāfiʿī, op. cit., p. 140.

32. Rāfiʿī, op. cit., p. 133 comments that the agreement took the people by surprise as nothing had been published concerning it.

33. Ibid., pp. 141-2.

34. AFK, IX, 140-1, 177-8.

35. Goldschmidt, "The Egyptian Nationalist . . .", p. 318 comments that Kāmil was denied space in al-Mu'ayyad because Shaykh ʿAlī Yusuf seems to have realised that Kāmil's growing popularity as a writer and orator gave him a base of support potentially independent of the Khedive and ʿAlī Yusuf."

36. AFK, IX, 204-5.

37. Rāfiʿī, op. cit., p. 162.

38. See Elizabeth Monroe, Britain's Moment in the Middle East (London, 1963), p. 19 for circumstances leading to the conclusion of this agreement.

39. Rashād, op. cit., p. 183. In his letter Kāmil expressed the humiliation he felt when he realised Egyptians would be the laughing-stock of the British for having relied on France.

40. Rāfiʿī, op. cit., p. 181.

41. Ibid., p. 438; Rashād, op. cit., p. 201.

42. Rāfiʿī, op. cit., p. 190, 193.

43. Ibid., p. 195.

44. Details of incident in ibid., pp. 199-202.

45. Full text of article in ibid., pp. 208-16.

46. Ibid., p. 245.

47. Letter to Muḥammad Farīd in Adam, op. cit., p. 273.

48. Goldschmidt, "The Egyptian Nationalist . . .", p. 311 writes that Laṭīf Salīm formed a secret society in 1893 which he called the Nationalist Party. "Its purposes were to organise Egyptians to work for their country's independence and to present its cause to European, specially French, public opinion...Kāmil was in Paris when this party was formed but joined after his return to Cairo and soon superseded Laṭīf Salīm as its leader."

49. Letter to Muḥammad Farīd in Adam, op. cit., p. 273.

50. Rāfi'ī, op. cit., pp. 262, 265.

51. Detailed programme in Shafīq, op. cit, II, ii, 127. Cf. Landau, Parliaments . . ., pp. 116-7.

52. Landau, op. cit., p. 117.

53. Ahmed, op. cit., p. 78.

54. Such people as Aḥmad Luṭfī al-Sayyid, editor of al-Jarīdah and member of the opposing Ummah party greatly mourned him. See Muḥammad Ḥusayn Haykal, Mudhakirāt fī al-Siyāsah al-Miṣrīyah (Cairo, 1951-3), I, 33.

II Nationalism

1. Hourani, Arabic Thought . . ., p. 199.

2. This is contested by Abdel-Malek, Idéologie . . ., pp. 48-9 who bases his arguments on Cromer's own report of 1891.

3. Hourani, op. cit., p. 133.

4. Ahmed, Intellectual Origins . . ., p. 28.

5. Ibid., p. 42.

6. Hourani, op. cit., p. 199.

7. Aḥmad Amīn, Ḥayātī (2nd ed.; Cairo, 1952), p. 81 who adds that when he heard this philosophy he asked his father whether the British had been obedient to the Will of God and had, therefore, been given mastery over Egypt. He was rebuked by his father and given no reply. P. G. Elgood, The Transit of Egypt (London, 1928), p. 140 writes: After Tel el Kebir "the country insensibly slipped back into a melancholy groove . . . over the people there had crept a disappointing apathy . . . public opinion did not dare venture on expression in those days: apprehension sealed men's lips, and concealed their hopes and fears." Describing the situation in Egypt at the time the Khedive ʿAbbās Ḥilmī wrote: "There was no moral strength of any kind. The events of 1881 spread confusion and dissension everywhere. Everybody looked as if he had lost his way in the general chaos that prevailed. The servants of the public lost their sense of loyalty because they did not know where it lay." Quoted in Ahmed, op. cit., p. 27.

8. This view advanced by al-Rāfiʿī and Shafīq as well as many other writers, is contested by the Egyptian marxists and J. Berque who give al-Nadīm and other publicists the credit for having kept the nationalist spirit alive and brought the notion of waṭan close to the masses when it had formerly been only known to the educated élite. See Abdel-Malek, op. cit., pp. 449, 494.

9. AFK, IX, 64-5.

10. Kāmil, Egyptiens et Anglais, pp. 170, 197.

11. AFK, VI, 98.

12. Kāmil, op. cit., p. 268.

13. Hourani, op. cit., p. 342. Other types of nationalism described are religious nationalism: "the assertion that all who adhered to the same religion should form a single political community" and an ethnic

or linguistic nationalism "based on the idea that all who spoke the same language constituted a single nation and should form an independent political unit." Ibid., pp. 341, 342.

14. In Hans Kohn, A History of Nationalism in the East (New York, 1929), p. 187.

15. AFK, I, 211-13.

16. Hans Kohn, The Idea of Nationalism, a Study in Its Origins and Background (New York, 1960), p. 9.

17. Kamil used the term ummah to indicate the sum of the people and not the community of Muslims. According to Anīs Ṣayigh, Taṭawwur al-Mafhūm al-Qawmī ʿind al-ʿArab (Bayrut, 1961), p. 45 at the time of the Napoleonic expedition the word ummah referred to the millah such as the ummah of the Copts or the ummah of the Maronites. It was also used in a general sense to indicate the people. An expression such as "there were many umam" meant there were many people.

18. AFK, I, 213.

19. Ibid., VI, 100.

20. Kāmil, op. cit, pp. 201, 230.

21. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Rāfiʿī, Muṣṭafā Kāmil, Bāʿith al-Ḥarakah al-Waṭanīyah (4th ed.; Cairo, 1962), p. 223.

22. Ibid., p. 481.

23. See introduction for his views on the subject.

24. Hourani, op. cit., pp. 78-9.

25. Ibid., p. 194.

26, AFK, IV, 148.

27. Rafi i, op. cit., p. 431, quoted in Hourani, op. cit., p. 206.

28. AFK, IV, 147-8.

29. Ibid., VI, 99.

30. Ibid., VI, 37.

31. Rāfiʿī, op. cit., pp. 149, 448.

32. Kāmil, op. cit., pp. 166-7. To support his argument Kāmil recalled

the historical event when Muslim officials in Egypt once urged the Khalīfah to stop the conversion of Egyptians to Islām because the jizyah had diminished and the treasury had been depleted. The Khalīfah had replied that the Prophet had been sent to spread the faith and not to collect the jizyah. Hence, a vast number of Muslims were Egyptians and descendants of the Pharoahs, who had embraced Islām.

33. Ibrahīm ʿAbduh, Jaridat al-Ahrām (Cairo, 1951), pp. 122, 226.

34. Ahmed, op. cit., p. 82.

35. Cromer, op. cit., II, 214.

36. Ibid., pp. 216, 217.

37. Faris Nimr, co-owner of al-Muqaṭṭam was nicknamed Shaykh al-Iḥtilaliyin. Ahmed, op. cit., p. 83.

38. Ibid., p. 82.

39. AFK, V, 184.

40. Ibid., IX, 69-71.

41. Ibid., II, 23, 25-7.

42. Ibid., V, 74; IV, 98.

43. Kāmil, Egyptiens . . ., p. 160; AFK, VI, 25.

44. AFK, IX, 154.

45. Ibid., III, 97.

46. Ibid., IV, 159.

47. Franz Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, trans. Constance Farrington (New York, 1968), p. 95.

48. Noting the incident in his memoirs Shafīq, Mudhakirātī . . ., II, ii, 55 says the Khedive was very angry with Kāmil because of his strong criticism of the government.

49. Rāfiʿī, op. cit., p. 347.

50. Blunt, My Diaries . . ., p. 577; Shafīq, op. cit., II, ii, 103.

51. Blunt, op. cit., p. 577.

52. In an interview with Mr. Dicey of the Daily Telegraph, ʿAbbās expressed his readiness to cooperate with the British and pronounced the British occupation better than any other occupation. Quoted in Rāfiʿī, op. cit., 349-50.

53. Kāmil told Blunt that ʿAbbās "thinks of nothing but making money . . . He has lost all his friends and has ended by having no influence whatever in Egypt. If he had had any courage, he might, over and over again, have held his own against Cromer and done incalculable good to his country, but he cares nothing now for his country, only for money. He puts up with endless indignities from Cromer, who has a hold over him through a knowledge of his rascalities and he clings to his L.E.100,00 a year and makes himself Cromer's servant . . . ." In Blunt, op. cit., pp. 564-5.

54, Landau, Parliaments . . ., p. 142; Rāfiʿī, op. cit., p. 370.

55. See Hourani, op. cit., p. 207; Safran, Egypt in Search . . ., p. 89.

56. Niyazi Berkes, The Development of Secularism in Turkey (Montreal, 1964), pp. 304-313 for an explanation of the movement of the "Young Turks" and their objectives.

57. Rāfiʿī, op. cit., p. 166.

58. Kāmil, op. cit., pp. 276-7.

59. Rāfiʿī, op. cit., pp. 166-7, quoted in Safran, op. cit., p. 89.

60. AFK, IX, 291.

61. Article dated May 26, 1907 in Rāfiʿī, op. cit., p. 350, quoted in Safran, op. cit., 89.

62. Rāfiʿī, op. cit., p. 255.

63. Ibid., p. 215.

64. John Marlowe, A History of Modern Egypt and Anglo-Egyptian Relations, 1800-1956 (Connecticut, 1965), p. 187.

65. Abdel-Malek, op. cit., p. 348 who comments that what was at stake was of grave importance; it was a question of diminishing the intelligence, weakening its sources of inspiration in order to halt the impetus which, held up, throughout the nineteenth century, the nationalist renaissance of Egypt and provided her with thinkers and leaders, p. 349.

66. During Ismāʿīl's reign no fees had been paid by all students of government schools. Moreover, students were provided with clothes, food and lodging. Cromer admits in his 1902 report that the object

of the educational policy was to limit the number of students. See Abdel-Malek, op. cit., p. 352.

67. Lord Lloyd, Egypt Since Cromer (London, 1933), I, 164.

68. George Young, Egypt (London, 1927), p. 166.

69. Valentine Chirol, The Egyptian Problem (London, 1920), p. 221.

70. Abdel-Malek, op. cit., p. 365 gives an account of the curriculum given to the 4th year of secondary school, completely ignoring the history of Egypt and of the Islamic countries.

71. AFK, II, 3-4.

72. Ibid., II, 4-5.

73. Kāmil, op. cit., p. 291.

74. Ibid.

75. AFK, IX, 44, 83.

76. Kāmil, op. cit., pp. 269-70, 293.

77. Ibid., p. 292.

78. AFK, IX, 75.

79. Kāmil, op. cit., pp. 205-6.

80. AFK, IX, 197-8. Kāmil's views on Islām and nationalism are elaborated in the following chapter.

81. Ibid., IX, 75.

82. Ibid., IX, 197.

83. Ibid., IX, 195.

84. Ibid., VI, 41, 146

85. Ibid., VI, 41.

86. Ibid., IX, 37, 280.

87. Ibid. IX, 38. Describing Arabic as a noble language Milner said: "its literature did not contain the great body of modern knowledge, The very terminology of physical science is wanting. Thus, the young Egyptian in learning English or French . . . is obtaining

the means of studying history, geography and science, as they cannot at present be studied in Arabic." A. Milner, England in Egypt (London, 1899), p. 302.

88. AFK, IX, 38, 39.

89. Abdel-Malek, op. cit., pp. 364-5.

90. Kāmil, op. cit., pp. 122, 123.

91. Hourani, op. cit., p. 79.

92. Ibid., p. 78.

93. Ibid., p. 81.

III Pan-Islamism

1. Safran, Egypt in Search . . ., p. 87.

2. Rāfi'ī, Muṣṭafā . . ., pp. 148-9. Translation from Safran, op. cit., pp. 87-8.

3. AFK, IX, 250, 252.

4. Ibid., IX, 252.

5. Ibid., IX, 282-3; Kāmil, Egyptiens . . ., p. 205. These ideas were expressed by Afghānī and other Islamic reformers.

6. Kāmil, Egyptiens . . ., p. 283.

7. Ahmed, Intellectual Origins . . ., p. 60.

8. A society "directed from Constantinople and operated in Egypt under the leadership of a certain 'Alī al-Mu'ayyad, maintaining a close secrecy about its enrolment and proceedings." Landau, Parliaments . . ., p. 121.

9. A society "reputed to have a membership of thousands and branches in the most important towns of Egypt, it also included many people of prominence in religious and other walks of life . . . The aims of this society were to uplift Islām and preserve its rites and laws intact by creating a united front against all Christians." Ibid., p. 122.

10. Kohn, A History of Nationalism . . ., p. 189.

11. Lloyd, Egypt since Cromer, I, 41-2.

12. Chirol, The Egyptian Problem, p. 95.

13. Elgood, Egypt and the Army (London, 1924), pp. 20, 21.

14. D. Ede "Some Considerations on Pan-Islamism", paper at Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, Dec. 1, 1968. The Crusade was religious, intellectual and polemic, not just military.

15. Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī and Muḥammad 'Abduh, Al-'Urwah al-Wuthqā (Cairo, 1957), pp. 10, 11, 90.

16. S. Haim, Arab Nationalism (Berkeley, 1962), p. 9. Berkes, Secularism . . ., p. 269 points out that Afghānī was not the originator of Pan-Islamism in Turkey. The idea had already been articulated some years before he developed his concept.

Moreover, Afghānī did not even have a chance to play a part in the Pan-Islamic policy of ʿAbdul-Ḥamid.

17. Hourani, Arabic Thought . . ., p. 116.

18. Al-Afghānī, Al-ʿUrwah . . ., p. 72.

19. Ibid., p. 272. S. Haim, op. cit., p. 15 maintains that Afghānī was ultimately "prepared to equate national solidarity to religious solidarity and to prefer the former should it prove more effective than the latter." She adds, however, that "his ideas on national solidarity could not have been widely known in Arabic-speaking lands since the Khatirat were not published until 1931 . . ."

20. Muṣṭafā Kāmil, Al-Mas'alah al-Sharqīyah (Cairo, 1898), p. 224.

21. Kāmil, Egyptiens . . ., p. 183.

22. Kāmil, Al-Mas'alah . . ., p. 278; AFK, IX, 217.

23. AFK, IX, 216-7.

24. Ibid., IX, 217.

25, Kāmil, Egyptiens . . ., 183; Rāfiʿī, Muṣṭafā . . ., p. 362.

26. In effect the British could only declare a protectorate over Egypt in 1914 when the Ottoman Empire entered the 1st World War on the opposing side.

27. Rāfiʿī, Muṣṭafā . . ., p. 367. Rāfiʿī, op. cit., p. 361 reports that Lord Dufferin had sought to take over the jizyah paid by Egypt to the Porte but the Sulṭān had rejected the idea.

28. AFK, V, 91.

29. Kāmil, Egyptiens . . ., p. 76. Here again Kāmil is echoing Al-ʿUrwah's emphasis on Egypt's leading part in the Muslim world.

30. Kāmil, Al-Mas'alah . . ., pp. 278-9.

31. Kāmil, Egyptiens . . ., p. 76.

32. AFK, VI, 189, 18.

33. Ibid., VI, 45, 190.

34. Ibid., VI, 186-7.

35. Ibid., VI, 45, 76.

36. Ibid., VI, 75, 77.

37. Ibid., VI, 77.

38, Ibid., VI, 190.

39. Ibid., IX, 18.

40. Ibid., IX, 253.

41. Ibid., IX, 18. Afghānī had also called for "a general conference of Islamic leaders" to be held in Constantinople, "to decide questions of common concern and declare a jihād against western aggression." Hourani, op. cit., p. 116.

42. AFK, VI, 93.

43. Adam, Injilterrā . . ., p. 243.

44. Rashād, Muṣṭafā Kāmil . . ., p. 223.

45. Ibid., pp. 225, 224.

46. Rāfiʿī, op. cit., p. 508.

47. AFK, IX, 254.

48. Ibid., 254-5.

49. Rashād, op. cit., p. 239; Kāmil, Egyptiens . . ., p. 173.

50. Berkes, Secularism . . ., p. 270.

Conclusion

1. Hourani, Arabic Thought . . ., pp. 201-2, 160.

2. Alexander, The Truth . . ., p. 132 quoted in Hourani, op. cit., p. 202.

3. The Memoirs of Sir Ronald Storrs (New York, 1937), pp. 81-2, quoted in Hourani, op. cit., p. 202.

4. P. 564.

5. Elgood, Egypt and the Army, p. 20.

6. Quoted in Rashād, Muṣṭafā Kāmil . . ., p. 297.

7. See Zaydān, Tarājim Mashāhīr . . ., p. 391 and Haykal, Tarājim Miṣrīyah . . ., pp. 140-1 for a description of the feeling of loss and sadness experienced by a vast number of Egyptians at Kāmil's death.

8. Al-Liwā', May 18, 1906 in Rāfi'ī, Muṣṭafā . . ., p. 430. See Desmond Stewart, Young Egypt (London, 1958), p. 184 who quoted 'Abd al-Nāṣir as having told him: "From 1934 I read the work of Muṣṭafā Kāmil. I read his biography, I read all the articles by him which had appeared in the newspapers . . .". Also see A. Abdel-Malek, Egypt: Military Society (New York, 1968), pp. 207-8.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abdel Malek, Anouar. Egypt: Military Society. (Trans. by C.L. Markmann) New York: Random House, 1968.

-------- Idéologie et Renaissance Nationale L'Egypte Moderne. Paris: Editions Anthropos, 1969.

ʿAbduh, Ibrāhīm. Jarīdat al-Ahrām. Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1951.

Abu-Lughod, Ibrahim. Arab Rediscovery of Europe. New Jersey: Princeton, 1963.

-------- "The Transformation of the Egyptian Élite: Prelude to the ʿUrābī Revolt", Middle East Journal, XXI, No. 3. (1967) pp. 325-344.

Adam, Juliette. Injilterrā fī Misr. (Trans. by A. F. Kāmil). Cairo: Maṭbaʿat Shirkat al-ʿIlm wa-al-Difāʿ al-Waṭanī, 1922.

-------- ed. Letrres Égyptiènnes Françaises, Addressées par Moustafa Kamel à Mme Juliette Adam. Cairo: 1908.

Adams, C.C. Islam and Modernism in Egypt. London: Oxford Un. Press, 1933.

Al-Afghānī, Jamāl al-Dīn and Muhammad ʿAbduh. Al-ʿUrwah al-Wuthqā. Cairo: Dār al-ʿArab, 1957.

Ahmed, Jamal Mohammed. The Intellectual Origins of Egyptian Nationalism. London: Oxford Un. Press, 1960.

Alexander, J. The Truth about Egypt. London: Cassell, 1911.

Amīn, Aḥmad. Hayātī. Cairo: Maktabat al-Adāb, 1952.

Anīs, Muḥammad. Safaḥat Maṭwīyah min Tārīkh al-Zaʿīm Muṣṭafā Kāmil. Cairo: Maktabat al-Anglo al-Miṣrīyah, 1962.

Arié, Ella Rachel. "Juliette Adam et le Nationalisme Egyptien de 1880 à 1924", Orient, No. 20 (4ème trimestre, 1961), pp. 117-143.

ʿAwad, L. Al-Muʾathirāt al-Ajnabīyah fī al-Adab al-ʿArabī al-Ḥadīth. Vol. II. Cairo: Dar al-Ma rifah, 1966.

Baer, Gabriel. A History of Landownership in Modern Egypt. London: Oxford Un. Press, 1962.

El-Barawy, Rashed. The Military Coup. Cairo: Renaissance Book Shop, 1952.

Berkes, Niyazi. The Development of Secularism in Turkey. Montreal: McGill Un. Press, 1964.

Blunt, Wilfred Scawen. My Diaries Being a Personal Narrative of Events 1888-1914. London: Martin Secker, 1932.

--------. Secret History of the English Occupation of Egypt. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1922.

Chirol, Sir Valentine. The Egyptian Problem. London: Macmillan, 1920.

Cromer, the Earl of. Modern Egypt. Two wolumes. London: Macmillan, 1908.

Dunya, Abd al- Aziz Hafiz. Rasā'il Tārīkhīyah min Mustafā Kāmil ilā Fu'ād Salīm al-Hijāzī. Bayrūt: Dar al-Nahḍah al-'Arabīyah, 1969.

Elgood, P. G. The Transit of Egypt. London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1928.

--------. Egypt and the Army. London: Oxford Un. Press, 1924.

Emerson, Rupert. From Empire to Nation. Cambridge: Harvard Un. Press, 1960.

Fanon, Franz. The Wretched of the Earth. (Trans. by C. Farrington). New York: Grove Press, 1968.

Gibb, H. A. R. Modern Trends in Islam. Chicago: Un. of Chicago Press, 1947.

Haim, Sylvia. Arab Nationalism. Berkeley: U. C. Press, 1962.

Goldschmidt, Arthur, Jr. "The Egyptian Nationalist Party: 1892-1919", in P. M. Holt, ed., Political and Social Change in Modern Egypt. London: Oxford Un. Press, 1968.

Harris, Christina Phelps. Nationalism and Revolution in Egypt. London: Mouton & Co., 1964.

Haykal, Muḥammad Ḥusayn. Mukhakarāt fī al-Siyāsah al-Miṣrīyah. Two volumes. Cairo: Maktabat al-Nahḍah al-Miṣrīyah, 1951-1953.

--------. Tarājim Miṣrīyah wa-Gharbīyah. Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Siyāsah, 1929

Hourani, Albert. Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age 1789-1939. London: Oxford Un. Press, 1962.

Ḥusayn, Aḥmad. Al-Itijāhāt al-Waṭanīyah fī al-Adab al-Miṣrī al-Ḥadīth. Two volumes. Cairo: Maktabat al-Adāb, 1954-1956

Issawi, Charles. Egypt at Mid-Century, an Economic Survey. London: Oxford Un. Press, 1954.

Kāmil, ʿAlī Fahmī. Muṣṭafā Kāmil Bāshā fī 34 Rabīʿan. Nine volumes. Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Liwāʾ, 1908-1910

Kāmil, Muṣṭafa. Egyptiens et Anglais. Paris: Perrin et Cie., 1906.

-------- Al-Masʾalah al-Sharqīyah. Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Adāb, 1898.

Kedourie, Elie. England and the Middle East. London: Bowes & Bowes, 1956.

-------- Nationalism. London: Hutchinson Un. Library, 1960.

Kohn, Hans. A History of Nationalism in the East. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1929.

-------- The Idea of Nationalism, a Study in Its Origins and Background. New York: Macmillan, 1960.

Landau, Jacob M. Parliaments and Parties in Egypt. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1954.

Landes, David S. Bankers and Pashas. London: Heinman, 1958.

Lacqueur, Walter. Communism and Nationalism in the Middle East. London: Routledge & Kagan Paul, 1956.

Lerner, Daniel. The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernising the Middle East. Glencoe: Free Press, 1958.

Lewis, Bernard. The Middle East and the West. New York: Harper, 1964.

Lloyd, Lord. Egypt since Cromer. Vol. I. London: Macmillan, 1933.

Marlowe, John. A History of Modern Egypt and Anglo-Egyptian Relations 1800-1956. Connecticut: Ardion Books, 1965.

Milner, A. England in Egypt. London: Edward Arnold, 1899.

Monroe, Elizabeth. Britain's Moment in the Middle East 1914-1956. London: Chatto & Windus, 1963.

Mūsā, Salāmah. Tarbiyat Salāmah Mūsā. Bayrūt: Muʾasasat al-Khanjī, 1958.

Muṣṭafā, Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Raḥīm, Miṣr wa-al-Masʾalah al-Miṣrīyah min 1876 ilā 1882. Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1956.

Newman, E. W. P. Great Britain in Egypt. London: Cassell, 1928.

Al-Rāfiʿī, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān. ʿAṣr Ismāʿīl. Two volumes. Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Nahḍah, 1932.

-------- ʿAṣr Muḥammad ʿAlī. Cairo: Maktabat al-Nahḍah, 1947.

-------- Muṣṭafā Kāmil, Bāʿith al-Ḥarakah al-Waṭanīyah. Cairo: Maktabat al-Nahḍah, 1962.

-------- Tārīkh al-Ḥarakah al-Qawmīyah fī Miṣr. Two volumes. Cairo: Maktabat al-Nahḍah, 1955 & 1958.

-------- Al-Thawrah al-ʿUrābīyah wa-al-Iḥtilāl al-Injilīzī. Cairo: al-Dār al-Qawmīyah, 1966.

-------- Thawrat 23 Yulio, 1952. Cairo: Maktabat al-Naḥḍah, 1959.

Rashād, Aḥmad. Muṣṭafā Kāmil, Ḥayātuhu wa Kifāḥuhū. Cairo: Maktabat al-Saʿādah, 1958.

Rifaat, Mohammed. The Awakening of Modern Egypt. London: Longman's, Green & Co., 1947.

Sabry, M. La Genèse de l'Esprit National Egyptien. Paris: Librarie Vrin, 1924.

-------- La Question d'Egypte, depuis Bonaparte jusqu'à la Revolution de 1919. Paris: Association Egyptienne de Paris, 1920.

Safran, Nadav. Egypt in Search of Political Community. Cambridge: Harvard Un. Press, 1961.

Saʿīd, Amīn. Tārīkh Miṣr al-Siyāsī. Cairo: ʿIsā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1959.

Ṣayigh, Anīs. Taṭawwur al-Mafhūm al-Qawmī ʿind al-ʿArab. Bayrūt: Dār al-Ṭalīʿah, 1961.

Al-Sayyid, Aḥmad Lutfī. Qiṣat Ḥayātī. Cairo: Dār al-Hilāl, n.d.

Shafer, Boyd C. Nationalism, Myth and Reality. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1955.

Al-Shafiʿi, Shuhdī ʿAṭīyah. Taṭawwur al-Ḥarakah al-Waṭanīyah al-Miṣrīyah. Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Dār al-Miṣrīyah, 1957.

Shafīq, Aḥmad. Mudhakirātī fī Niṣf Qarn. Two volumes. Cairo: Maṭbaʿat Miṣr, 1934-1936.

Smith, W.C. Islam in Modern History. New York: Mentor Books, 1961

Snyder, Louis C. The New Nationalism. New York: Cornell Un. Press, 1968.

Stewart, Desmond. Young Egypt. London: Allan Wingate, 1958.

Storrs, Ronald. The Memoirs of Sir Ronald Storrs. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1937.

Tajir, Jaq. Aqbat wa-Muslimun, munth al-Fath al- Arabi ila Am 1922. Cairo: Karasat al-Miṣri, 1951.

Waḥidah, Subḥi. Fī Uṣūl al-Mas'alah al-Miṣrīyah. Cairo: Maṭba'at Miṣr, 1950.

Young, George. Egypt. London: Ernest Benn Ltd., 1927.

Zaydān, Jurjī. Mashāhīr al-Sharq fī al-Qarn al-Tāsi' 'Ashr. Volume I. Bayrūt: Dār Maktabat al-Ḥayāt, 1970.