

# Islam Assembled

The Advent of the Muslim Congresses

---



MARTIN KRAMER

# ISLAM ASSEMBLED

*The Advent of the Muslim Congresses*

MARTIN KRAMER

*New York* Columbia University Press 1986



### THREE

## AN IDEA REFINED

### *First Proposals from Cairo*

**I**N THE independent Ottoman and Qajar states, the congress idea and its early advocates bore a stigma. Only in British Egypt, an occupied country whose liberation was advocated so persistently by Blunt and Afghani, was the idea allowed to flourish. From subjugated Cairo, Muhammad 'Abduh (1849–1905), Blunt's associate and Afghani's disciple, further propagated the congress idea. This he did in collaboration with his own student, Muhammad Rashid Rida (1865–1935), from Syrian Tripoli. Their instrument was *al-Manar*, a Cairo journal of religious and political affairs, and perhaps the most widely circulated Muslim periodical of its time. The achievement of these two men was that they took advanced notions of religious reform, tainted by association with skepticism, and through judicious recasting made them more widely palatable. Among those notions was that of a Muslim congress.

The bond linking 'Abduh to Afghani and Blunt was a close one. Blunt's quest for the true Islam had led him to 'Abduh, then a shaykh from the Delta teaching at al-Azhar, as early as 1881. The debt owed by the Englishman to the Egyptian was an acknowledged one, and Blunt found in 'Abduh a sympathizer with his radical ideas on religious reform and the caliphate:

Sheykh Mohammed Abdu was strong on the point that what was needed for the Mohammedan body politic was not merely reforms but a true religious reformation. On the question of the Caliphate he looked at that time, in common with most enlightened Moslems, to its reconstruction on a more spiritual basis. He explained to me how a more legitimate exercise of its authority might be made to give new impulse to intellectual progress, and how little those who for centuries had held the title had deserved the spiritual headship of believers. The House of Othman for two hundred years had cared almost nothing for religion, and beyond the right of the sword had no claim any longer to allegiance. They were still the most powerful Mohammedan princes and so able to do most for the general advantage, but unless they could be induced to take their position seriously a new Emir el Mumenin might legitimately be looked for.<sup>1</sup>

In 'Abduh's writings, too, there was a discernible affection, if not pref-

erence, for the Arabs in this matter, although never in terms as extreme as Blunt's.<sup>2</sup>

More important was ʿAbduh's relationship with Afghani. When Afghani came to Cairo, first in 1869 and again in 1871, ʿAbduh became his fervent acolyte. Later, following ʿAbduh's self-incriminating involvement in the ʿUrabi revolt, he joined Afghani in that Paris room where together they wrote and edited *al-ʿUrwa al-wuthqa*. Although Afghani and ʿAbduh parted in 1884 upon the closure of the newspaper, never to meet again, an important correspondence between them survives. From it, we learn that ʿAbduh took it upon himself to spread the word, at least during a visit to Tunis, that *al-ʿUrwa al-wuthqa* was not simply a newspaper but a secret Muslim society under Afghani's guidance, with branches throughout the Muslim world. Unfortunately, only the internal regulations of the "fourth cell" of this imaginary society survive, so that it is impossible to say whether ʿAbduh envisioned a general Muslim congress of all the cells within the secret society.<sup>3</sup> It seems nonetheless certain that ʿAbduh was fully acquainted with the congress idea as it appeared in Blunt's work, and as possibly mentioned by Afghani.

In 1897, ʿAbduh, soon to be mufti of Egypt, was joined in Cairo by Shaykh Muhammad Rashid Rida, a young enthusiast of religious reform from Syrian Tripoli. That same year, they founded *al-Manar*, a journal which advanced reformist ideas through Qurʾanic exegesis and political commentary. *Al-Manar* was controversial from the very beginning. According to a group of ulama who asked that it be barred from Tunisia in 1904, the journal "had not ceased to undermine, at their foundations, the most essential and least debatable principles of Muslim orthodoxy."<sup>4</sup> Rashid Rida was often accused during his lifetime of religious nonconformism, and was the target of an ugly disturbance which followed a lesson taught by him in 1908 at the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus.<sup>5</sup> In ʿAbduh and Rida, then, the congress idea remained associated with far-reaching reformism. Yet *al-Manar's* wide circulation, and consequent influence upon thought among Muslim readers as distant as Java and South Africa, gained for their ideas a more extensive following than in the past.<sup>6</sup> Through *al-Manar*, the rationale for a congress made inroads far afield.

*Al-Manar* first raised the congress issue in an article on religious reform, directed to Abdülhamid and published in 1898 in the first volume of the new journal. The article opened with explicit reference to Abdülhamid as *amir al-muʾminin*, and then went on to note that the unification of creeds, teachings, and laws was the most important principle of Islamic reform.

This reform is consistent with the creation of an Islamic society, under the auspices of the caliph, which will have a branch in every Islamic land. Its greatest branch should be in Mecca, a city to which Muslims come from all over the world and where they fraternize at its holy sites. The most important meeting of this branch should be held during the pilgrimage season, when members (*ḥadā*) from the rest of the branches in the rest of the world come on pilgrimage. Thus they can bring back to their own branches whatever is decided, secretly and openly, in the general assembly (*al-mujtamaʿ al-ʿamm*). This is one of the advantages of establishing the great society at Mecca rather than *Dar al-Khilafa* [Istanbul]. There are other advantages, the most important among them being the distance [of Mecca] from the intrigues and suspicions of [non-Muslim] foreigners, and security from their knowing what there is no need for them to know, either in part or in whole.<sup>7</sup>

Here was an early expression of that radical concept of pilgrimage which set Muslim reformers apart. The traditional pilgrimage was an obligation performed usually once, by individual Muslims in search of a transcendent religious experience of communion with God. The exchange of ideas between pilgrims themselves was incidental. Shaykhs ʿAbduh and Rida made that exchange central. An article in *al-Manar* lamented the attitude of returning pilgrims, who spoke much about their journey and not at all about the circumstances under which their Muslim brethren elsewhere lived. This was contrary to the meaning of the name ʿArafat, the great plain on which all pilgrims stood before God at the close of the pilgrimage: it was a place not only of ritual and prayer, but mutual acquaintance (*taʿaruf*).<sup>8</sup>

In Mecca itself, this exchange would be institutionalized. The proposed society would publish a religious journal in the holy city, and work to counter religious innovations and corrupt teachings. A book would be composed by the society, in which the principles of Muslim faith would be set down in conformity with the society's decisions. This work would then be translated into all Muslim languages, "and the caliph would announce that *this* is Islam, and all who believe in it are brethren in faith." The caliph would also order the society to compose books of law, drawn from all the schools (*madhahib*) and adapted to contemporary circumstances, and the resulting legislation would take effect in all Muslim states. But the caliph himself, while presiding over this unification, would be a member like all other members in the society.

The choice of Mecca as the society's center, and the relegation of the caliph to the position of an ordinary member of the society, were probably sufficient to alert Ottoman authorities to the nature of this proposal. The appeal, although couched in a deferential tone, could only offend

Ottoman sensibilities and those Muslims for whom the claims of Istanbul and the Ottoman caliphate were not open to dispute. The following year, ʿAbduh and Rida complained that their proposal had played on the minds of these Muslims, and had taken a strange form among some writers. These had urged that the Muslim congress (*al-muʿtamar al-islami*) be convened in Istanbul. This modification was completely detached from reality, argued an article in *al-Manar*: not only would a congress set in Istanbul do more harm than good, but the idea was opposed by Abdülhamid himself. The evidence for this opposition, theorized the article, could be found in the complete absence of such a proposal from the Istanbul press.<sup>9</sup> The proposal for an Istanbul congress had originated not in Istanbul, but in the Indian Muslim press, and *al-Manar* cited an Indian example calling for the creation of an Islamic association (*mujtamaʿ islami*) in Istanbul, under the presidency of Abdülhamid.<sup>10</sup>

The poor reception which greeted *al-Manar*'s proposal was evidenced in yet another controversy. In one of his pieces on Islam, the French historian and diplomat Gabriel Hanotaux, against whom ʿAbduh had launched a vigorous polemic, wrote that Paris was an appropriate site for the creation of a society of ulama from all parts. Such a society, Hanotaux argued, would draw Muslims closer to France. *Al-Manar* launched a vigorous attack upon this suggestion, and repeated the principles of its earlier proposal.

How did the Muslims receive this [original] proposal? The great majority are neither sensitive nor thoughtful, and as far as those assigned to write and thus guide the Muslims through the newspapers, they disfigured the proposal and turned away from its intent. They started writing articles urging an "Islamic congress" (*muʿtamar islami*) in Istanbul, and so could not wait to divert the proposal into the deserts of fantasy, except to urge a switch in the venue. Among our proofs against them, by which we made them realize the error of their opinion, was to ask whether there was even one Istanbul newspaper that supported this appeal, given that all of these newspapers are virtually official, and print only what the authorities wish them to print.<sup>11</sup>

From *al-Manar*'s account, it was thus clear that Abdülhamid continued to oppose the idea of a congress, not only in Mecca but under his own auspices in the Ottoman capital. The reasons for his opposition to a Meccan congress were apparent, given his concern over Arab separatism in general and Hijazi autonomy in particular.<sup>12</sup> The Istanbul setting probably was rejected on other grounds. It almost certainly seemed to the authorities a roundabout means for the establishment of a structurally parliamentary forum in the capital of the Empire. As the point of Hamidian pan-Islam, in the domestic sphere, was the enhancement

of the absolute authority of sultan-caliph, support for such a congress would have directly contradicted established policy.

Yet while *al-Manar* was incapable of overcoming these obstacles to the organization of a congress, the journal was the perfect device for the wide dissemination of the idea through a literary piece of fiction. The congress idea was given detailed expression for the first time in ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Kawakibi's well-known Arabic treatise, *Umm al-qura*, first published in 1900.<sup>13</sup> *Umm al-qura*, one of the names of Mecca, was where Kawakibi set a fictional Muslim congress the proceedings of which he ostensibly recorded but in fact composed.<sup>14</sup> *Umm al-qura* represented not only the most imaginative treatment, but also the most virulently anti-Ottoman elaboration, of the congress theme. For in these imaginary proceedings, Kawakibi argued at length for an end to the Ottoman caliphate, and its replacement by an Arabian Qurashi caliphate in close association with a great Muslim congress. Rashid Rida took this work and made it famous, through serialization in *al-Manar*.

Kawakibi (1854–1902) and his writings were not celebrated during his lifetime, so that important questions about his political affiliations and sincerity remain unresolved. Even the details of his public career are not clear. He was born in Aleppo to a scholarly family, and spent his youth in that city and in Antioch, receiving a solid education in Arabic, Turkish, and Persian. He showed ability, and while still in his twenties he gained a reputation as editor of Aleppo's official newspaper, *al-Furat*, and then as editor of a series of other Aleppan newspapers. His further journalistic career seems to have been one of advancement, sudden reversals, and clashes with various Ottoman governors, the reasons for which are now obscure. At the height of his Aleppan period, he filled a number of bureaucratic posts concerned with local administration. The reasons for his disaffection and fall from favor are no longer clear, but while still in Aleppo he began to compose *Umm al-qura*, an explicit repudiation of that Arabo-Turkish symbiosis in which he was formed. In 1899, at the urging of a friend, he left for Cairo, with the intention of publishing his work.<sup>15</sup>

Once in Cairo, he immediately published a series of implicitly anti-Ottoman articles on despotism in the Cairo daily *al-Muʿayyad*, under the title *Tabaʿi ʿal-istibdad*.<sup>16</sup> At the same time, Kawakibi revised his draft of *Umm al-qura* six times before its clandestine publication in 1900 under the pseudonym of al-Sayyid al-Furati.<sup>17</sup> It seems certain that the influence upon *Umm al-qura* of Rashid Rida and perhaps Muhammad ʿAbduh was great, for Rashid Rida later wrote that the draft first presented in Cairo by Kawakibi was only an outline, and was much expanded in



consultation with himself and others. "I have the original manuscript that confirms this," wrote Rida over thirty years later.<sup>18</sup>

It is thus reasonable to see in *Umm al-qura* a further elaboration of ideas current in the circle of Afghani's disciples, and the theories of Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, for the familiar theme which ran through Kawakibi's work was the need for radical religious reform.<sup>19</sup> Like his predecessors, he insisted that there was some kernel of belief and ritual which was incontestably Islamic and indisputably valid, obscured by accretions which were neither. Kawakibi demanded a stripping away of these accretions, particularly Sufism, and urged an apologetic campaign in defense of the kernel laid bare. This attempt to reduce an integrated tradition to pristine essentials had led Afghani and ʿAbduh to skepticism, and attracted Shaykh al-Raʿis Qajar to Babism. Where it left Kawakibi, one cannot say, for nothing survives concerning his own convictions. During his lifetime, Kawakibi was not personally attacked for his religious views, as were Afghani, Shaykh al-Raʿis, ʿAbduh, and Rida, for Kawakibi published under pseudonyms and lived his creative period in relative obscurity.

*Umm al-qura*, then, was in great part a repetition of ideas made familiar by Kawakibi's predecessors, and on most questions, Kawakibi's views were virtually identical with the reformist opinions given currency at the same time by ʿAbduh and Rida. Kawakibi's originality lay rather in his vivid presentation of these ideas, set down in the fictional and dramatic framework of a Muslim congress held in Mecca during the pilgrimage season of 1898. The nominal narrator, al-Sayyid al-Furati (Kawakibi himself), describes how he was moved to gather a congress and embark on a journey through the Arabic-speaking provinces of the Ottoman Empire to collect participants. Once in Mecca, he recruits another contingent from among the most notable pilgrims of more distant lands. Twenty-two Muslims, each representing a different community from Fez to China, are finally gathered together by the narrator, and Kawakibi uses their discussions as a vehicle for advancing a broad range of radical religious and social arguments.

Yet the congress setting was not only a literary device, but was itself one of those useful innovations for which *Umm al-qura* argued so forcefully. First of all, there was the congress for which *Umm al-qura* served as an account, and which Kawakibi entitled the Congress of Islamic Revival (*Muʿtamar al-nahda al-islamiyya*). Kawakibi gave this event the character of an ad hoc and clandestine gathering of some two dozen interested participants, who met in structured sessions, elected officers, and passed a set of resolutions. The wealth of detail offered by Kawakibi for the twelve sessions of this imaginary congress can be appreciated only through a full reading of the proceedings.

The third session, devoted to the decadence which afflicted Muslims, was not untypical. A participant from Istanbul blamed Muslim rulers for interference in areas reserved for Islamic law; a Kurdish participant pointed instead to the neglect of certain natural sciences by the ulama; and an Afghan participant cited poverty and the fiscal rapacity of government as the cause. Further opinions were offered by participants from Egypt, the Najd, and China, as well as by an English Muslim from Liverpool.

Implicit in Kawakibi's presentation was the idea that such an organized exchange of ideas was instructive and worthy of frequent repetition, for Kawakibi has this small group adopt a provisional charter (*qanun*) for regulation of a permanent body entitled the Society for the Edification of the Unitarians (*Jam'iyat ta'lim al-muwahhidin*). This projected society would consist of one hundred Muslims of solid reputation, whose precise method of selection was not explained. Ten of these would enjoy the rank of active members (*'amilun*), another ten would serve in advisory capacities, and the remainder as honorary functionaries. The select twenty, for whom there were special language and residency requirements, would be elected in an annual general assembly of the society. The twenty then would elect a president, vice-president, first and second secretaries, and a treasurer, for limited terms. The general assembly in annual session would fill a broad supervisory role, while the select twenty, required to remain at the headquarters of the society for eight months each year, would carry on the society's daily functions. Upon the treasurer would devolve the usual responsibility for the raising and disbursement of funds. The other active and advisory members would be entrusted with carrying out a broad campaign to inform Muslims of their errors and rejuvenate religious thought through publications, educational programs, and missionary activities.<sup>20</sup>

Beyond these functional provisions, inspired no doubt by a foreign model, were articles in the charter which made explicit Kawakibi's theories on the primacy of the Arabs in Islam. Kawakibi made the ability to read, write, and speak Arabic a basic requirement of the society's elect. The charter designated Mecca the official center (*al-markaz al-rasmi*) of the Society for the Edification of the Unitarians. Istanbul was relegated to the status of a branch (*shu'ba*), the same position enjoyed in *Umm al-qura* by Cairo, Damascus (for *al-Sham*), Aden, Hail, Tiflis, Teheran, Khiva, Kabul, Calcutta, Delhi, Singapore, Tunis, and Marrakesh. The charter further emphasized that the society would not be aligned with any Muslim state, an indication that it would not legitimize Ottoman pretensions. In the charter, then, the organizational format of the congress appeared once again in an explicitly anti-Ottoman context.

But just as the congress described in *Umm al-qura* was preparatory to

a larger society, so the society was conceived by Kawakibi as preparatory to yet another organizational innovation. The dignitaries assembled under the society's auspices were to commit themselves to the convening of an even greater congress: "Three years after its inauguration, the society will endeavor to convince Muslim kings and princes to convene an official congress (*mu'tamar rasmi*) in Mecca, attended by delegates from each of them, over whom shall preside the least of these princes. The subject of the proceedings shall be religious policy (*al-siyasa al-diniyya*)."<sup>21</sup> The results of this great congress were anticipated by Kawakibi, through the medium of a fictional Indian Muslim prince's commentary appended to the fictional proceedings.<sup>22</sup> A general advisory body (*hay'at al-shura al-'amma*) of one hundred members, some elected and others delegated by Muslim sultans and amirs, would meet in Mecca for one month each year, on the eve of the pilgrimage. This official body would elect an Arab caliph of Quraysh, who would serve for a period of three years, after which his term of office required renewal. His own effective reach would extend only to the Hijaz, which was to be defended by a Muslim force drawn from all Muslim states. Both the caliph and the advisory body would desist from interference in the internal affairs of Muslim states, and would concern themselves only with "religious questions." Thus was manifested Kawakibi's radical vision of the exclusively spiritual role of the caliphate, and his utter rejection of the Ottoman claim.

The book made some impression upon initial publication, although the earliest edition of the work is rare.<sup>23</sup> It seems to have been difficult to come by even at the turn of the century, for when the first serialized installments appeared in Rashid Rida's *al-Manar* in 1902, various Egyptian newspapers were unable to secure the full original edition. "Attempts to find this work have always been without result," reported *Les Pyramides* in 1902. "What became of it? One supposes that all the copies had been confiscated, then burnt."<sup>24</sup> Kawakibi thus remained unknown even to his few readers, and was led, by necessity or interest, to make his living in the service of the Khedive of Egypt, 'Abbas Hilmi II.<sup>25</sup> This had some effect upon *Umm al-qura*, in which there is an incongruous passage invoking the aid of the Khedive, and placing the provisional center of the Society for the Edification of the Unitarians in Egypt. Nor was Kawakibi averse to serving the Khedive as an agent, and he went as far as Yemen to preach not an Arab caliphate of Quraysh, but a caliphate of Egypt's ruling house. In this fashion, Kawakibi managed to maintain himself in the brief period between his arrival in Cairo and his sudden death in 1902, at which time he was buried at the Khedive's expense.

Rashid Rida would not have serialized *Umm al-qura* in his widely

circulated *al-Manar* had it been readily available, so that when the first installment did appear, shortly before Kawakibi's death, the effect was mildly sensational. Many believed that the Meccan congress described in *Umm al-qura* had taken place. The book itself probably let loose the rumor current in Egypt in 1901, that seventy-two delegates from all Muslim countries had met in Mecca and decided to strip Abdülhamid of the caliphate.<sup>26</sup> The publication of the book in *al-Manar* spread this rumor yet further, and the Arab separatist Negib Azoury, in his statement *La Réveil de la nation arabe*, alleged that Kawakibi had been unjustifiably persecuted by Abdülhamid, adding:

Last year, a committee composed of several ulama met at Mecca to deliberate on the institution of a purely religious caliphate located at Mecca. This committee decided to confide this important dignity to a Christian foreigner, rather than leave it to the loathsome Abdul-Hamid, for it is written in the sacred books of Islam that an infidel but just prince is better than an unjust Muslim prince. The sultan learned of the existence of this committee and of some of its resolutions. To prevent this dangerous movement from spreading beyond the tomb of the Arab Prophet, he ordered the vali of the Hedjaz to provoke a massacre of pilgrims, and so render the trip perilous to all civilized Muslims.<sup>27</sup>

Here was not only an affirmation that the congress met, but the addition of willful distortions to Kawakibi's account. Azoury was also joined by a number of orientalist who took the proceedings of *Umm al-qura* as genuine. D. S. Margoliouth was perhaps the first of them to write about the congress as though it had occurred, and the error was often repeated.<sup>28</sup>

But whether mistaken for a genuine account or understood as political literature, *Umm al-qura* attracted important interest in the congress idea, for the concept henceforth was identified with a cause. *Umm al-qura* was written in Arabic, on the eve of a period in which Arabic-speakers openly challenged Turkish-speakers for primacy in Islam. Kawakibi did far more than Blunt, or even 'Abduh and Rida, to associate the congress idea closely with one side of this incipient struggle. He also put flesh on the bones, for here were an agenda, protocols, and a rudimentary model for procedure, offered in a vivid Arabic. With the passage of time, *Umm al-qura* became widely known for its message of Arab primacy, earning for Kawakibi a posthumous fame. Modern scholarship has done much to correct the version of Kawakibi's life which emerged from his canonization by Arab nationalists, and has established his frequent resort to plagiarism. Yet *Umm al-qura*, although a collection of borrowed ideas by an author of mixed motives, was nonetheless of signal im-

portance to the evolution of the congress idea. The book presented a detailed and imaginative construction of a gathering which hitherto had been conceived only in the most abstract sense. Kawakibi filled out the proposals of his predecessors with an engaging text that commanded the attention of reformers and their opponents alike. His influential work thus had a dual effect: it attracted to the congress idea a wide sympathy among those in the expanding reformist school; and it further assured for the concept an abiding Ottoman hostility.



41. *Ibid.*, April 10, 1884.
42. *Ibid.*, June 5, 1884.
43. Blunt, *Gordon at Khartoum*, 492.
44. Mirza Lutf Allah Khan Asadabadi, *Sharh-i hal ve asar-i Sayyid Jamal al-Din Asadabadi ma'ruf bih Afghani*, 56.
45. Shaykh Ahmad-i Ruhi (Trabzon) to his mother (Kirman), Ramadan 22, 1312/March 19, 1895, in Faridun Adamiyat, *Andishehha-yi Mirza Aqa Khan Kirmani*, 280–81.
46. In his preface to the Azali Babi text *Hasht Bihisht*, as translated by Nikki Keddie, "Religion and Irreligion in Early Iranian Nationalism," 292–95.
47. For Persian text and translation, see Edward G. Browne, *The Persian Revolution of 1905–1909*, 409–15, especially 412.
48. Keddie, *Sayyid Jamāl ad-Dīn*, 445.
49. The most thorough account of Shaykh al-Ra'īs is offered by Ibrahim Safa'i, *Rahbaran-i mashruleh*, 1: 563–91. Other biographical sources are not as frank. See Javahir Kalam, "Hujjat al-Islam vala Shahzada Abu al-Hasan Shaykh al-Ra'īs Qajar," and Muhammad Nasir Mirza Fursat, *Kitab-i asar-i 'ajam*, 529–30.
50. Minutes of the meeting, in Abu al-Hasan Shaykh al-Ra'īs, *Muntakhab-i nafis az asar-i hazrat-i Shaykh al-Ra'īs*, 117–23.
51. Abu al-Hasan Shaykh al-Ra'īs, *Ittihad-i Islam*, 83–84.
52. Algar, *Malkum Khān*, 225–27.
53. H. M. Balyuzi, *Edward Granville Browne and the Bahá'í Faith*, 90.
54. H. O'Mahoney, "Le Congrès Parisien," 17–18.

### 3. AN IDEA REFINED

1. Blunt, *Secret History*, 106.
2. For when Blunt consulted him about the fitness of the Arabs for such a central role in Islam, 'Abduh replied that they were indeed fit, but the Turks would never permit them to exercise authority, and the Turks were militarily stronger. Furthermore, if one of these two peoples fell under European domination as a consequence of internecine strife, all Islam would suffer. With this argument, 'Abduh claimed to have dissuaded Blunt from pursuing the idea of an Arabian caliphate. Muhammad 'Amara, *al-'amal al-kamila li-'l-imam Muhammad 'Abduh*, 1: 735.
3. For the text, see Rashid Rida, *Ta'rikh al-ustadh al-imam al-shaykh Muhammad 'Abduh*, 1: 283–87. According to Rida, the basic charter (*qanun asasi*) of this organization was not put to paper, lest it fall into the wrong hands. But it is obvious that the society never existed. What is certain is that 'Abduh organized a "branch" during a visit to Tunis in 1884–85. See M. Chenoufi, "Les deux séjours de Muhammad 'Abduh en Tunisie." On that occasion, he claimed that the society was founded by Afghani in India, but no evidence exists for the creation of a formal society there; see Aziz Ahmad, "Afghani's Indian Contacts." For alleged correspondence of the society's members—their names deleted to protect them—see Rida, *Ta'rikh al-ustadh al-imam*, 2: 553 ff.
4. Mustapha Kraiem, "Au sujet des incidences des deux séjours de Muhammad 'Abduh en Tunisie," 92.
5. Al-Munsif al-Shanufi, "Ala'iq Rashid Rida, sahib al-Manar, ma'a al-tunisiyyin," 133–37.
6. On the school identified with their thought, see Henri Laoust, "Le réformisme orthodoxe des 'Salafiyya' et les caractères généraux de son orientation actuelle."
7. *Al-Manar* (December 17, 1898), 1(39): 765–66.
8. *Al-Manar* (August 5, 1899), 2(21): 325.

9. *Al-Manar* (September 23, 1899), 2(28): 433–34.
10. *Al-Manar* (December 31, 1898), 1(41): 807.
11. *Al-Manar* (April 30, 1900), 3(7): 153–54.
12. See Abu-Manneh, "Sultan Abdülhamid II and the Sharifs of Mecca." This was also a period of Ottoman apprehension over revolt in Yemen. See John Baldry, "Al-Yaman and the Turkish Occupation, 1849–1914."
13. Kawakibi has been the subject of several biographies. Among them are Norbert Tapiero, *Les idées réformistes d'al-Kawākibī, 1265-1320-1849-1902*; Sylvia G. Haim, "The Ideas of a Precursor, ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Kawākibī (1849–1902)"; Sami al-Dahhan, *ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Kawakibi*; and ʿAbbas Mahmud al-ʿAqqad, *al-Rahhala "Kaf": ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Kawakibi*.
14. Al-Sayyid al-Furati [ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Kawakibi], *Umm al-qura*. I have used a copy of the rare early edition, which belongs to the Princeton University Library. The Princeton copy is bound with *Tabāʾīf al-istibdad*, and the binding bears the name of the former owner, ʿAbd al-Hamid al-Bakri (1876–1940), Shaykh al-Sajjada al-Bakriyya from 1911.
15. Aleppans reported having seen drafts of *Umm al-qura* before Kawakibi's departure. See Kamil al-Ghazzi, "ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Kawakibi," 448–49; and the preface to the edition of *Umm al-qura* published in Aleppo in 1959. On the survival of that symbiosis through Kawakibi's formative years, see Shimon Shamir, "Midhat Pasha and the Anti-Turkish Agitation in Syria."
16. A work since shown to have been much influenced by Vittorio Alfieri's *Della Tirannide*, in Sylvia Haim, "Alfieri and al-Kawākibī."
17. According to Rashid Rida's obituary for Kawakibi, in *al-Manar* (July 1902), 5(7): 279.
18. *Al-Manar* (February 1932), 33(2): 114.
19. On the possible influence of Blunt, see Sylvia G. Haim, "Blunt and al-Kawākibī." Here it is noted that Blunt's *Future of Islam* was not translated into Arabic (p. 137), although Blunt himself wrote that the essays in *The Fortnightly Review* "found their way, to some extent, in translation to Egypt." Blunt, *Secret History*, 122. I have found no translation in Blunt's own papers.
20. For the charter, see Kawakibi, *Umm al-qura*, 169–88; Tapiero, *Les idées réformistes*, 48–56.
21. *Ibid.*, 186.
22. *Ibid.*, 211–12.
23. Something on the appearance of the book can be learned from the reports to the Khedive ʿAbbas Hilmi from one of his informants, Muhammad ʿUrfi. At first, ʿUrfi believed the congress to have been genuine, and related that the book had surfaced in the possession of pilgrims arriving in Egypt from Mecca. For his first report on the book, see Muhammad ʿUrfi to Khedive ʿAbbas Hilmi, October 4, 1900, in *AHP*, 32:7. In a subsequent undated letter, which obviously accompanied a copy of the book, he summarized *Umm al-qura*'s contents; see *AHP*, 32:72–73. ʿUrfi, in reporting an encounter with Kawakibi, knew to identify him as "one of the authors of *Umm al-qura*," in a letter to the Khedive of March 11, 1901, *AHP*, 32:38, 41.
24. *Les Pyramides*, March 19, 1902.
25. For a summary of the evidence, see Sylvia G. Haim, *Arab Nationalism: An Anthology*, 28–29; Elie Kedourie, "The Politics of Political Literature: Kawakibi, Azoury and Jung," 109–11; Dahhan, *ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Kawakibi*, 29–30; ʿAqqad, *al-Rahhala "Kaf": ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Kawakibi*, 101 ff. But I found no correspondence between Kawakibi and the Khedive in the latter's papers.
26. L. Hirsowicz, "The Sultan and the Khedive, 1892–1908," 304–5, citing a Russian diplomatic dispatch.



27. Negib Azoury, *Le Réveil de la nation arabe*, 229.  
 28. D. S. Margoliouth, "Mohammedan Explanations of the Failure of Mohammedanism: A Conference at Meccah."

#### 4. A PRACTICAL PLAN

1. See A. Battal-Taymas, "Ben Onu gördüm (Ismail Gaspralı hakkında notlar)," 649–50.
2. On Gasprinskii, see Edward James Lazzerini, "Ismail Bey Gasprinskii and Muslim Modernism in Russia, 1878–1914"; Cafer Seydahmet, *Gaspralı İsmail Bey*; Z. V. Togan, "İsmâ'il Gasprali (Gasprinski)"; and Gerhard von Mende, *Der nationale Kampf der Russlandtürken*, 44–61.
3. For an assessment of this newspaper's significance, see Alexandre Bennigsen and Chantal Lemerrier-Quellejey, *La presse et le mouvement national chez les musulmans de Russie avant 1920*, 35–42.
4. Ch. Lemerrier-Quellejey, "Un réformateur tatar au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle: 'Abdul Qajjum al-Nasyri."
5. Lazzerini, "Ismail Bey Gasprinskii," 24.
6. *Ibid.*, 104–5.
7. For general accounts of his proposal, see Martin Hartmann, "Der Islam 1907/1908," 11(2): 212–15; 12(2): 34–37; Thomas Kuttner, "Russian *Jadidism* and the Islamic World: Ismail Gasprinskii in Cairo—1908," concerning the Arabic newspaper *al-Nahda* which Gasprinskii published in Cairo; and Lazzerini, "Ismail Bey Gasprinskii," 108–27.
8. See Charles Hostler, *Turkism and the Soviets*, 128. Katkov appears to have viewed the cultivation of selected Muslims as an important activity; he later invited Afghani to Petrograd. See Keddie, *Sayyid Jamāl ad-Din*, 282.
9. Gasprinskii described his reception in Cairo and the effect of the Reuter dispatch in *Tercüman*, November 2, 1907. I am indebted to Edward Lazzerini, who provided me with his microfilms of *Tercüman*.
10. Vambéry letter of October 12, 1907, in *The Times*, October 22, 1907. The relevant issue of *Tercüman* is missing from the collection at my disposal.
11. On several occasions, Gasprinskii dismissed the suggestion of a European city, such as Geneva, as a site for the congress. He may have feared that a Muslim congress in Europe would inevitably deteriorate into a forum for Ottoman exiles seeking to vent their hostility toward the Hamidian regime.
12. The more noteworthy Egyptian participants are listed in *Tercüman*, November 20, 1907.
13. For versions of the text, see *Revue du monde musulman* (November–December 1907), 3(11–12): 497–500; *Sırat-ı müstakim* (Cemazi II, 6, 1327), 1(42): 248–50; *Tercüman*, November 20, 1907; *al-Manar* (November 1907), 10(9): 658–73; *al-Muqtataf* (December 1907), 32(2): 968–81.
14. *Al-Manar* (November 1907), 10(9): 677–78.
15. For the climate in Egypt, see Arthur J. Goldschmidt, "The Egyptian Nationalist Party: 1892–1919"; Fritz Steppat, "Nationalismus und Islam bei Mustafā Kāmīl"; Abbas Kefidar, "Shaykh 'Alī Yusuf"; and Ann Elizabeth Mayer, "'Abbās Hilmī II."
16. Cambon (Constantinople), dispatch of September 1, 1892, *Documents diplomatiques français, 1891–1914*, ser. 1, 10: 23.
17. Lord Cromer, *Modern Egypt*, 2: 177.
18. On his modernist critics, see F. de Jong, "Turuq and turuq-opposition in 20th century Egypt," 84–86. For an account of his career, see F. de Jong, "Muhammad Tawfiq b. 'Alī b. Muḥammad al-Bakrī."