IQBAL REVIEW

Journal of the Iqbal Academy, Pakistan

October 1978

Editor

Muhammad Moizuddin

IQBAL ACADEMY PAKISTAN

Title : Iqbal Review (October 1978)
Editor : Muhammad Moizuddin
Publisher : Iqbal Academy Pakistan
City : Lahore
Year : 1978
Classification (DDC) : 105
Classification (IAP) : 8U1.66V12
Pages : 77
Size : 14.5 x 24.5 cm
ISSN : 0021-0773
Subjects : Iqbal Studies
: Philosophy
: Research

IQBAL CYBER LIBRARY
(www.iqbalcyberlibrary.net)

Iqbal Academy Pakistan
(www.iap.gov.pk)
6th Floor Aiwan-e-Iqbal Complex, Egerton Road, Lahore.

Table of Contents

Volume: 19 **Iqbal Review: October 1978** **Number: 3**

---

1. IQBAL'S LECTURE ON IJTIHAD 4
2. ELEGIAC NOTE IN IQBAL'S POETRY 13
3. IQBAL—A VIEW OF POLITICO-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE 38
4. QUAID-I AZAM AND ISLAMIC CULTURE 44
5. IQBAL'S RELATION WITH THE BRITISH IMPERIAL POWER 56
6. A STUDY OF LOCKE'S ATTACK ON INNATE KNOWLEDGE IN COMPARISON TO DESCARTES AND LEIBNIZ 59
7. BOOK REVIEWS 75

IQBAL'S LECTURE ON IJTIHAD

Muhammad Khalid Masud

Iqbal's lecture on ijtihād ("The Principle of Movement in the Structure of Islam") constitutes the sixth chapter in his Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam. The first six of the seven chapters in this book were delivered as lectures in the Universities of Madras, Hyderabad and Aligarh during the years 1928 and 1930.

Although much has been written about these lectures, yet the one on ijtihād has not earned as much scholarly attention as it deserved. It has been evaluated variably by commentators, mostly with a slight regard for the originality of its thought. The reasons for the complacency or indifference of the scholars to this lecture are worth investigating. In fact, this lecture has suffered from these attitudes from the day it was delivered. The history of the writing, presentation and publication of this lecture is curiously stretched over a longer period than any of Iqbal's writings. An investigation about the dates of the various stages of this lecture is quite interesting as well as revealing. The limited space of this paper does not allow to elaborate upon the relevance and significance of such an investigation for an under-standing of this lecture. This requires a separate study.[1] This paper only attempts to ascertaining the dates of the various phases of this lecture. We are, therefore, limiting ourselves to the following questions:

(1) When was the first draft of Iqbal's lecture on *ijtihād* written?
(2) When did Iqbal start the actual, writing of the lecture and how many years did its preparation take?
(3) When was the lecture delivered in Lahore?
(4) When was it presented in South India?

Before we begin exploring answers to these questions it is essential to preface this attempt with a brief introduction to the problem of *ijtihād* with the salient points in this lecture.

Ijtihād is an Arabic word which literally means "to exert one's efforts". Technically it is defined usually as "the putting forth of every effort in order to determine with a degree of probability the question of Islamic law".

---

[1] Ref. Author's unpublished monograph on *Iqbal Aur Ijthiād.*

Although the technical definition did not even implicitly limit *ijtihād* to mean to found a school of law, yet in common parlance the term came to be understood as such. Whenever someone claimed *ijtihād* he was condemned in certain quarters as a heretic and innovator. No *ijtihād* was necessary or allowed after the establishment of the schools of law in Islam. These were, therefore, extremely confident and intrepid souls who chose to speak on this problem from time to time. Naturally they had to face a bitter opposition.

Iqbal does not completely accept the conventional definition of *ijtihād* in his lecture. He rather defines *ijtihād* as a principle of movement in Islam, hence the title of his lecture. In this lecture Iqbal analyses various definitions of *ijtihād* and rejects the static view implied therein. He discusses the phenomenon of the relapse of *ijtihād.* Among the causes of its immobility, he enumerates the following:

(1) Orthodox reaction to rationalist movements such as the Mu'tazilah ;
(2) apprehensions about Sufism: and
(3) destruction of Baghdad.

These factors forced the Islamic society to discontinue *ijtihād* activities. This analysis leads Iqbal to a discussion of the history and working of *ijtihād* in modern times. He discusses "Wahhabism" and traces its origin to Ibn Taimāyyah. The impact of Wahhābī movement continued in modern era and culminated in the reform movements in Islam. He does not entirely approve of these re-forms in Turkey. He particularly singles out Zia Gokalp as a symbol of modern trends in Islam in Turkey, and criticises his views on the emancipation of women. After this analysis he comes to grapple with the actual problem of *ijtihād* in the present situation. In his view the crux of the problem lies in facing certain fundamental facts. He emphasises that until the rise of the Abbasids there was no written law of Islam apart from the Qur'ān. Secondly, during the first four centuries of Islam the activities of *ijtihād* which culminated in the appearance of nineteen schools of law, not only demonstrates the dynamism of Islamic law but also points nut that the formulation of Islamic law was the result of these activities. With these preliminary remarks Iqbal goes on to discuss the four sources of Islamic law, i.e. the Qur'ān, Ḥadīth, Ijmā' and Qiyās. He brings out the dynamic character of these principles. He gives an entirely new interpretation to the institution of Ilmī. Instead of letting it remain a passive material source of legal reasoning, he proposes it to become an active functional source in the form of a e legislative assembly.

Having summarised Iqbal's views, let us now turn to the questions we have raised above.

I

It was in 1904 that lqbal first expressed his views on the problems of *ijtihād* in an article entitled: "*Qaumī Zindagī*". He said:

> "if we contemplate on the present situation we will come to the con elusion that as, in order to support the fundamentals of religion, we need a new theology, similarly we need great jurists for the reinterpretation of Islamic law. The jurist must be able not only to codify Islamic law on a modern pattern but he should also be capable of extending these principles, by his power of imagination, to cover all the possible situations of the present-day social needs. As far as I know there is no one such single jurist born yet in the Islamic world. Considering the significance and volume of the work it appears that this requires definitely more than one mind."[2]

From this excerpt we may see that, Firstly, Iqbal was conscious of the insufficiency of fiqh for the present-day needs. Secondly, therefore, he felt the need for its reinterpretation. "Thirdly, he had come to the conclusion that *ijtihād* required a collective effort in-stead of individual attempts.

Although the remarks about *ijtihād* in this article clearly demonstrated Iqbal's grasp of the problem, yet it took Iqbal a decade or so to fully develop his views on *ijtihād*. He delivered a lecture on this problem first in Lahore in 1924 and then in South India perhaps in 1930. It was eventually published as the sixth chapter of the *Reconstruction*.

The question, however, arises: when was the first draft of this lecture completed? Iqbal's biographers and commentators have given different dates. The earliest date is given by Sayyid 'Abd al-Vāḥid al-Mu'īnī as 1920,[3] and the latest as 1925 is suggested by Rashīd Aḥmad Ṣiddiqī.[4] As we shall see shortly, the first date is too early and the second is too late. We know this from the internal evidences such as Iqbal's letters or the reminiscences of his contemporaries.

---

[2] Iqbal, "Qaumī Zindagī" *Makhzan*, October 1934, vide 'Abd al-Valid Mu'īnī, Maqālāt-i lqbāl (Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1963), p.55.

[3] S.A.1Vahid, Ed., Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal (Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1964), p. xiv.

[4] R.A. Ṣiddīqī, "Ba Yād-i lqbāl," Jawhar, Dehli, 1938. Reappeared in R.A. Ṣiddīqī, Iqbāl: Shakhṣiyyat Aur Shā lei (Lahore: Iqbal Academy, 1976), p. 3.

During the writing of this article Iqbal consulted a number of scholars. His correspondence with Sayyid Sulaimān Nadvī on this point is dated 1925.[5] The letters to 'Abd al-Mājid Daryābādī in which he refers to this lecture also dates as 22 March 1925.[6] From this we can conclude that possibly Iqbal had started writing the article in 1920 and kept on improving it until 1925. There arc, how ever, two substantial evidences that put this date a bit differently. One is a letter that Iqbal wrote to a certain friend of his, Sayyid Muhammad Sa'īd al-Dīn Ja'farī, on 3 August 1922, in which he said: "I am writing a comprehensive article in English entitled: 'The Idea of Ijtihād in the Law of Islam.'"[7]

This shows that it would not be correct to say that the article was completed in 1920. It is evident that until 1922 he was still occupied with the compilation of this article.

It would be equally wrong to conclude on the basis of Iqbal's correspondence with Nadvī and Daryābādi in 1925 that the article was completed as late as 1925. Firstly, because the letters, particularly that of Daryābādī, imply that the article was already completed and Iqbal was asking his addressee for his comments. Secondly, it is now certainly known, as we will explain shortly, that Iqbal delivered this lecture in Lahore in December 1924. We would not deny, however, the possibility of several drafts having been written on various dates. Also it is still a question whether Iqbal delivered the same lecture in South India which he did in Lahore.

II

We have seen that Iqbal's interest in the problem of *ijtihād* began in 1904 and he started drafting his lecture in question probably in 1920 and delivered it in 1924 and again in 1930. Naturally the question arises why it took Iqbal so long to prepare this lecture. Even if it is admitted that Iqbal kept on improving and revising his draft, the need for such revisions is still to be explained. The very first answer one can give is that the subject was very delicate as well as controversial. Iqbal was apprehensive of the reaction of the conservative ‘*ulnmā’* and the general public. This is why, whereas in 1904 his medium of expression was Urdu, in his later years his addressees were the English-reading public.

---

[5] Sh. 'Aṭa' Allāh, Ed., Iqbāl Nāmah [Collection of Iqbal's Letters], (Lahore : Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, n.d.), I, 13.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Vide B.A. Dar, Ed., Anwār-i lqbāl [Collection of Iqbal's Letters], (Karachi : Iqbal Academy, 1967), p. 285.

In relation to this we must also keep in view that Iqbal was highly conscious of his limitations. His lack of knowledge about Arabic sources, especially on the principles of Islamic jurisprudence, made him more and more cautious. There is yet another factor to be taken into account. The books on the principles of Islamic jurisprudence were not readily available to him in those years, particularly Abū isḥāq al-Shāṭibī’s Al-Muwāfaqāt[8] and Shawkānī’s lrshād al-Fuḥūl on which he drew extensively, became available only in 1924. In fact, he was one of the first Indian Muslims to have used them. To make up for his mastery of Arabic sources he turned to as many scholars and as many times as was possible for him. We know from Chaghatāʾī’s[9] account that he consulted extensively the following scholars when he was in Ludhiana: Maulānā Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān, Mufti Na'īm, Miyān ‘Abdul Ḥayy and Maulānā Muhammad Amin.

In Lahore he was constantly in touch with Maulānā Aṣghar Alī Rūḥī and Maulānā Ghulam Murshid. As we have already mentioned, he was also in correspondence with Sayyid Sulaimān Nadvī on this point. These consultations and deliberations on these advices did demand time.

Furthermore, the book which particulary incited Iqbal to de-line his view was that by N.P. Aghnides, *Mohammedan Theories of Finance*.[10] Aghnides was a Christian Greek from Turkey who was sent in 1911 to Columbia University, New York, by the Turkish Government. He wrote this book as his Ph.D. dissertation for the University in 1916.[11] The book was published soon after, but Iqbal came to know of it only in 1923 when a certain Raḥmat ‘Alī in New York sent it to him for his comments.[12] Aghnides shows a good command of original Arabic sources of Islamic jurisprudence. In his formulation of the problem he adopted the approach of an Orientalist. This provided Iqbal with a view of *ijtihād* which was refreshingly different from the conventional one. It was, however, as Iqbal observed, erroneous at many places.

---

[8] For a study of Shāṭibī’s legal thought, see the present writer’s *Islamic Legal Philosophy*, Islamabad, 1977.

[9] Dr ‘Abdallāh Chaghatāʾī, “Allāmah Iqbāl Kay Madras Kay Lekcharon Ka Pas Manẓar” [Background of Iqbal’s Lectures], Daily *Imroze*, Lahore, 22 April 1956.

[10] First published by Columbia University, New York, in 1916.

[11] Ibid., and Appendix.

[12] Chaghatāʾī, op. cit.

The points where Iqbal found himself differing with Aghnides gave him an opportunity to reconstruct his views more profoundly. We would like to point out only three important points of difference between Aghnides and Iqbal. Firstly, Aghnides criticises Islamic law as a mechanical system.[13] This criticism had deep reaction on Iqbal's thinking. In fact, one can say that Aghnides' characterisation of this concept as mechanical compelled Iqbal to reinterpret the whole development of Islamic thought in order to stress its dynamic rather than mechanical nature. If we study the seven lectures in the *Reconstruction* we find this theme running through the whole book almost as a refrain. Iqbal rejects the characterisation of Islamic worldview as static. He singles out the notion of *ijtihād* as the principle of movement *par excellence*.

The second point of contention with Aghnides was the question of *Ḥadīth*. While Aghnides accepted the traditionlist point of view in taking all the *aḥādīth* as a reliable source of law,[14] Iqbal did not fully endorse his idea.[15]

The third point of difference was the question of *ijmā'*. Aghnides says that, according to some Muslim jurists, *ijmā'* can repeal the Qur'ān and the *Sunnah*.[16] Iqbal disagreed with him on this point as well.[17]

It shows that the problem of *ijtihād* was not a simple one. It involved the whole ambit of Islamic thought. The modern social problems gave it an entirely new dimension. Adding to it a lack of command on original sources inhibited Iqbal to progress rapidly.

III

Dr Iqbal, in one of his letters, states that he delivered the lecture on the problems of *ijtihād* in Lahore, but he does not mention any date. Dr Ghulām Jīlānī Barq, in one of his interviews, recalls that this lecture was delivered in

---

[13] Aghnides, *Mohammedan Theories of Finance* (Lahore: Premier Book House, 1961, reprint), p. 143.

[14] Ibid., p. 35.

[15] Iqbal, *Reconstruction*, p. 173.

[16] Aghnides, op. cit., p. 38.

[17] Iqbal, op. cit., p. 174.

Lahore after Iqbal's return from South India.[18] This remark places the date around 1929-30. This, however, is not acceptable in view of a number of evidences that we shall discuss shortly.

Faqīr Sayyid Vaḥīduddīn has given this date as 1925.[19] It is probably a conjectural remark. A more concise and succinct account of this lecture is given by Dr 'Abdallāh Chaghatā'ī.[20] He explains that this lecture was delivered before lqbal's journey to South India. He also mentions that it was delivered on 13 December 1924. This is confirmed by an announcement in *Zamīndār*, Lahore. We also know that Iqbal delivered almost all of his lectures in Lahore at various annual sessions of Anjuman-i Himāyat-i Islām, before his journey to South India. This fact has been very ably documented by Ḥanif Shāhid in his book *Iqbāl Aur Anjuman-i Ḥimāyat-i Islām*.[21]

The announcement in the *Zamīndār* is a very solid and comprehensive evidence on this point. Hence we would like to quote it *verbatim*:

> "'Allāmah Shaikh Muhammad lqbāl will read a very important paper today, the 13th December, at 6.30 p.m. in Ḥabībiyah Hall in Islamiyah College. The paper is entitled as: 'ljtihād in Islam'. Shaikh 'Abd al-Qādir will preside. The article will be in English."[22]

From this evidence there should have remained no doubt that the exact date of the delivery of this lecture in Lahore was 13 December 1924. Dr 'Abdallāh Chaghatā'ī adds that there also appeared comments, reviews and criticism of this lecture in the Lahore press. However curious it may be, we have not been able to find any news reports or comments in the Urdu and English press in the days after the lecture was delivered.

IV

Iqbal was invited to deliver lectures at the University of Madras in 1928.

---

[18] *Vide* Raḥīm Bakhsh Shāhīn, *Awrāq-i Gum Gashtah* [`Allāmah Iqbāl Kī Ghayr Mudawwanah Taḥrīrenl, (Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1975), pp. 191-93.

[19] Faqīr Sayyid Vaḥīduddīn, *Rūzgār-i Faqīr* (Karachi: Lion Art Press, 1968), II, 87.

[20] Chaghatā'ī, op. cit.

[21] M. Ḥanīf Shahid, *Iqbal Aur Anjuman-i Ḥimayat-i Islam* (Lahore: Anjuman-i Ḥimāyat-i Islam, 1976), p. 110.

[22] The Daily (?) *Zamīndār*. Lahore, 12 Dec. 1924. I am grateful to the Research Society of Pakistan, Lahore, for allowing me to consult their files.

In this tour he also visited Hyderabad. He made another lecture tour in 1930. It has, however, been difficult to find out when and where ijtihād lecture was given. It is certainly known that the lecture was not given in his first tour to Madras in 1928-29. It is hard to explain why, when the lecture was already prepared and had in fact been delivered in Lahore, should it not be included in the first three lectures delivered at Madras. There is only one indirect reference to the effect that it was given at Hyderabad in 1930.[23] Besides this we have no other evidence on this point.

The fact that, despite its availability, the lecture was not de-livered in Madras, raises a number of questions. With the present status of information on this point we can explain this delay only by referring to Iqbal's apprehensions of the criticism of his views on *ijtihād*. He had experienced it in his correspondence with Maulānā Daryābādī. It is also possible that when he presented this lecture in Lahore he might have been criticised by a section of his audience. This is, however, only a surmise. It is also possible that, although the lecture was prepared, Iqbal was not confident enough to present it to his Madras audience. He still wanted time to improve and revise it before the final presentation. Now, if this is true, then the question arises whether the present lecture included in the Reconstruction is actually the revised version of the Lahore lecture or it is the same. It would have been interesting to compare the drafts of both these lectures, but, unfortunately, the text of the Lahore lecture is not available. The original manuscripts or the drafts of these papers might hold the key to explain this point, but so far scholars have not been able to trace the original manuscripts.[24]

A MESSAGE FROM THE EAST

Being Versified English Rendering of

IQBAL'S
PAYAM-I MASHRIQ

---

[23] I am thankful to Professor M. Saeed Sheikh, Director, Institute of Islamic Culture, Lahore, for information on this point.

[24] In an interview, Dr Jāvīd Iqbāl has recently confirmed that the said MS is not extant. See recorded interview: Islamic Research Institute Library.

M. HADI HUSSAIN

THE *Payam-i Mashriq* was published in 1922. It was intended as the response of the East to Goethe's *Oestlicher Divan*. During his productive period, extending over almost half a century, lqbal was very much concerned with the human situation in the phenomenal world. The Faustian element in the human drama engrossed his attention no less than the voluntaristic urges manifested in the universe. His robust optimism led him to formulate a melioristic philosophy of the perfectibility of the human ego in an existential setting of ceaseless struggle and striving. The egalitarian system of Islam . . . was regarded by him as the base for the emergence of a universalist democracy of unique individuals presided over by the most Unique Individual—God. But his was not a mere dry-as-dust philosophy. Richly endowed with the poetic sensibility, his genius burst forth into songs of exquisite beauty and power.

The *Payanm-i Mashriq*, par excellence, bears witness to his wide range of interests and sympathies. To translate the work of such a genius is an arduous enterprise and its difficulties can properly he appreciated only by one who has attempted to transmute the magic element of poetry in one language to that of another. The elusive quality of thought, peculiar diction and imagery in Eastern tradition, of the ghazals in the *Payanm-i Mashriq* are specially difficult to transmit in a form intelligible to the Western reader.

Mr Hadi Hussain has, however, acquitted himself with credit even in this difficult sector. . . . His is a faithful translation which reads well…will rank among the major efforts made to introduce 1qbal to sophisticated Western audiences.—From Foreword by S.A. Rahman.

Demy 8vo., xxiv, 189 pp. Rs 33.00

IQBAL ACADEMY PAKISTAN
90 B/2 GULBERG III, LAHORE

ELEGIAC NOTE IN IQBAL'S POETRY

Muhammad Iqbal

If we consider the simplest elements of poetry we find that a poem consists of a tune, a picture, a story and a feeling. These are closely related and, when fused together in proportion, they form a single artistic whole; yet there are many poems in which one particular element preponderates over others. There are poems in which sound effect is more important, or pictorial representation is more important, or description and narrative are given precedence over other qualities, or the subjective element dominates. As civilisation advanced and life became more and more complicated, man's appreciation and understanding of Nature, environmental conditions and life problems became more sophisticated. The mysteries of Nature were, to a sizeable extent, solved by scientists, naturalists, physiologists and physicists. Men of letters, thinkers and poets became more concerned with human life and subjective poetry superseded other forms of poetry; but emotions and feelings depicted in these poems were of a complex nature and poets and men of letters had to offer more technical and more erudite interpretations. Instinctive impulses and cherished longings were replaced by values such as beauty, truth, goodness and the ultimate end of man. Poets became deeply involved with the highest ideals of life, and poetry was thus brought nearer to life.

The modern poets feel intensely about life, and, when so many adjuncts of life appear unintelligible to his naked reason, he be-comes more intrigued about them. Death is a phenomenon which, in some form or the other, has impressed modern thinkers, philosophers and poets. It is a mystery and takes the shape of an adventure greater than life itself. Elegies have been written in their various forms in every language of the world. If we turn to English literature we observe that the elegies written by Milton, Gray, Shelley, Tennyson and Arnold have the basic qualities of sincerity of emotions coupled with an exalted tone and expression of sorrow over the sad lot of man. Studied against the vast expanses of the universe man looks so small, so vulnerable and totally at the mercy of myriads of elemental forces, none of which is favourable for his growth and survival. Did he come into being through fantastic stages of evolution and is just another example of kaliedoscopic shapes taken by matter? Is he just a handful of dust and finally becomes dust? Or has he been created by a Superior Agency and sent for a temporary sojourn on this earth? If he has been created by God and blessed with a soul, what happens to him after death? The English poets have generally bypassed these tantalising issues.

In English literature, elegy has evolved through many stages of development and change. Spencer’s “Astrophel,” Ben Jonson’s famous poem written on the death of Shakespeare, “Memory of My Beloved—Mr. William Shakespeare,” Milton’s “Lycidas,” Arnold’s “Rugby Chapel” and “Thrysis” are elegies of a type in which memorial and encomiastic note is most pronounced, while the elegy by Sir William Watson, “Wordsworth’s Grave,” is memorial and critical. These poems are, in a sense, tributes paid by poets to poets and men of letters who are dead. These pcems present studies of lives and character and poetic worth. Gray’s “Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard” and Shelley’s “Adonais” are written on a different pattern. The poet, in each case, is tormented by a sense of personal loss and gives it expression in the poem. Generally speaking, all English elegies pass from the particular to the general and universal. The sense of personal loss merges itself into an expression of feeling of sorrow over the lot of humanity in general.

Poetic truth, however, does not mean total fidelity to facts in the general acceptation of that term, because this type of objective representation we associate with science. By poetic truth we mean fidelity to our emotional apprehension of facts, to the effect they have upon us, to the feelings of’ hope and fear, pleasure or pain, wonder or religious reverence which they arouse. Thus, it is a subjective realisation of the world around us. The worth of any poetic truth is determined by its accuracy in representing, not only what these facts are objectively, but also by the beauty, picturesqueness, mystery and truth that we associate with them by observing them imaginatively. The real significance of poetry lies in its interpretation and representation of Nature and life through imagination and feelings. Elegiac poetry is lyric poetry and the subjective element in it is effectively projected by giving expression to personal sorrow and associating it with universal values. A good elegy is not darkened by an all-pervading sadness or pessimism. The dark clouds of personal loss and sorrow are there, but beyond these dark shadows life goes on with all its Divine effulgence. This is particularly so in the case of Iqbal for whom death is a change and the human ego does not suffer extinction through death:

فرشتہ موت کا چھوتا ہے گو بدن تیرا
تیرے وجود کے مرکز سے دور رہتا ہے![25]

[Though the angel of death does touch your physical self,
yet it stays away from the nucleus of your being.]

lqbal had studied English literature and his poetic genius and critical acumen justly evaluated its real worth and significance. He appears to owe no debt to any of the poets who wrote elegies. He had read *marthiyahs* written by Anīs and Dabīr, but the genius of lqbal and his philosophy of life did not have much in common with these poets, great in their own field, but not affined to Iqbal. Iqbal has written three elegies: one on the death of Dāgh, one on the death of his mother and one on the death of Ross Masud. The three poems express a sense of deep personal loss, but, except in the elegy written on the death of Dāgh, in the other two philosophic and speculative elements become prominent at an early stage and the personal interest becomes subordinated to general and universal interests. As the poet broods on his subject his meditations urge him on to the discussion of the deepest problems of life. In this respect Iqbal has more points of similarity with Gray and Shelley than with the writers of Urdu elegies of traditionally conventional pattern. His elegies are not dirges steeped in all-permeating sadness.

If we take his elegies one by one, we observe that the elegy written on the death of Dāgh is the only poem in which the elegiac note is maintained right up to the end and each verse gives expression to the mood of sadness at the death of a great poet:

عظمتِ غالب ہے اک مدت سے پیوندِ زمیں
مہدئ مجروح ہے شہرِ خموشاں کا مکیں[26]

[Ghālib’s grandeur lies buried with him and so much time has elapsed, and
Mandī Majrūḥ too is now a denizen of the dead.]

This poem was written by Iqbal quite early in his career and he appears to be overwhelmed by the death of Dāgh and the note of sadness runs right up to the end:

---

[25] *Ḍarb-i Kalīm*, p. 65. References to Iqbal's poetic works (both Persian and Urdu) are from the editions published by Sh. Ghulam All & Sons, Lahore, as *Kulliyāt*.

[26] *Bāng-i Darā*, p. 89.

ایک ہی قانونِ عالمگیر کے ہیں سب اثر
بوئے گل کا باغ سے، گلچیں کا دنیا سے سفر[27]

[These are all manifestations of the one universal law
that the odour departs from the flower and the flower-picker leaves the world.]

In the case of the other two elegies, viz. "On the Death of My Mother" and on the death of "Sir Ross Masud," the first few verses are elegiac and express the mood of sadness and feeling of loss. Addressing his dead mother he says:

کس کو اب ہوگا وطن میں آہ! میرا انتظار؟
کون میرا خط نہ آنے سے رہے گا بے قرار

عمر بھر تیری محبت میری خدمت گر رہی
میں تیری خدمت کے قابل جب ہوا، تو چل بسی[28]

[Who would now wait for me at home
and who would be anxious for the arrival of my letter?
All your life you lavished loving care on me,
but when I became capable of your service you passed away.]

The two verses that follow are in the same strain, but then there is a change and the poet becomes involved in a philosophical discussion of problems of life and death. For Iqbal man is a glorious creature. Man alone can think, talk and pray. He alone has aspirations for a better state of things, he alone can conceive about God and aspire for union with Him. Death cannot be the final aim of life. Such a glorious being is destined for better things; he must have a better and more befitting end to his sojourn on earth. Indeed, contradictions in life are hard to reconcile and have to be faced with courage:

کتنی مشکل زندگی ہے! کس قدر آساں موت!

---

[27] Ibid., p. 90.

[28] Ibid., pp. 228, 229.

گلشنِ ہستی میں مانندِ نسیم ارزاں ہے موت!
زلزلے ہیں، بجلیاں ہیں، قحط ہیں، آلام ہیں
کیسی کیسی دخترانِ مادرِ ایام ہیں[29]

[How hard it is to be and how easy not to be,
in the garden of life death is as easy to find as the Zypher.
Earthquakes, thunderbolts, famines and miseries—
how fearful are these offsprings of mother-time.]

All things created come to an end and apparently death is the end of human life as well. Iqbal, however, is sure that the human ego does not suffer extinction with death:

زندگی محبوب ایسی دیدۂ قدرت میں ہے
ذوقِ حفظِ زندگی ہر چیز کی فطرت میں ہے
موت کے ہاتھوں سے مٹ سکتا اگر نقشِ حیات
عام یوں اس کو نہ کر دیتا نظامِ کائنات[30]

[Nature holds life so dear
that desire for survival is in the nature of all creation.
If life were to suffer extinction at the hands of death,
then in the world-order death would not have been so common.]

پھر نہ کر سکتی حباب اپنا اگر پیدا ہوا
توڑنے میں اس کے یوں ہوتی نہ بے پروا ہوا[31]

[1f the air had no capacity for forming new bubbles,
it would not have been so careless in destroying it.]

---

[29] Ibid., p. 230.

[30] Ibid., p. 231.

[31] Ibid., p. 232.

جوہرِ انساں عدم سے آشنا ہوتا نہیں
آنکھ سے غائب تو ہوتا ہے، فنا ہوتا نہیں[32]

[The essence of man (ego) is never destroyed,
it may disappear from sight but is never extinct.]

Iqbal broods over the death of his mother and these musings give birth to new trains of ideas. Death is not the final end of the ego, but the pain and sufferings caused to the bereaved are of a permanent nature. Time does not heal the wounds caused by the death of the dear ones; it may cover them up, but with the passage of time memory of the dead and departed becomes more and more poignant:

کہتے ہیں اہلِ جہاں دردِ اجل ہے لا دوا
زخمِ فرقت وقت کے مرہم سے پاتا ہے شفا[33]

[They say that the pangs of death are incurable
and time is the antidote for such wounds.]

وقت کے افسوں سے تھمتا نالۂ ماتم نہیں
وقت زخمِ تیغِ فرقت کا کوئی مرہم نہیں[34]

[The magic of fleeting time cannot stop the lamentations of the bereaved, because the ointment of time cannot heal wounds caused by the sword of separation.]

We cannot forget them; they are dead and for all intents and purposes are separated from us. They have left their abode on earth and we may never meet them again: but they have not suffered annihilation, because death is just a change:

---

[32] Ibid., p. 234.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid.

یہ اگر آئینِ ہستی ہے کہ ہو ہر شام صبح
مرقدِ انساں کی شب کا کیوں نہ ہو انجام صبح؟[35]

[If this is the law of life that evening is followed by morning,
then why should the dark night of grave be not followed by the bright morning of a new life.]

These ideas are expressed in more detail by Iqbal in his Lecture: "The Human Ego—His Freedom and Immortality". He says: "Whatever may be the final fate of man it does not mean the loss of individuality. The Quran does not contemplate complete liberation from finitude as the highest state of human bliss. The 'increasing reward' of man consists in his gradual growth in self-possession, in uniqueness, and intensity of his activity as an ego."[36]

خودی ہے زندہ تو ہے موت ایک مقام حیات
کہ عشق موت سے کرتا ہے امتحانِ ثبات[37]

[If the ego is powerful and alive, death becomes anothet stage of life,
and love tests immortality through death.]

If we take up the third elegy, the one written on the death of Sir Ross Masud, we find that the pattern is almost the same. The death of a friend, whom the poet held in great esteem and regard, moved him deeply. He feels that the loss was irreparable and the opening verses give expression to this sad mood:

زوالِ علم و ہنر مرگِ ناگہاں اُس کی
وہ کارواں کا متاعِ گراں بہا، مسعود[38]

[His unexpected death will bring decline of learning and arts because Masūd was the most precious item in the caravan.]

---

[35] Ibid., p. 235.

[36] *Reconstruction*, p. 117.

[37] *Armaghān-i Ḥijāz*, p. 25.

[38] Ibid., p. 24.

This elegiac tone and expression of personal grief is kept up for a few more verses and after that Iqbal becomes involved in discussing universal truths about life and death, the ego and the survival after death:

خودی ہے زندہ تو دریا ہے پیکرانہ ترا
ترے فراق میں مضطر ہے موجِ نیل و فرات![39]

[If you possess a strong and living self (ego), you are like a limitless river,
and the Nile and Euphrates are waiting to meet you.]

Life is a living reality and is universal and Divine in essence. The soul is a bright nucleus in man and the possibilities of this living reality are fully awakened and realised when man, through striving and effort, puts into operation the potential powers of the ego. The aspiring ego succeeds in converting his potentialities into actualities. The attainment of this perfection is the source of immortality. In *Reconstruction*, Iqbal has said:

> "Even the scene of 'Universal Destruction' immediately pre-ceding the Day of Judgment cannot affect the perfect calm of a full-grown ego. . . . Who can be the subject of this exception but those in whom the ego has reached the very highest point of intensity? And the climax of this development is reached when the ego is able to retain full self-possession, even in the case of a direct contact with the all-embracing Ego."[40]

There are quite a few poems of Iqbal in which the elegiac note is markedly noticeable. A mild note of sadness permeates these poems, but more emphasis is laid on the discussion of general and universal truths about life, death, destiny of man and other problems which humanity has faced since the day of creation. In his poem addressed to the "Dead Asleep under the Earth" (خفتگانِ خاک سے استفسار) he begins with a description of the scene of desolation spread out before him. The second verse is truly elegiac and this note of sadness is maintained up to the
seventh verse:

---

[39] Ibid., p. 26.

[40] *Reconstruction*, pp. 117-18.

یہ سیہ پوشی کی تیاری کسی کے غم میں ہے
محفلِ قدرت مگر خورشید کے ماتم میں ہے[41]

[All objects are draped in black (of dusk),
and the entire Nature is mourning for the sun (which is going to set)].

تھم ذرا بیتابی دل! بیٹھ جانے دے مجھے
اور اس بستی پہ چار آنسو گرانے دے مجھے[42]

[O, my distressed heart, be a bit calm. Let me sit here
and shed a few tears on this abode of the dead.]

In the eighth verse the mood of sadness is replaced by the spirit of questioning. The poet wants to know where man came from and where he will go. The mysteries of life are tantalising. Life on earth, life after death, love, beauty, Hell and Heaven, good and evil, sin and virtue are all shrouded and no categorical and concrete interpretation is available:

اے مئے غفلت کے سرمستو! کہاں رہتے ہو تم؟
کچھ کہو کہ اگس دیس کی آخر جہاں رہتے ہو تم[43]

[O, you, who have drunk an opiate and have lost awareness,
tell us something about the place which is now your home.]

کیا وہاں بجلی بھی ہے، دہقاں بھی ہے، خرمن بھی ہے؟
قافلے والے بھی ہیں؟ اندیشۂ رہزن بھی ہے[44]

[Are there thunderbolts in that world too and does the tiller build up a heap,
and do caravans go beset by fear of robbers"]

Iqbal knows that forces of creation and destruction exist side by side. He asks the dead if conditions are the same in their world. The final verse of the poem poses the question about the mystery of life and death:

---

[41] *Bāng-i Darā*, p, 38.
[42] Ibid., p. 39.
[43] Ibid.
[44] Ibid

تم بتا دو راز جو اس گنبدِ گرداں میں ہے؟
موت اک چبھتا ہوا کانٹا دلِ انساں میں ہے[45]

[Please unravel to me that secret which lurks under this revolving sky.
Death is a thorn which ever pricks the human heart.]

The 'Royal Graveyard" (گورستانِ شاہی), one of the many remarkable poems in Bāng-i Darā, has marked affinities with elegiac poetry though it is not written on the death of any one person. It portrays the feelings of grief which swarm the poet's mind as he looks at the graves of dead emperors. The poem opens with beautiful descriptions of Nature which are vivid and realistic as well as accurate and detailed. But by the time we reach the seventeenth verse we find the poet overpowered by the feeling of anguish provoked by that scene of desolation and fallen grandeur:

سوتے ہیں خاموش، آبادی کے ہنگاموں سے دور
مضطرب رکھتی تھی جن کو آرزوئے ناصبور[46]

[They sleep away from the pageantry of life.
yet their lives passed in distress over unfulfilled yearnings.]

In the twenty-first verse the mood of sadness matures and the poet appears to be deeply affected by the sense of desolation which prevailed all over the graveyard:

بادشاہوں کی بھی کشتِ عمر کا حاصل ہے گور
جادۂ عظمت کو گویا آخری منزل ہے گور[47]

[The harvest gathered by kings too is a grave,
and the paths of glory lead to the grave.]

This poem was written by Iqbal after 1908 when his genius as a thinker and a poet had matured and he had formed his ideas about the human ego and self-consciousness and death was now for him:

---

[45] Ibid., p. 40.
[46] Ibid., p. 150
[47] Ibid., p.

زندگی سے یہ پرانا خاکداں معمور ہے
موت میں بھی زندگی کی تڑپ مستور ہے[48]

Even the old graves bustle with signs of life
and in death lies hidden the palpitating flame of life.]

The dead lay in their graves under heavy heaps of earth and these mounds showed no signs of physical life, but Nature was alive. Flowing canals flanked by grass, trees and flowers told a different tale. Nothing was dead and static. If environmental conditions were in a flux, the human ego must surely be alive. Death cannot touch the ego if the state of aspiring tension is kept up.

بگذر از مرگے کہ سازد با لحد
زانکہ ایں مرگ است مرگِ دام و دد!
مردِ مومن خواہد از یزدانِ پاک
آں دگر مرگے کہ بر گیرد ز خاک[49]

[Step away from the death which makes you one with the grave
because such a death befits lower forms of creation.
The perfect man asks from the Creator
such a death as would lift him up and away from the earth.]

lqbal observed everything, in all its minute details, and the multifarious aspects of life attracted him most. Man was a unique form of creation and there was every reason to believe that he did not stumble into this world through some freak of Nature or by some chance happening. He was created for specific purposes and has about him a touch of divinity but the environment in which he had to live was more hostile than favourable to his survival—physical as well as spiritual. Natural calamities, diseases, accidents—all spelled destruction. Yet life was so glorious, picturesque and attractive. lqbal knew that life was a curious admixture of joys and sorrows and perhaps joys are outnumbered by sorrows:

---

[48] Ibid., p. 152

[49] *Jāvīd Nāmah*, p. 185.

گو سراپا کیفِ عشرت ہے شرابِ زندگی
اشک بھی رکھتا ہے دامن میں سحابِ زندگی[50]

[The wine of life is an intoxicating luxury,
but the cloud of life carries in its folds tears as well]

Tears are an expression of that nobler part of the human self from which emanate love and sympathy which distinguish him from brutes. If there were no grief and sorrows, so many fine feelings and noble sentiments would go out of life. Sorrows and sufferings have a chastening effect on human temperament. They bring about an emotional and intellectual catharsis and we come out of such experiences better and nobler beings. lqbal knew full well that life is not all roses; there are thorns as well. In fact, every pretty flower is encircled by thorns. The above given verse and the one given below are taken from the poem "Philosophy of Sorrow" (فلسفۂ غم) addressed to late Sir Fazl-i Husain and in it Iqbal has propounded his views on sorrow most effectively:

کلفتِ غم گرچہ اُس کے روز و شب سے دور ہے
زندگی کا راز اُس کی آنکھ سے مستور ہے[51]

[The ephemeral bubbles of life dance on the waves of sorrow and grief is a vital chapter of the book of life.]

The human ego aspires for perfection and yearns to learn the secrets of life. His efforts are occasionally crowned with success, but more often these end in failure. These failures spur him on to further efforts and qualitatively increase the intensity of the self and reveal to him the secrets of his being:

کلفتِ غم گرچہ اُس کے روز و شب سے دور ہے
زندگی کا راز اُس کی آنکھ سے مستور ہے[52]

[The nights and days of such a man never know the pangs of misery, but he is never able to divine the secrets of life.]

---

[50] *Bāng-i Darā*, p. 155.
[51] Ibid.
[52] Ibid.,

After this verse Iqbal's ideas take a turn. He feels hopeful about regeneration which would follow death. The ego is indestructible. Death brings separation which is temporary but we deem it to be permanent and cry over it. Yet, continuity of the stream of life is never broken:

ایک اصلیت میں ہے بہرِ روانِ زندگی
گِر کے رفعت سے ہجومِ نوعِ انساں بن گئی
پستیء عالم میں ملنے کو جدا ہوتے ہیں ہم
عارضی فرقت کو دائم جان کر روتے ہیں ہم[53]

[The continuity of the river of life is never broken,
however, when it fell from the heavens it converted itself into a crowd of human beings.
We part in this mundane world to meet again,
but we take this temporary separation to be permanent and lament.]

The title of the poem and its theme give expression to an important trend in Iqbal's thought and philosophy. He knows that life is a blend of sorrows and joys and one complements the other and both act as formative forces in perfecting the ego. It is the impact of the ego on environmental conditions and the counter impact of environment on the ego which generates that evolutionary process leading to perfection. Since griefs and sorrows have a deeper and more lasting effect, they exert a more potent influence on the ego and are more beneficial and chasten and ennoble the ego. In a life full of pleasures and luxuries and without any traumatic experiences, the devolopment of the ego, not only becomes retarded, it also becomes lop-sided. In this very poem ("Philosophy of Sorrow") he has said:

شام جس کی آشنائے نالۂ “یارب!” نہیں
جلوہ پیرا جس کی شب میں اشک کے کوکب نہیں
جس کا جامِ دل شکستِ غم سے ہے نا آشنا
جو سدا مستِ شرابِ عیش و عشرت ہی رہا

---

[53] Ibid., p. 157.

ہاتھ جس گلچیں کا ہے محفوظ نوکِ خار سے عشق جس
کا بے خبر ہے ہجر کے آزار سے
کلفتِ غم گرچہ اُس کے روز و شب سے دور ہے
زندگی کا راز اُس کی آنکھ سے مستور ہے[54]

(One whose evenings are not familiar with the anguished cry "O God" and in whose nights tears do not glisten like stars,
One whose heart is not broken by grief
and who ever remained lost in a life of pleasures and luxury,
The flower-picker whose hand was never pricked by thorns,
and the lover who never knew the pangs of separation,
The nights and days of such a man never know the pangs of misery,
but he is never able to divine the secrets of life.]

The finitude of man vis-a-vis the quantitative and qualitative vastness of Time and Space does not give: man a very advantageous position on this earth. 'Juxtaposed against environmental conditions he is in many respects helpless and the only retrieving unit in his make-up is his ego. In this world of contrarities we find beauty as well as ugliness, good as well as evil, sometimes conditions are favourable but more often hostile, and man has to carve out a place for himself through his own exertions and efforts. He may succeed, but there is a greater likelihood that he would fail. His duty, however, is to wage a continuous struggle against adverse circumstances and in this constant involvement with life-forces lies his betterment and salvation.

بدریا و غلط با موجش در آویز
حیاتِ جاوداں اندر ستیز است[55]

[Plunge in the sea and grapple with the waves,
because immortal life consists in continuous struggle.]

This constant involvement with life and perpetual struggle against unfavourable conditions is the keynote of Iqbal's message in respect of the human ego's efforts to gain control over the world of Nature where he has to exist. The ego will not be at the mercy of external forces and agencies because of his will-power and consciousness of his existence as a vital and dynamic entity. This struggle is a permanent feature waged by the ego with varying results. The realisatison of man's finitude and the serious efforts made by him for survival gave anxious moments of deep contemplation to Iqbal and this pensiveness found expression in his poems. In an untitled poem in *Bāng-i Darā*, we find two verses in which this mood of meditative sadness is noticeable. The poem was written by Iqbal quite early in his life, but his anxiety over the lot of man is remarkably quite evident:

---

[54] Ibid., p. 156,

[55] *Payām-i Mashriq*, p. 45.

آدمی واں بھی حصارِ غم میں ہے محصور کیا؟
اُس ولایت میں بھی ہے انساں کا دل مجبور کیا؟

واں بھی کیا فریادِ بلبل پر چمن روتا نہیں
اس جہاں کی طرح واں بھی دردِ دل ہوتا نہیں[56]

[Is man a captive of sorrow in that world too
and his heart helpless as it is here ? .. .
Does no one shed tears of sympathy at the plaintive song of the nightingale
and is the human heart as callous as it is here ?]

This note of meditative pensiveness in Iqbal should not be confused with the pessimism of Tennyson which is the outcome of want of faith and a Godless concept of the universe, nor with the anguished cries of Shelley who falls upon the thorns of life and bleeds because for him the objective realities of life were ethereal that he lost his moorings with the matter-of-fact world in which he lived. It is not the melancholy which haunts all the poems of Arnold and is the logical result of his agnosticism. Iqbal never denied the importance of the objective world of matter; he admits the significant role which Nature and environment play in human life and for him God—the Creator of the universe—is a Living Reality. Man is for him a unique creation and he is ever hopeful about his destiny, and he is optimistic that man will finally emerge with a more perfect ego capable of maintaining his finitude in time and space. Yet his optimism is not the makebelieve optimism of Browning arrived at by a pragmatic belief in a monotheistic concept of God

---

[56] *Bāng-i Darā*, p. 39.

Whom the poet makes analogous to a potter with his clay. Browning groped about in the dark searching for a faith, while Iqbal's path was blazoned by the teachings of the Holy Qur'an and guidance provided by the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him). This pensiveness is to some extent the outcome of dissatisfaction with existing conditions.

The note of pensive sadness was further deepened as Iqbal realised the dangers that lurked in the decadence which prevailed in the world of Islam. During his stay in Europe he made a close study of the European ideal of nationalism based on geographical, racial and linguistic considerations and found it much inferior to the concept of *millat* as envisaged in the Holy Qur'ān which transcended geographical limits and did not recognise differences of race, colour or language. The socio-economic set-up of European countries was capitalistic though socialist and communist ideas were finding credence with the rising generation of thinkers. Iqbal again went to the Holy Qur'ān and found that the socio-economic system advocated in it was much more equitable and, being simpler, could be easily implemented. He also observed that Western society being atheistic and without any moral and ethical values could not replace Islam:

تو نے کیا دیکھا نہیں مغرب کا جمہوری نظام؟
چہرہ روشن، اندروں چنگیز سے تاریک تر![57]

[Have you not looked at the democratic set-up in the West:
its exterior is bright but inside it is dark like Chingiz.]

The Church and the Clergy had degraded themselves and there was no possibility of a regeneration and rehabilitation. Christ's religion had been debased into blind worship of gods of wealth and brute force. Iqbal was disgusted by this naked materialism and was ultimately convinced that the whole of the Western world with all its wealth and much-vaunted culture was poised on the edge of a precipice and was heading towards a cataclysmic end. His premonitions came true and the First World War (1914-18) shook the very foundations of the socio-economic and political edifice of the West.

Having a superior religion, a superior culture and a superior code of law regulating not only human behaviour but also owner-ship of land and wealth, why were Muslims all over the world living under such degrading conditions?

---

[57] *Armaghān-i Ḥijāz*, p.8.

Politically they were slaves of Western powers, their economic condition was the worst and their culture and civilisation decadent. Islam had fallen on evil days and Iqbal grieved over it:

غم نصیب اقبال کو بخشا گیا ماتم ترا
چن لیا تقدیر نے وہ دل کہ تھا محرم ترا[58]

[Grief-stricken Iqbal laments over your lot
and destiny chose him because he knew the reason of this downfall.]

Iqbal brooded over this state of affairs and the conclusions he had already formed became confirmed. Muslims recited the Holy Qur'ān, but were ignorant of the spirit of Qur'ānic teachings; they vociferously proclaimed their love for the Holy Prophet but never cared to practise his precepts and follow his way of life:

محبت کا جنوں باقی نہیں ہے
مسلمانوں میں خوب باقی نہیں ہے
صفیں کج، دل پریشاں، سجدے بے ذوق
کہ جذبِ اندروں باقی نہیں ہے[59]

[Muslims are no longer possessed of that frenzied love
and have become weak;
Their rows are curved, their hearts distressed and prayers without fervour
because their inner faith is gone.

رگوں میں وہ لہو باقی نہیں ہے!
وہ دل، وہ آرزو باقی نہیں ہے!
نماز و روز و قربانی و حج
یہ سب باقی ہیں تو باقی نہیں ہے[60]

---

[58] *Bāng-i Darā*, p. 134.
[59] *Bāl-i Jibrīl*, p. 85.
[60] Ibid., p. 88.

[The same fiery blood does not course in their veins
and they have not that heart full of yearnings!
Prayer, fast, sacrifice and *Ḥajj* are there,
but the true Muslim is not there.]

Long moments of sad meditations convinced Iqbal that things could change and the panacea for all the evils from which the world of Islam suffered was a resuscitation and revival of the Islamic spirit by making the Muslims realise the true significance of the Prophet and the Qur'ān. Muslims should be revitalised and should learn to act upon the teachings of the Holy Prophet and the Holy Book, but he was disappointed with Muslims all over the world, who cared for the shell and ignored the kernel.

زائرنِ کعبہ سے اقبال یہ پوچھے کوئی
کیا حرم کا تحفہ زمزم کے سوا کچھ بھی نہیں[61]

[May someone ask pilgrims returning from the holy Ka'bah
why they got nothing as a gift from the holy places except the Zamzam (water) ?]

The resuscitation and revitalisation was not an easy thing to accomplish because it meant a change in outlook and a weaning away from the alluring charms of the Western ways of life. Muslims had lost their mental and spiritual bearings. They were Muslims in name only and lqbal felt sorry for them and grieved over their fall. How could that zest and enthusiasm for their religion be revived in their hearts? This gave birth to those wavering moods of hopefulness and desperation which are repeated again and again in his 'epoch-making poem *Shikwah*:

حوصلے وہ نہ رہے، ہم نہ رہے، دل نہ رہا
گھر یہ اُجڑا ہے کہ تُو رونقِ محفل نہ رہا[62]

[We are not (what we were), our hearts are changed and we are no longer that courageous;
the ruin of this house is due to Thine absence.]

---

[61] *Bāng-i Darā*, p. 135.
[62] Ibid., p. 169.

وائے ناکامی متاعِ کارواں جاتا رہا
کارواں کے دل سے احساسِ زیاں جاتا رہا[63]

[The caravan lost its most valued possession
and, O the pity of it, it lost the feeling for that loss]

It is bad to lose something but it is worse not to realise the after-effects of that loss. Muslims had lost their past glory and grandeur and had become slaves of others, but they were satisfied with what they had become and felt proud of emulating the ways of their masters:

ترے صوفے ہیں افرنگی، ترے قالیں ہیں ایرانی
لہو مجھ کو لاتی ہے جوانوں کی تن آسانی[64]

[Your sofas come from England and your rugs from Iran;
I shed tears of blood over the new generation's love for ease.]

Iqbal appears to be particularly worried about the younger generation who seemed to have arrived at a compromise with the existing state of affairs:

نوجوانان تشنہ لب، خالی ایاغ
شستہ رو، تاریک جاں، روشن دماغ![65]

[The young have parched lips, empty cups,
clean faces, dark souls and enlightened minds.]

Conditions had to be changed, and how this change could be brought about gave Iqbal some of the most anxious moments of his life. If things were allowed to continue as they were, the fate of the Muslim world and with it of Islam as a way of life would be sealed for all times to come. Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Ḥālī and Shiblī had set the ball rolling and Iqbal did what none else had ever done before; he gave a clarion call to the new generation to be awake and alert and sec things for themselves. He turns to them and says:

---

[63] Ibid., p. 187.
[64] *Bāl-i Jibrīl*, p. 119.
[65] *Jāvīd Nāmah*, p. 202.

جوانوں کو سوزِ جگر بخش دے	مرا عشق، میری نظر بخش دے
مری ناؤ گرداب سے پار کر	یہ ثابت ہے تو اس کو سیار کر!
مرے دیدۂ تر کی بے خوابیاں!	مرے دل کی پوشیدہ بے تابیاں
مرے نالۂ نیم شب کا نیاز!	مری خلوت و انجمن کا گداز!
اُمنگیں مری، آرزوئیں مری	امیدیں مری، جستجوئیں مری!
مرا دل، مری رزم گاہِ حیات!	گمانوں کے لشکر، یقیں کا ثبات!
یہی کچھ ہے ساقی متاعِ فقیر!	اسی سے فقیری میں ہوں امیر!
مرے قافلے میں لٹا دے اسے!	لٹا دے، ٹھکانے لگا دے اسے[66]

[O God ! bless the young with keen sensibilities,
give them my love (for humanity) and my insight too.
Bring my boat out of the whirlpool;
it is static, O God, activate it... .
The sleeplessness of my tear-wet eyes
and the hidden restlessness of my heart,
The sincerity of my late night lamentations
and the sympathy that I feel when alone or in company,
My yearning, desires and hopes
and all that I am searching for... .
My heart which is a battlefield
of doubts and my firm faith;
These are all that my poor self has
and these make me rich in my destitution;
Scatter all these among the members of my caravan
and thus put these to a proper use.]

These verses are an exhortation urging the youth to come forth and, through faith and action, change the fate of the East. They should give up blind imitation of the West and turn to the Holy Qur'ān and the Prophet for inspiration and guidance. The general trend among the Muslims to emulate the West was tantamount to courting disaster. The Godless West had become a blind follower of Satan and Iqbal makes the fifth adviser of Satan say:

---

[66] *Bāl-i Jibrīl*, pp. 124-25.

میرے آقا! وہ جہاں زیر و زیر ہونے کو ہے
جس جہاں کا ہے فقط تیری سیادت پر مدار[67]

[O master, that world will soon be topsy-turvy
which relies on your politics.]

This was timely advice to escape disaster and ruin, but Muslims, instead of believing in the true Islamic spirit, believed in the advice given by Satan (v--1:l) to his followers. They not only believed in it; they also practised it. Iblīs says to his advisers:

عصرِ حاضر کے تقاضاؤں سے ہے لیکن یہ خوف
ہو نہ جائے آشکارا شرعِ پیغمبر کہیں
الحذر آئینِ پیغمبر سے سو بار الحذر
حافظِ ناموسِ زن، مرد آزما، مرد آفریں

چشمِ عالم سے رہے پوشیدہ یہ آئیں تو خوب
یہ غنیمت ہے کہ خود مومن ہے محرومِ یقیں!
ہے یہ بہتر کہ الٰہیات میں اُلجھا رہے
یہ کتاب اللہ کی تاویلات میں اُلجھا رہے[68]

The demands of the present times may not
resuscitate and revive the teachings of the Prophet;
Beware of the teachings of the Prophet–
he provides safeguards for the honour of women, tests men and

---

[67] *Armaghān-i Ḥijāz,* p. 11.
[68] Ibid., pp. 12-13.

bless those with noble qualities
It is in our interest that precepts of Islam remain hidden from the world
and believer remains lost in doubts;
It would be better if he remained lost
in the labyrinths of interpretations and commentaries of the Book.)

Iblīs winds up his oration by saying:

ہر نفس ڈرتا ہوں اس اُمت کی بیداری سے میں
ہے حقیقت جس کے دیں کا احتسابِ کائنات
مست رکھو ذکر و فکرِ صبحگاہی میں اسے
پختہ تر کر دو مزاجِ خانقاہی میں اسے[69]

[Every moment I fear the reawakening of this group
because its religion is based upon a system that brings to account the entire creation.
Keep him occupied in discussions
and make him perfect in following superstitious beliefs based on grave-worship.]

Iqbal felt sorry for the Muslims who professed the most perfect religion, who had a Book which could guide them at every step in life and who had before them the guidelines laid down by the Prophet and who could get inspiration from his exemplary life and yet were lost in the morass of no-faith and inactivity. They had lost self-respect and appeared to be quite forgetful and unconscious of degradation and decadence which had befallen them. They were like a rudderless ship drifting on the vast occean of life. Iqbal's contemplations and meditations made him sad because he was, perhaps, the only person who realised the misery and ruin of the Muslim world. He closes his *Jāvīd Nāmah* with the following verse —an advice to his son, but in fact to all sons and daughters of Islam:

سرِ دینِ مصطفیٰ گوئم ترا
هم به قبر اندر دعا گوئم ترا[70]

---

[69] Ibid., pp. 14-15.
[70] *Jāvīd Nāmah*, p. 208.

> [I bring to your notice principles of the religion of Mustafa and after death will pray for you even in my grave.]

Muslims were on the horns of a dilemma. In the race for development and acquisition of material power they had been left behind. Centuries of decadence and slavery had deprived them of self-consciousness and will power to fight against adversity and wrest from adverse conditions what was their due. Iqbal turns to God:

یا مسلماں را مده فرماں که جاں بر کف بنه
یا دریں فرسوده پیکر تازه جائے آفریں
یا چناں کن یا چنیں

یا بُکش در سینۂ من آرزوئے انقلاب
یا دگرگوں کن نهادِ ایں زمان و ایں زمیں
یا چناں کن یا چنیں![71]

[Do not give these orders to the Muslims to bear their lives on their palms
or instill a new life into their time-worn and wrecked bodies;
Either do this or do that... .
Destroy the spirit for revolution enkindled in my heart
or completely change the basis of this time and space:
Either do this or do that.]

اے مسلماناں فغاں از فتنه ہائے علم و فن
اہرمن اندر جہاں ارزاں و یزداں دیر یاب!
انقلاب! انقلاب! اے نقلاب![72]

[O Muslims, beware of and protest against the guiles of arts
and knowledge.
Devil is easy to get and God is found late.
Revolution, Revolution, Revolution!]

---

[71] *Zabūr-i ʿAjam*, pp. 24-25.

[72] Ibid., p, 95.

بے یقیں را رعشہ ہا اندر دل است
نقشِ نو آوردن او را مشکل است[73]

[One who loses faith bears a palsied heart,
and it is not possible for such a man to follow a new course.]

lqbal was not satisfied with prevailing conditions. The ego could not flourish in unfavourable environment and conditions had to be modified and improved to enable man to attain that perfect state which was his due as the acme of creation. Unlike the English Romantics, Iqbal was not an escapist. He understood the past, was fully alive to the present and realised the importance of the future; but ushering of a new order was not a child's play. Ultimate truth and beauty were difficult to attain. He had an aspiring heart and his ego, in spite of its finitude, was restless and demanding of that perfection and realisation of beauty which he knew was the first perquisite for successful living in this world and blessedness in the world to come:

چو نظر قرار گیرد بہ نگارِ خوبروئے
تپد آں زماں دلِ من پئے خوبتر نگارے[74]

[As my eyes settle on one beautiful beloved
immediately my heart begins to yearn for a better one.]

This intense yearning for a fuller and better ideal of life is the basis of that mood of pensive meditation which heightens the poetic appeal of Iqbal's verse.

Contributors, Attention Please

Please check and revise your learned articles before finally sending them on to us. Kindly give particular attention to quotations, prose or verse, and check that these are reproduced as exactly as the original text. The name of the author, his initials, details about the work cited as to its publisher, place and year of publication, number of volume, if any, and page(s) from where the quotation has been taken, should be correctly given.

---

[73] Ibid., p, 187.
[74] *Payām-i Mashriq*, p. 127.

This would make matters easy for the editors and ensure flawless printing of your articles.

Thank you !

—Editor, Iqbal Review

IQBAL—A VIEW OF POLITICO-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE[*]

Gilani Kamran

The year 1977 was dedicated to the memory of Iqbal in Pakistan, and a back view of the philosopher-poet's teaching was made in the light of the changed world conditions In Pakistan, Iqbal's contributions to thought obviously possess a definite con-text; Iqbal stands for Muslim nationalism and for Islamic inter-nationalism. But the thinking which got consolidated over the year 1977 made a good progress in understanding Iqbal's place in a wider context: in the context of the larger world. Iqbal has, in-deed, addressed the Muslims in their twentieth-century historical situation, but there certainly are the areas of his thought which are even more relevant to the common situation of man in the modern world. Thus, politico-cultural perspective which guides and dictates the affairs of practical life of men demands its evaluation also in terms of Iqbal's philosophy.

In his long creative career which covered the crucial thirty-five years of the present century, Iqbal employed poetry as his principal medium of expression; nevertheless, he also communicated in prose on serious subjects which demanded closer study and systematic analysis. He took part in active politics, and was a prominent leader of Muslim political opinion in India. He was perhaps the most important modern Muslim of the subcontinent who had an international worldview, and who looked upon the shifting perspectives of world affairs as the movement of history He began his career as a poet of subjective experience, but very soon he gave up this mode of writing, and was inclined towards the life of men in their natural setting which brought him face to face with what is called the state of man-in-the-situation. Thus, he became the poet of the man-in-the-situation. Colonialism, which was then the system of British imperial administration in India, defined the situation, and the human scene in India appeared in Iqbal's eyes as the scene which demanded his creative and intellectual involvement.

---

[*] Presented at the Eastern Washington State University, Cheney, Washington, and Duke University, Durham, N.C., in February 1978. 35

In retrospect, however, two questions appear which had serious impact on Iqbal's poetically sensitive political awareness. And they were: Why has colonialism taken possession of the sub-continent? and how is it possible to live through such a distressing situation? The state of colonialism, of course. meant the suppression and isolation of the history of the people of India, and Iqbal had an acute sense of loss of the collective memory in this context. A large body of his writings, therefore, consisted of transmission of historical memory to his audience, and he soon became a spokesman of past history in a political environment which failed to accommodate such awareness in the subcontinent. His early poems sing of the Indo-Aryan memory, and of the glorious achievements of Muslims in the past and create a mental landscape of history in a geography which was controlled by alien rulers. Thus, as creative act, Iqbal's poetry in its earlier phase achieved one important political objective: it saved the collective memory from extermination in a colonial rule.

Politically, however, India of the British imperial era was sharply divided even in its collective memory. Two different strands of historical awareness ran parallel to each other, and in the absence of any principle of unification and of a united effort the situation could hardly be resolved satisfactorily in favour of the people of India. Iqbal hoped for a conciliation between the divided collective memories of the Hindus and the Muslims of the subcontinent, and he held out the idea of geographical nationalism where the Indian soil appeared as the sacred motherland for the two major communities. He pointed out that communal and ethnic division was mainly the outcome of psychological attitudes, and once these narrow and culturally restricted attitudes were changed and transformed a more rewarding principle of existence would emerge and resolve the inner and outer contradictions of the Indian situation. His poem "The New Temple" invites conflicting ethnic and religious groups to transcend their myopic visions and to merge into a positive and creative totality.

Iqbal's political thought, in its creative framework, was geographically oriented before he left for Europe in 1905. His idea of nationalism was soil-based, and the identity of the people derived its meaning from the idea of a common homeland. His stay in Europe, however, enabled him to observe the working of geographical nationalism in its materialistic setting, and he found to his great disappointment the clashes among European nations for various materialistic ends. He also found an inner cleavage in the European thinking process, and felt that ordinary reason had elevated materialism to the status of a new deity which demanded unconditional submission and worship from modern man. Though he was fairly appreciative of the achievements of Europe, yet he could hardly incline himself to subscribe to its extreme materialism. Consequently, the rise of materialism in Europe shattered his faith in nationalism in its strict geographic form. He, therefore, naturally looked elsewhere for the fulfilment of his politico-national aspirations. The Muslim world, as a fact of collective geo-historical memory, offered him a subject for serious consideration.

In the history of the Muslim world, Iqbal discovered the principle of unity which was extraterritorial, and supranational, a unity which was not geographical but creative and experiential. It was a unity which was non-spatial. The Muslim world, as a phenomenon of history, appeared to Iqbal as an idea which could transform the condition of man and promised the growth and fulfilment of human life. This awareness changed the entire political perspective, and Iqbal related India to the larger world of Islam for its future orientation. This change of perspective was in fact a change from abstraction to concrete humanism, and from the idea of the indifferent soil to the state of real human beings.

The working of nationalism in Europe had enabled Iqbal to see the weight of numerical majority in a democratic form of government. He realised that the numerical majority, if it so in-tended, could as well bring about the total effacement of the identities of the minority groups through a democratic process.

In India, he also realised that the Muslims had to face a permanent, unchanging majority of the ethnic group which, for certain historical reasons, could hardly extend any confidence to Muslims in any future form of government in the subcontinent. The idea of numerical majority, unless it was properly educated, caused anxiety and fear, and compelled the minority groups to save and preserve their identity from total effacement, and their humanity from complete liquidation.

Thus, between his European experience and the Indian ethnic and cultural situation, Iqbal moved towards the idea of Islamic community, because it promised regeneration to mankind. This conviction was strengthened in the decade following the end of the First World War in 1918. His lectures on the *Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam* (1929) were delivered precisely with the purpose to assess the role of Islam and Islamic community in the changed conditions of modern times. The moral of the lectures, however, was, and it still sounds convincing, that Islamic community in a reconstructed thought-environment can offer hope to mankind. This conclusion formed the basis of Iqbal's Presidential Address to the Annual Session of the A11-India Muslim League at Allahabad in 1930 which pleaded for the establishment of an independent Muslim State in the Indian subcontinent. The State, he observed, would demonstrate the efficacy of the role of Islam as the principle of regeneration in the future world order.

Iqbal's politico-cultural perspective does not consider the human situation as a mad hunt after material ends. Still, it does not mean that Iqbal did not have any sympathy with the materially depressed condition of men and nations. In fact, Iqbal wanted a healthy balance between the material and the spiritual aspects of human life. His politico-cultural view had a strong philosophical basis where political enslavement of nations meant the suppression of the human ego. It also clearly suggested that the idea of political freedom definitely ensures the liberation of the ego from its unrealised state of existence. In a politically handicapped environment the ego remains dormant, and, as such, it exists simply as an inanimate object. Freedom from political over-lordship brings it back to life, and opens up innumerable possibilities of its expansion. The expansion, in a creative sense, is the destiny of the human ego which must yield a life-giving expansion in both horizontal and vertical dimensions.

Iqbal's thinking relates politics to philosophy and offers an aim to the man-in-the-situation. The situation, once altered, can hardly stop the ego from its expansion. In his poem addressed to the Russian people, Iqbal, while complimenting them on their success in the creation of a new mode of society, holds out a warning to them in no less strong terms to beware of materialism. He advises them to realise their collective ego in its fullest creative expansion which transcends the matter and approaches the spiritual. The ego, Iqbal points out, integrates the material with the spiritual, and the Divine appears in the human at the point where the horizontal intersects the vertical. Unless the ego operates in this framework the kingdom of God on earth cannot be witnessed by the unfortunate children of Adam.

The idea of expansion of the ego, as a politico-cultural idea, has its basis in the behaviour of the individual. Iqbal points out that only the eternal values of human conduct can provide destination to the wandering human ego. The fragmented human psychology can expose it to another more serious predicament. The human being stands in need of a happy combination of love and reason. The Western heritage must come closer to the heritage of the East and the mind must come closer to the human heart in order to bring about a happy reunion between the complements of the human ego. Without this reunion, the human ego cannot have a second birth. All political philosophies and, indeed, all political movements have hardly any meaning if their destiny is not enriched by the experience of the second birth. In Jāvīd Nāmah, Iqbal emphasises this idea, and says:

"It was by way of birth, excellent man.

that you came into this dimensioned world;

by birth it is possible also to escape,

it is possible to loosen all fetters from oneself;

but such a birth is not of clay and water

that is known to the man who has a living heart.

The first birth is by constraint the second by choice:

the first is hidden in veils, the second is manifest ;

the first happens with weeping, the second with laughter,

for the first is a seeking, the second a finding;

the first is to dwell and journey amidst creation,

the second is utterly outside all dimensions;

the first is in need of day and night,

the second—day and night are but its vehicle.

A child is born through the rending of the womb,

a man is born through the rending of the world;

the call to prayer signalises both kinds of birth.

The first is uttered by the lips, the second of the very soul.

Whenever a watchful soul is born in a body,

this ancient inn, the world, trembles to its foundations."

In the perspective suggested by Iqbal's politico-cultural thinking the human ego has a definite political and cultural destiny which anticipates its fulfilment in the ever-shifting geo-historical situations of the modern world.

QUAID-I AZAM AND ISLAMIC CULTURE

Abdul Humid

"Culture" is apparently a simple word. The Concise Oxford Dictionary defines it as "trained and refined state of understanding and manners and tastes". Thus one who can enjoy and appreciate the best and the finest things in life is said to be a man of culture. But this word has gathered a great deal of mass with the passage of time. Its original meaning has been considerably broadened. It is now usual to speak of the cultural characteristics of racial and national groups. Interpreted in this why the culture of a people comprehends the entire complex of its hopes and fears, opinions and assumptions, views on life and living and its public and private morals that find expression in laws, precedents and customs. Essentially, it is the soul and spirit of a people and includes all that they pride and preserve as distinctive marks of self-identification. Not all sections of a society are equally culture conscious. Some would guard their cultural frontiers in the spirit of a crusade. Less sensitive sections of society may not go that far. But few are entirely indifferent to the fate of their culture. This is a veritable frame of reference for what they do and what they desist from doing. A living culture is necessarily dynamic. It responds to fresh ideas and novel situations. Politically and economically virile groups leave an indelible cultural impact on weaker and less stable groups. "Cultural infiltration" and "cultural aggression" are not altogether modern concepts. But no culture would admit or absorb all extraneous influences.

The Muslims entered the south Asian subcontinent as far back as the early years of the eighth century. Their scanty numbers grew by the triple process of immigration,, conversion and procreation. The distinction between the converts and immigrants and their descendants was never firmly drawn. As a matter of an ingrained habit the people of the areas included in the Pakistan of today have tended to look westwards. They have always esteemed their spiritual affiliations with the wilier world of Islam. What is popularly known as the Indian Muslim culture represents the interaction of the Muslim faith on local populations and indigenous creeds. Within this culture there are numerous variations and differences which are local and accidental, by no means fundamental. They have all flourished under the overall umbrella of "Muslim civilisation".

Muslim culture is founded on traditional Muslim learning. The characteristic and centuries-old school system was broadly similar in all Muslim lands, imparting instruction in identical disciplines with the help of the self-same texts. The vast and varied Muslim scholarly community was ever mobile and truly cosmopolitan. Educational exchange is not exactly a post-war innovation. It was inherent in the Muslim social system. Students moved from country to country in quest of knowledge (and its professors) in their chosen fields. Arabic and Persian served as educational media. Either one or the other was widely understood throughout the Muslim world. So that it was the typical Muslim scholarship combined with the established Muslim legal system and well-known institutions like the mosque and the annual pilgrimage that forged and cemented the bonds of cultural unity among the Muslim peoples living in different climes and longitudes. The Muslim elite in the subcontinent, like their peers abroad, were, thus, sure of their intellectual foundations and spiritual moorings.

The establishment of British rule in the middle of the nineteenth century created no end of problems for the conquered Muslims. The subject races were overwhelmed by the undoubted superiority of the rulers in the arts of war and peace. The Muslim response to the new order was initially undecided. Of Western education the community was particularly distrustful. Rejecting it as godless learning, it kept the growing generation away from the new schools. This negative attitude persisted for decades. The spiritual crisis was accompanied by a sort of economic serfdom that aggravated Muslim afflictions. With his characteristic insight, Sayyid Ahmad Khan (1818-1898) grasped the implications of the desperate situation and applied himself to remedial action. In an attempt to wean his people away from their old ways, he fought their sterile attitude to the culture of the ruling classes. His mission was obstructed by orthodoxy and obscurantism. But his viewpoint prevailed towards the end of his long and strenuous life. If Sayyid Ahmad Khan was the founder of the modern "Indian Muslim nationalism," Iqbal (1877-1938) was its most consistent and influential philosopher. Jinnah (1876-1948) built on the foundations laid by both. It was left to him to transform the concept of Muslim nationhood into a political reality.

Nationalism is essentially, a Western concept. It was practically unknown in the land before the establishment of British political and administrative institutions. At any rate, it made little appeal to the Muslims.

At the hands of its non-Muslim exponents, the gospel of nationalism was almost unconsciously woven into the texture of existing social and cultural disparities. The product was not one (territorial) Indian nationalism, but two ideological nationalisms, Hindu and Muslim. Their integration was ruled out from the very start. In spite of its constant exposure to numerous and conflicting systems of ideas, and extensive but selective borrowings from exotic sources, Muslim culture has remained fundamentally Muslim. As it happened, the Indian National Congress (founded 1885) and the All-India Muslim League (founded 1906) became the symbols of these nascent nationalisms.

Jinnah entered politics in 1906. The *India Review* of Madras welcomed the new recruit to Congress ranks deploring the calculated Muslim apathy towards this organisation. Jinnah's rise on the political horizon was phenomenal. To be a Muslim Gokhale was his reported aspiration, yet he shaped unlike any other leader, Hindu or Muslim. The politics of a subjugated people can be highly emotional and the declarations of its leaders are often marked by lack of precision and realism. Jinnah avoided both. Of restrained speech, he was a pragmatic constitutionalist without mental reservations. He expounded no philosophies and floated no legends about himself. A politician with the temper of a states-man, he mixed with few. His integrity and incorruptibility won him the deserved measure of applause and recognition from his countrymen. But the understanding of a man and admiration for him may not always go together. Jinnah was not adequately understood either by his associates in the Congress or by the common run of leaders of the Muslim community from which he sprang. He was apparently somewhat distant from the Muslims, because his community, on the whole, had no enthusiasm for the politics of a Congressite Muslim. It was in the year 1920 when the Congress became an affair of mob demonstrations, exuberant emotional-ism and studied lawbreaking that Jinnah walked out of it. The new weapons of agitational politics were repugnant to his orderly nature. This was precisely the moment when the Muslims entered the Congress in large numbers even though this new-fangled relationship was uneasy and shortlived.

Jinnah's contacts with orthodox Muslim leaders were neither frequent nor intimate. He was openly critical of their unconcealed and courtly leanings towards the alien bureaucracy. His Hindu colleagues misjudged him for different reasons. They took for granted his much-gossipped about ignorance of Islam and doubted his sense of belonging to the Muslim community. This was taking a wrong measure of the man. Rather late in life he told his sister that, while yet in his teens, he had decided to join the Lincoln's Inn for barristerial studies only because that institution displayed the name of the Prophet among the great lawgivers of the world.

Jinnah's concern for the affairs of his community was deep and sustained, not spectacular. Even from the Congress platform he had pleaded for appropriate waqf legislation to repair the damage done by a Privy Council decision (1894) in a well-known case it had decided under the Muslim law. When he rose from his seat in the legislature (11 March 1911) to introduce the validating bill, he explained the confusion and consternation that the judicial verdict had caused among the Muslims and went on to say:

"The feeling in the country on this point is very… strong… The question… has been agitating the Muslim community. I had the opportunity of consulting leading Mussalmans in the country… the Muslim League, which represents a great volume of Mussalman opinion in this country… passed a resolution… that the Government should undertake this legislation. ... I decided that the only way . . . in which (this question) can be solved . . . was to bring a bill in the council. . . . The decision of the Privy Council is not in accordance with the true principles of Mussalman law.... It has been breaking up Muslim families. ... Wakfs have been hunted down.... The bill is only intended to reproduce the Muslim law. . . . I have quite easily obtained two French translations of books which appear to deal with the whole subject and to indicate how the institution is regarded in Turkey . . . and Egypt. . . . I may draw . . . attention of the council to the words of a great Russian professor who approves of the system...."

This utterance cannot be brushed aside as irrelevant to the understanding of the man. It provides a significant clue to J innah's thinking and loyalties at the beginning of his career as a legislator. He was not only fully alive to the social and economic problems of the Muslim community, but was actually doing what-ever he could to help their solution. In spite of his Congress connections he could accurately guage the strength of the Muslim sentiment on social and political questions. This is borne out by his many-sided interest in contemporary issues of Muslim politics. Thus he supported the popular Muslim demand for raising the Aligarh College to the status of a university, and disfavoured the vast powers of interference that the Government proposed to assume with respect to its organisational affairs. Upholding the Congress demand for self-government he did not join the chorus for "colonial" form of self-rule in India. He would not condone the culpability of high public officials whose high-handedness and cynical disregard for the strong Muslim sentiment had led to the demolition of a part of a mosque building (1913) that obstructed the progress of a municipal road-building project at Cawnpore.

Jinnah joined the Muslim League in 1913. The event has been briefly described by poetess Sarojani Naidu in a passage of lofty and spirited prose. Her remarks have been quoted and requoted till they stand established beyond question. Jinnah's decision was the outcome of clear thinking and considered judgment. It is not improbable that the lively imagination of the poetess has over-painted the picture. This new chapter in Jinnah's career could not have commenced with a show of disdain for the League. The Naidu version is plainly inconsistent with the character of the man as represented by the poetess herself. What may have actually brought Jinnah into the League was an appreciation of its re-presentative character and its sounder position on an important issue of public policy to be noticed in a moment. Addressing the Imperial Legislative Council on 11 March 1911, he had described the League as representing "a great volume of Mussalman opinion". At the end of the next year, i.e. 31 December 1912, he had commended the Muslim League resolution on "suitable self-government" as a distinct improvement on the unrealistic Congress preference for "colonial form of government". The simultaneous membership of both Congress and League, on Jinnah's part, might have looked like a piece of constitutional incongruity. This may have been demanded by the stituation. The tiny Muslim minority in the Congress was commonly reputed to be insensitive to the dictates of Muslim interests. But Jinnah was differently constituted. Muslim good meant to him as much as common weal; however, he interpreted both independently; the impression that he viewed the fortunes of his community with the detachment of an outsider is unfounded.

Jinnah used his new position with telling effect to bring about clearer understanding between the League and the Congress. The Lucknow Pact (1916), as it has been called, was a compromise measure with all the unattractive features of a give-and-take deal. Looking back over the years, its specific provisions appear to be far less important than the spirit that led to the success of direct negotiations between the major communities. The agreement was based on the assumption that the Congress was entitled to speak for the Hindus and that the League alone was the guardian of Muslim interests. It amounted to an unqualified recognition of the League claim to determine Muslim priorities in the milieu of India's body politic. This reading of the concord was unilaterally repudiated by the Hindu leadership after 1924. The Muslim gain, however, was no less strategic than it was psychological and enduring.

It was in response to a compelling viceregal apeal that all political activity was suspended at the beginning of World War I. But this vacuum proved ephemeral. The ineptitude and insolence of foreign bureaucracy, that construed all independent expression of opinion as sedition, ended the truce. The revival of political life was signalised by the formation of the Home Rule League (1917) which enrolled politicians of all persuasions. Jinnah was one of its formost leaders and this historic juncture represented the meridian of his "nationalist" politics. An indefati gable peacemaker between the two major communities he was extolled as the "Ambassador of Hindy-Muslim Unity". But the "nationalist" in him was far from the way he administered the most personal affair in life. His wedding took place in 1918. Belonging to an aristocratic and conservative Parsi family, the bride was converted to Islam before the marriage ritual. A civil union in this case might have passed off without notice or comment when the evanescent zest for inter-communal unity was still strong. But Jinnah chose to adhere to the Muslim matrimonial dictates. Apparently, he had no mind to figure as "a Muslim with a difference". Nevertheless, he was opposed to obscurantism in every form. Liberalism in politics had given him an unbiased outlook on social questions. Thus he had little respect for the time-honoured institution of *purdah* and was a valiant advocate of women's emancipation.

A closer study of the politics of the 'twenties is essential to a clear understanding of all that happened to the subcontinent in the late 'thirties and after, leading to the break-up of 1947. The political atmosphere of the period was brimming with tensions and uncertainties. The situation had all the appearance of a civil war that ruled out a level-headed discussion of public and political controversies. The far-reaching significance of Jinnah's unostentatious re-emergence in politics (1924), after a brief spell of retirement, was far from apparent to the contemporaries. Indian independence still remained his first objective, but this, he thought, could not come about without a durable Hindu-Muslim compact for the protection of the political and cultural rights of the Muslim minority in the British Indian empire. A Bill of Rights, in his judgment, could offer no dependable guarantees for peaceful co-existence. An act of British withdrawal from the subcontinent, which could not be foreseen at the moment, would not necessarily mean freedom for the Muslims. It might bring graver disabilities leading them into no-man's-land.

The Muslim dilemma, was, by now, abundantly clear. They were confronted with a choice between conflicting loyalties. Allegiance to the community might put a heavy strain on their obligations to the country. On the whole, the Muslims were not wanting in patriotism. But group integrity meant a great deal more to then. Current public debate centred round cultural issues and distribution of political power. As a matter of fact, the two were inseparably mixed up. Themes as diverse as the playing of music before places of worship, the slaughter on festive occasions of a certain species of animals and the quantum of representation for the various denominational groups in elective bodies were discussed at length in the futile "unity" conferences summoned by one party or the other under the pressure of circumstances.

To begin with, Jinnah was of opinion that a federal democratic constitution vesting residuary powers in the federating units — some of them with sizeable Muslim majorities — could be relied upon to afford political and cultural security to the community. But the disillusionment came at the end of 1928 when the majority representatives, assembled in a convention at Calcutta, summarily refused to listen to his moderate compromise proposals presented in the form of amendments to the document popularly know as the *Nehru Report*. This hostile posture exhausted his patience and he cried out that the "parting of ways" had come. This was no exaggeration. These words would continue to ring like a prophecy to later generations. The immediate issue was political, but the wheels of politics were being driven by forces generated by irreconcilable religious and political divisions. Almost exactly three months later, Jinnah formulated his "Fourteen Points" which may have been maturing in his mind since the Calcutta ferment. This was a set of propositions severally and collectively emanating from the various Muslim parties furnishing a rational basis for another approach to intercommunal consensus. These "Points" appear to lay down constitutional fundamentals. Their basic purpose is to preserve and protect

Muslim identity. This can be easily shown by the following: Point 7: "Full reli-gious liberty, that is, liberty of belief, worship, observances, association and education, should be granted to all communities." (A majority will have its way in all such matters anyhow. Coming from a minority it locates the spot where the shoe pinches.) Point 12: "The constitution should embody adequate safeguards for the protection of Muslim religion, culture and personal law, and promotion of Muslim education, language . . . Muslim charitable institutions, and for their due share in grants-in-aid given by the state and by self-governing bodies." Point 8 was more comprehensive but less specific. It empowered three-fourths majority of membership of any community in an elective body to withhold measures it judged "injurious" to its own interests. The recognisable purpose of the constitutional provisions was to secure cultural ends.

The political climate was not helpful. The majority representatives dismissed the "Fourteen Points" as a bunch of extravagant, even wild, claims. The criticism was unfair. Jinnah had broken no fresh ground. He was only acting as the spokesman of the general will. After this fresh disappointment, the protection of communal way of life became integral to every scheme advanced on behalf of the Muslims to secure an equitable deal in a free India. At the Round Table Conferences held in London (1930 and 1931) Jinnah was a fervent advocate of Indian independence; he was equally emphatic that this would remain a mere dream in the absence of Hindu-Muslim unity. The Hindu members of the Conference assumed that a constitutional framework could be completed be-fore attending to the problem of minority rights. Jinnah strongly questioned the justice of this approach. "I tell my friends here .. . that there is . . . a grave apprehension in the minds of Muslim delegates . . . that if you go on participating in the structure right up to the roof, and when everything is complete, this constant assurance that . . . the Communal question must be settled .. . may recede into the background to such an extent that we might have a finding, . . . against us ex-parte almost." The majority representatives rejected this order of priorities, insisting on "acquisition before distribution". These divergent premises ruled out the likelihood of a settlement.

In these and subsequent discussions, Jinnah proved an unyielding opponent of the Federal part of the constitutional scheme improvised by the British government of the day as it lacked every attribute of a workable and worthwhile union. At the same time, Iqbal had independently concluded that the new constitution (popularly known as the Act of 1935) would placate the Hindus and ultimately strike at the roots of Muslim solidarity, in spite of an imposing array of "safeguards" for the minorities with which it was loaded.

The provincial part of the constitution, which had given a measure of autonomy to the federal units, was less controversial and easier to operate. It was put on trial in 1937. Held earlier in the year, the elections to the newly constituted provincial legislatures gave a landslide victory to the Indian National Congress. When called upon to assume office the Congress parliamentarians adopted a coercive demeanour towards the British governors demanding a hand in running their governments. The constitutional guarantees for the minorities proved ineffective confirming the endemic Muslim apprehensions about the future, and bringing out, at the same time, the close interdependence between political power and cultural survival. Elected Muslirn representatives were excluded from power on grounds that would sound convincing in a mature parliamentary democracy like that of Britain, but were hardly valid under Indian conditions. Muslim culture was the first target of majority assault. The operation suppression was occasionally veiled. More often it was direct and frontal. A well-known song from a noted work of Bengali fiction was decreed the national anthem. The Muslims took a strong exception to the decision as its author was an unabashed revivalist whose primary object was to whip up Hindu feeling of hostility and contempt against the Muslims. An educational scheme directly leading to the Hinduisation of society was enforced in the face of a vocal and vigorous Muslim opposition. Branded as an alien import, Urdu, the language of Indian Muslims, was dislodged from its position as the *lingua franca* of northern India. These and other discriminatory measures came in quick succession. Muslim dissent was either ignored or overruled as "vexacious" and "frivolous". This left the Muslim minority in the larger part of India exposed with no hope of redress or redemption. With cultural (and eventually all-round) annihilation staring them in the face, the Muslims hastened to close their ranks as the only condition of their continued group existence. The circumstances that pulled Jinnah out of retirement and placed him at the helm were unprecedented in the annals of British rule in the subcontinent.

From this point (1937) began the duel between the two major political parties, the Congress and the League, and their leaders, that ended in the departure of the British and the division of the subcontinent. The compelling and exceptional circumstances of the situation turned the constitutionalist and parliamentarian Jinnah into a mass leader almost overnight. He became the idol of the Muslims for his "courage and candour and fidelity to fundamentals". In him they discovered their natural leader, nay, their saviour. Cheerfully he submitted to restraints and responsibilities inherent in this role. He adopted the traditional Indian Muslim dress and began to address mass meetings in the Urdu language over which his mastery was far from complete. In spite of his halting speech he was heard with feelings of profound deference. This phase of his politics brought him into close touch with poet and seer, Iqbal: while the latter had unbounded admiration for Jinnah's strength of convictions and upright dealings, the two had lately found themselves in the opposing wings of the divided Muslim League. From his death-bed the philosopher made a spontaneous response to the leader's call and agreed to fill a provincial party office under him. On 21 June 1937, he wrote to Jinnah that "the only way to a peaceful India is a redistribution of the country on the lines of racial, religious and linguistic affinities". In an earlier communication dated 28 May 1937, he had stressed "that the enforcement and development of the Shariat of Islam is impossible in this country without a free Muslim state or states". Jawaharlal Nehru had sharply denied the existence of minorities and derided the symbols of their culture. Iqbal's reaction to these postulates was summarised in another letter, dated 20 March 1937: "It is absolutely necessary to tell the world both inside and outside India that the economic problem is not the only problem in the country. From the Muslim point of view the cultural problem is of much greater consequence to most Muslims." Jinnah must have applied his precise and penetrating mind to this thesis in the light of his long experience and the dismal facts of the rapidly worsening political scene. Quite a few of Jinnah's public utterances during this period bear an unmistakable imprint of the philosopher's thinking and viewpoint. Towards the end of 1938, he finally realised that the social and cultural barriers separating the two major communities would not collapse under the levelling pressure exerted by a common "democratic" constitution. He told the Muslim League gathering at Patna (December 1938) that "I have no hesitation in saying that it is . . . Gandhi . . . who is turning the Congress into an instrument for the revival of Hinduism . . . and he is utilizing the Congress to further this object." In this very context he had observed a few moments earlier that "the Congress is determined, absolutely determined, to crush all other communities and cultures in this country". Throughout the next year he was speaking in the same strain. After the passage of the Lahore Resolution (23 March 1940) his language was firmer and uncompounded. Talking to an American journalist on 1 July 1942, he elaborated, once more, the thesis of his Lahore speech stating: "The difference between the Hindus and Muslims is deep-rooted and ineradicable. We are a nation with our own distinctive culture and civilization, language and literature, art and architecture, names and nomenclature, sense of values and proportion, legal laws and moral cedes, customs and calender, history and traditions, aptitudes and ambitions. in short we have our distinctive outlook on life." These were the grounds on which he continued to justify the demand for a Muslim homeland. The spiritual contentment of the people was of greater moment to him than material affluence achievable under unwanted domination. When a press correspondent tried to cast doubts on the economic viability of the proposed state of Pakistaa. he replied that he was not at all worried about the alleged poverty of the land and indigence of its people ; it was a matter of gratitude that Pakistanis would enjoy the blessings of freedom and keep up their self-respect. Moreover, in his way of thinking, the creation of Pakistan was not an end in itself; it would come into existence as a state with a mission. In his message issued to the Frontier Muslim Students' Federation he indicated the sense of direction: "Pakistan not only means freedom and independence, but the Muslim ideology, which has to be preserved, which has come to us as a precious gift and treasure and which, we hope, others will share with us."

Ultimately it is the genius of the people that would furnish the motive force behind the system envisaged by him and this had to be saved at all costs. "The vital contest in which we are engaged," he told a gathering of the Punjab Muslim Students' Federation on 2 March 1941, "is not only for material gain but also for the very existence of the soul of the Muslim nation. Hence I have said often that it is . . . not a matter of bargaining. . . . If we lose in the struggle all is lost. Let our motto be, as the .. . proverb says: Money is lost nothing is lost ; courage is lost much is lost ; honour is lost most is lost ; soul is lost all is lost."

To sum up: spiritual and cultural homogeneity was an over-emphasised ingredient of nationalism as it developed on this sub-continent. Both Hindu and Muslim nationalisms were primarily culture-based and retained this character throughout. The developments that followed the partition of Bengal (1905) gave a deep religious complexion to Hindu nationalism.

Gandhi went further. Confessing that every fibre of his being was Hindu, he brought such concepts as "inner voice" and "inward light" into politics that bordered on the elusive and the irrational. The initially liberal and constitutional Muslim nationalism crumbled before the onslaught of the Khilafat movement with its pan-Islamist propensities. The relations between the Hindu and Muslim national-isms were relaxed for a while, but the two were ranged in an unrelenting state of confrontation after 1922. The political and cultural discords of the day represented the two sides of same coin. Gandhi himself had declared in 1925 that the problem of cow-protection was as important as the issue of Indian independence.

There is ample evidence to show that the Quaid-i Azam acted as an independent spokesman of the Muslim community from the very beginning of his public career. though his innate aloofness and elitist attitudes created the legend that he was remote from his community. This is an excessive simplification. On important questions he followed the community line. In spite of his personal disapproval of separate representation, he did not press his views because his trust in joint electorate was not shared by the generality of Muslims. Similarly, in releasing the resolution on the Four-teen Points he was careful to point out that the draft represented not his personal views but the measure of communal agreement. The fact that he never set himself up against the Muslim community would partly explain the spontaneity with which his leader-ship was accepted and acclaimed. His motto "Unity, Faith and Discipline" commanded instinctive assent as it appeared to hark hack to the ways of early Islam. It is true that he did not speak the language of the culturalists of today. But whereas his later politics was plainly culture-inspired, his earlier politics was discernibly culture-oriented.

IQBAL'S RELATION WITH THE BRITISH IMPERIAL POWER

Riaz Hussain

Iqbal's relation with the British Imperial Power in India was characterised by perennial friction and conflict. He was deeply conscious of his own and his nation's position as enslaved people,[75] yet he had the nerve to look straight into the eyes of the representatives of the British Raj.

Almost at the outset of his career he came into direct conflict with the highest political authority, the redoubtable Lord Curzon, Viceroy of India.

In 1903, Iqbal's elder brother Shaikh Ata Muhammad, then working as Sub-Divisional Officer in the Department of Military Works at Quetta, was involved in a criminal plot by his professional adversaries. The charges framed against him were entirely fake. Apprehending that Shaikh Ata Muhammad would be judged unfairly, Iqbal addressed a forceful letter to Lord Curzon, setting out the facts of the case in detail. The Viceroy ordered a prompt re-investigation of the case, at the end of which the charge-sheet against Shaikh Ata Muhammad was withdrawn.[76]

Apart from the Viceroy, Iqbal's relationship with the Indian Civil Service, the steel frame of the British Empire in India, was none too happy.

In his speeches on the floor of the Punjab Legislative Assembly during the 1929-30 Sessions Iqbal twice[77] made some provocative suggestions to curb the vested interests of the bureaucracy. The bureaucratic elite, composed mainly of the British, drew enormous salaries, allowances which, coupled with spacious housing facilities, servants, furloughs, pensions and gratuities, gave them a much higher standard of living than any other comparable class of bureaucracy in the world. Referring to this, Iqbal categorically stated in the Council: "We spend much more than any other country in the world on the present system of ad-ministration. . . . We pay much more than our revenues justify."[78] He informed the house that "There are to my mind only three alternatives open to the people of this province—either have the present system with all its ugly daughters, such as deficit budgets, communal bickerings, starving millions, debt and unemployment or do away with the present system root and branch, or retain the form of the present system and secure the power to pay less for it. There is no other alternative. This system must come to an end if you want to live a comfortable life."[79] The last sentences of the quoted excerpt implied large cuts in the emoluments and facilities enjoyed by the civil service. Not unnaturally the statement drew a strong protest from the British official members of the house and the feudal-bureaucratic establishment dismissed Iqbal's suggestions out of hand.

---

[75] See "Taswir-i Dard" (*Bang-i Dara*, pp. 68-76) and "Ghulamon Ki Namaz" (*Darb-i Kalim*, p. 15S), in *Kulliyat-i Iqbal* (Urdu), (Lahore: Sh. Ghulam Ali & Sons, 1977).

[76] Riaz Hussain, *The Polities of Iqbal* (Lahore: Islamic Book Service, 1977), PP. 3-4.

[77] See speeches delivered on 4 March 1929 and 7 March 1930 (reproduced in Latif Ahmad Sherwani, Ed., *Speeches, Writings and Statements of Iqbal* [Lahore : Iqbal Academy Pakistan, 1977), pp. 59-65).

During the Round Table Conference also there was a latent current of hostility between Iqbal and Britishers. Iqbal proposed to his fellow Muslim delegates to the Round Table Conference that the British government should be advised to accept Provincial Autonomy before the introduction of the principle of Central responsibility in the Government of India. In the opinion of Iqbal, without the consolidation of Provincial Autonomy a federal constitution could not function in India. Accepting Iqbal's view the Muslim Delegation resolved on 15 November 1931 not to participate in the discussions of the Federal Structure Committee.

In a surprise move, disregarding its earlier decision, the Muslim Delegation did participate in the Federal Committee on 26 November and consented to the simultaneous introduction of Provincial Autonomy and Central Responsibility.

Iqbal blamed the British politicians for this somersault of the Muslim Delegation. In bitter tones Iqbal commented: "The Muslim spokesmen were badly advised by certain English politicians in rejecting the immediate introduction of responsible Government in the provinces of British India."[80]

Two years after the publication of the *Secrets of the Self* (1924 an English translation of *Asrar-i Khudi* by Reynold A. Nicholson of Cambridge University, the British Government, recognising his scholarship and poetic talent, knighted Iqbal.

---

[78] Ibid., p. 64.

[79] Ibid.

[80] Quoted from Percival Griffiths, *The British Impact on India* (London : Frank Cass, 1955), p. 330, in Riaz Hussain, op. cit., p. 86.

Iqbal did not seek this honour and it came to him unsolicited. In this he was an exception because his other contemporaries, Mian Fazl-i Hussain, Sikandar Hayat Khan and Shaikh Abdul Qadir, had earned their Knighthood by sterling service to the colonial power.

Fazl-i Hussain's and Sikandar Hayat's entire career was spent in the service of the British rule. The apathy which existed between Iqbal and these two gentlemen was mainly attributable to this cause.

The hostility between Iqbal and the British rulers is well port-rayed by Azim Hussain, Fazl-i Husain's son.

On the authority of his father's diaries, Azim Hussain tells us:

> "In 1924 Fazl-i-Hussain urged Sir Malcolm Hailey to raise Iqbal to the Bench, but while the case was under consideration Dr. Iqbal alienated the sympathies of officials by unrestrained criticism of the Government. . . . On his [Iqbal's] return to India (from the Round Table Conference), he severely criticized the work of the Muslim Delegation, a criticism greatly resented by the Secretary of State because it belittled the proceedings of the Conference."

The Viceroy was also appropriately angry and only reluctantly agreed to send Iqbal to the Round Table Conference. "While the Conference was in progress," writes Azim Hussain, "he [Iqbal] re-signed and returned to India, and denounced the British Government in the strongest possible terms in his address to the Muslim League at Allahbad."[81] Not surprisingly, therefore, the Viceroy refused to appoint Iqbal as member of the Public Service Commission or as Agent of India to South Africa.[82]

It is inconceivable that Iqbal could ever have come to terms with British rulers. He regarded slavery as the greatest misfortune that could befall a man, while a free man in his eyes was a "living miracle in himself".[83]

---

[81] Azim Hussain, *Fazl-i-Hussain* (Bombay : Longmans, 1946), pp. 318-19.

[82] Ibid., p. 320.

[83] Darb-i Kalim (Kulliyat), p. 78

A STUDY OF LOCKE'S ATTACK ON INNATE KNOWLEDGE IN COMPARISON TO DESCARTES AND LEIBNIZ

Mrs Arifa Shameem

The scope of this essay is restricted to a study of Locke's attack on theoretical innate knowledge with reference to Descartes who was the patron of innate idea theory in modern classical philosophy ; and Leibniz's evaluation of Locke's challenge to the theory of innate knowledge. I shall omit in this paper Locke's arguments against innate practical knowledge and Leibniz's answer to him in order to bring my present study within reasonable bounds. However, I believe that the arguments Locke advances against *innate practical knowledge* and Leibniz's reply to them are in substance more or less the same as they have advanced with regard to innate theoretical knowledge.

As an heir of Descartes, who defined all thoughts and experience in terms of ideas, Locke chooses the "new way of ideas" as the easiest way to knowledge and truth. All internal and external experiences of man are known to him in terms of "ideas". "Ideas," therefore, are the media through which man knows himself, other people, external world, and God. Locke denies all direct approach to reality. The treasure of knowledge and truth is open to man by way of "ideas". In the Essay[84] Locke occupies himself with the task of defining the origin, extent and certainty of all knowledge. Tracing the origin of all knowledge, Locke declares experience as the source and fountain of all knowledge. The human mind is like a tabula rasa which comes to be furnished with "ideas" it derives from experience. Man has a double source of experience. When his mind is employed about external sensible object, it comes to be furnished with ideas of sensation; when it is employed about its own operation, it gets ideas of reflection.[85] These two kinds of ideas cover the whole range of man's experience and are the limits of his knowledge. In

---

[84] John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, abridged and edited by AS. Pringle•Pattison, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950. 59

[85] Ibid., p. 42.

Book II, Chap. I, Sec. 8 of the Essay,[86] Locke claims that our mind comes to be furnished with ideas of sensation prior to the ideas of reflection. The latter require greater attention and maturity and are, therefore, late in experience than ideas of sensation. Considering experience as the whole range of knowledge, Locks declares that there are no "innate ideas". All ideas are acquired through experience. Locke's denial of innate ideas has led to a great controversy in philosophical circles as to what Locke means by "innate ideas" when he denies them, and what he means by "experience" when he affirms it as the whole and sole of knowledge. Or, in other words, what it is that he is denying when he denies innate knowledge, Locke's attack is not directed mainly towards Descartes who was the patron of innate idea theory in modern classical philosophy, for Locke most of the time denies those innate principles or axioms that were supplied by Scholastics to be the foundation of all knowledge. Locke was deadly against such deductive knowledge as was based upon unquestionable axioms or maxims, and first principles. Locke viewed such maxims as only general principles arrived at through abstractions and generalisations. However, the scope of this paper is limited to an analysis of his arguments in so far as they affected Descartes' position, and Leibniz's reply to them.

In *Meditation II*;[87] Descartes classifies all ideas under three heads: (1) innate ideas; (2) adventitious ideas, (3) ideas invented by the mind or ideas of imagination.

Descartes 'criteria of true and false ideas are their "clearness" and "distinctness". Of all ideas, the ideas of "God" and of "oneself" are the most "clear'and "distinct" ideas. Tracing the origin of these ideas, Descartes declares them as innate. *By innate ideas Descartes understands such ideas whose presence within me is not caused by myself; and I can by no mental catharsis get rid of them*. The cause of all innate ideas is God. In Meditation 11 he writes: "All clear and distinct awareness is undoubtedly something it cannot owe its origin to nothing and must of necessity have God as its author."[88]

Here it is important to find out what is Descartes' meaning when he traces the source of all ideas in God. Does he mean to say that God has engraved on our mind, as it were, the full-blown ideas such that in our act of knowing we simply make use of them? Or is there any other meaning of their being innate? When we analyse Descartes' meaning with respect to different kinds of ideas that are innate, we find that by innateness Descartes understands different things in different contexts. When he talks about the idea of God as innate, he seems to imply that the idea of God is some-thing given to us, or is present in our minds, in its full-blown form so that a denial of the presence of such an idea will be a white lie. We all have this idea within us, which we perceive instantly alongwith the ideas of our own selves. My awareness of my-self as imperfect is an awareness of an absolute perfection (God) somewhere out of myself. This is a universal idea then, which, to speak the truth, we must all affirm. It is also a necessary idea in the sense that denial of it would amount to the denial of the idea of one's own self, which is another necessary idea in the sense that the very act of denial is an affirmation of it.

---

[86] Ibid., pp. 43-44.

[87] E.S. Haldane and G.R. Ross, Ed. and Tr., *Philosophical Works of Des-cartes*, Cambridge: University Press, 1967.

[88] Ibid.

To prove that the idea of God is innate within me and not in-vented by my mind or presented to me by something outside me, Descartes refers to the principle known by natural light: that is, cause must contain the effect either formally or eminently. I, he argues, can neither be the formal cause nor eminent cause of the "idea of myself comprehending the idea of God as a perfect being," for, in order to be the cause, I shall have to be either as perfect as my "idea of God," or more perfect: I am neither of these, I am rather aware of myself as an imperfect being, and as such cannot invent the idea of a perfect being. For if I could, I would have imparted all possible perfection to myself. Nor can the external objects be the cause of the idea of God, for none of them contain perfection and therefore cannot be the formal or eminent cause of this idea. My idea of God is, therefore, caused by nothing other than God Himself, and is innate in this sense.

As for my idea of myself, it is also innate. By innateness Descartes here understands something different. My idea of my-self is innate in the sense that I become aware of it by "natural light". In the very first act of reflection I become aware of myself as a thinking being and come to have a "clear" and "distinct" idea of myself. This is also a *universal* idea in the sense that whoever makes a mental exercise and pays attention to his thought becomes aware of himself. It is necessary in the sense that every act of reflection affirms to each one of us that he is a thinking being, and thus each one of us comes to have a clear and distinct idea of himself. But what is the origin of this idea? Or, in other words, who is the author of this idea of myself within me? Descartes' answer seems to be that the cause of the "idea of myself" within me is myself, for each time I reflect I become aware of my-self as the cause or author of this idea, or, in other words, when, after purging my mind of all prejudices I reflect, I perceive myself as the cause of the idea of myself. What Descartes perhaps meant by considering "myself" the cause of the idea of "myself" is that my first act of reflection affirms, on the one hand, my own existence and, on the other hand, *my existence as the cause of the idea of myself.* However, Descartes was not himself sure of the cause of the idea of one's own being. He nowhere explicitly discusses this issue. In *Meditation IV* he makes a general remark that the cause of all innate ideas is God. But the question still persists: is God the cause of the idea of myself in me in its fully formulated form? Descartes' language is here fluctuating. Though he makes a general remark that God is the cause of all innate ideas, in this context he means to say that God has endowed us with "natural light" which is a faculty through which we are able to arrive at "clear" and "distinct" ideas of ourselves, of God and of other things. An innate idea of ons own self is an idea which is perfectly "clear" and "distinct," because it is perceived by "natural light". The innate idea of "myself" here is not *given*, *inscribed*, or engraved on my mind, but it is something which the "natural light" makes evident to me in the first act of meditation. But, is God needed to validate my ideas of myself? Does not Descartes' claim that the idea of myself is the first intuition within me of a truth, and that it is not possible for me to doubt my own existence, since the more I doubt, the more evident it becomes that I exist as a doubting being? This idea of myself as a "thinking being," then, is an idea such as which I can never purge from my mind. I can doubt the whole universe with all its glory and beauty, but I can by no effort doubt the truth of the idea of myself. Even a *Deus Deceptor* cannot make me doubt my own existence. This is, then, an idea so "clear" and "distinct" that I can have no occasion for doubting it. It is innate, then, in a very unique sense. It is an awareness of myself, my being, my own existence without which I would cease to be. I cannot doubt myself as the author of this idea. Now, this is a very confusing position. Descartes normally believes that all ideas are innate by virtue of God being their author. But in case of my idea of myself, the author seems to be undoubtedly myself and not God. Descartes nowhere clarifies this ambiguity.

As for the ideas of sensible objects, again, so long as they are mere perceptions, they do not convey any knowledge to the mind. But our minds are capable of having "clear" and "distinct" ideas of them, through the "natural light," and an eternally veracious God ensures that whenever I have a "clear" and "distinct" idea of anything; the idea so long as it is "clear" and "distinct" cannot be false; and there must exist something in the external world which is the cause of the idea. The immediate causes, therefore, of the ideas (not perceptions) of sensible objects as extended beings are those physical objects outside me of which they are ideas. But these ideas are innate in the sense that they are presented to me by "natural light" which is a faculty of clear and distinct perception (rational apprehension) endowed to me by God. The clear and distinct ideas of a sensible object, then, are not given to me in the sense of being engraved or inscribed on my mind: in their fully formulated forms, they are innate in the sense of my potentiality of knowing them by the "natural light": though an immense variety of such adventitious ideas may never become a part of my thoughts.

All ideas for Descartes, then, are innate, from the simple idea of my own self, to the idea of God, and complex ideas of a variety of things.

Here it is important to note that, though Descartes regarded all ideas as innate, he uses the term "innate" in different senses in different contexts. The idea of God is innate in the sense that it is present in the mind in its fully formulated form, and is revealed to the mind as soon as mind becomes aware of its imperfection. It is an idea, then, which is what Locke would call "something that soul brings with itself". The idea of myself is innate in the sense of being self-evident to me as a necessary truth. The ideas of physical objects as extended substances are innate in the sense of being "clear" and "distinct" idea whose truth is qualified by an eternally veracious God. However, despite these different shades of meaning of innateness, Descartes writes in his *Notes Against A Programme*[89] and in his letter addressed to Mersenne, and at many other places, that by innateness he means nothing other than the faculty of thinking itself. All ideas are innate, then, in the sense that the mind has the capacity to formulate them, though it may actually never formulate them.

Locke in Book I of the Essay[90] denies all innate ideas and principles whether theoretical or practical. All knowledge, according to Locke, is derived from *experience*. Experience, then, is the whole and sole of our knowledge. Human mind is like a *tabula rasa* on which impressions are imprinted as a result of experience. As stated before, Locke's polemic against innate ideas is not specially directed towards Descartes. However, Locke was fully familiar with Descartes' philosophical position and was an heir of Descartes' in so far as his "new way of ideas" is concerned. One can safely say that Descartes' theory of innate ideas must have been in his mind when he attacked innate ideas and principles. Before examining Locke's attack on innate ideas, it is important to specifically lay down the meaning of the terms "idea" as it is used by Descartes and Locke.

---

[89] Ibid.

[90] Op. cit., pp. 16-41.

Descartes uses the term "idea" in three senses: (I) idea is used to stand for a sensible impression; (2) idea signifies an immediate intuitive apprehension of something; (3) idea is used to denote a mental concept. When Descartes talks of innate ideas, by ideas in this context he understands the intuitive apprehension of something. The ideas, impressions or images produced by body on our minds do not play any part in Descartes' epistemology. These ideas or impressions are forthwith rejected by Descartes as confused perceptions that obscure our thoughts and have no foundation in reality. Those ideas, then, that are known by intellectual intuition form all the data of our knowledge.

Locke, who is proud of his "new way of ideas," gives a completely different scheme of knowledge. Locke defines an idea as "whatsoever is the object of understanding when a man thinks". He classifies all ideas as (a) ideas of sensation and (b) ideas of reflection. The former are impressions imprinted on the mind in its immediate relation with sensible objects. The latter are impressions received by the mind when the mind is employed about itself. These are simple ideas of which, when combined together in different ways, our mind comes to have complex ideas. The whole of our experience comprises these ideas. Locke rejects the possibility of any other source of knowledge. All knowledge for Locke is derived from experience. "Experience" is the general term that covers immense variety of ideas. In view of Locke's notion of ideas, knowledge and experience, let us see how far his attack on innate ideas affects Descartes' position.

In the very beginning of Chap. II, Book I of the Essay, Locke remarks: "It is an established opinion amongst some men that there are in the understanding certain innate principles ; some primary notions, characters, as it were, stamped upon the mind of man, which the soul receives in its very beginning and brings into the world with it."[91] As he proceeds, he writes: "It would be sufficient to convince unprejudiced readers of the falsiness of this proposition, if I should only show (as I hope I shall do in the following part of the discourse) how men, barely by the use of their natural faculties, may attain to all knowledge they have without the help of innate impressions, and may arrive at certainty without any such original notions or principles."[92]

With these remarks, Locke proceeds to examine and criticise all innate ideas, notions or principles whether theoretical or practical. Before we proceed to examine Locke's arguments against innate ideas, it is important to note that Locke considers innate ideas and principles as if they are "stamped upon the minds of men," or which "the soul receives in its very beginning and brings into the world with it". Now, this is not the meaning of innate ideas and principles as held by the exponents of innate knowledge theory. No one ever held that innate ideas and principles are as if "stamped upon the mind". Locke is misled by his metaphor *tabula rasa* which he uses for mind on which, as it were, impressions are imprinted. There is no denying the fact that the function of the mind begins when it conies into contact with the external world. This is also true that all knowledge begins with experience. But, what does it matter? Is not experience a co-ordinated function of the mind and the external world? Locke's language seems to imply that in the reception of the data of knowledge, mind is passive to the extent of not functioning at all. But Locke cannot give any evidence of it from experience.

Locke commits another error when he claims to show to his opponents that "how men barely by their use of natural faculties may attain to all knowledge they have, without the help of any innate principle".[93] This statement of Locke's is based upon a complete misunderstanding of the nature of innate idea and principle theory. No significant philosopher except some old Platonists and Scholastics, have ever meant by innate ideas or principles certain notions or propositions which are given ready-made at the birth of a child. Tile exponents of innate idea theory have not made any greater claim than that these ideas and principles constitute the framework of our mind which, in its contact with the external world, yields knowledge ; or that we all discover certain ideas and principles within us as necessary truths, which form the basis of all our knowledge. However, Locke's attack need not be supposed as throwing stones in the vacuum. It definitely hurts the position of Descartes with regard to his idea of God. As for the other innate ideas, Descartes traces them to the faculty of reason or, what he calls, the "natural light," but he seems to believe that the idea of God is present in our mind in its fully formulated form and is yielded to the mind in its first serious act of meditation. Descartes even searches for the cause of the idea of God (which is the same as idea of an absolutely perfect Being) and gives arguments to prove that the cause of this idea within us in its fully formulated form is God Himself. It is innate, then, in the sense of being actually given to us by God in its fully formulated form, or, what Locke would say, "the soul receives in its very beginning and brings into the world with it". However, with the sole exception of Descartes' idea of God, all other innate ideas are regarded by Descartes and others as certain notions and principles that the mind comes to attain through its use of natural faculties or reason. Leibniz specifically emphasises this point in his reply to Locke in his *New Essay*. He writes: "When it is read that innate notions are implicitly in the mind, this must simply mean that it has the faculty of knowing them."[94]

---

[91] Ibid., p. 16,

[92] Ibid.

[93] Ibid.

Locke, with the above-mentioned misunderstanding about the nature of innate ideas, advances a number of arguments against the theory of innate ideas and principles.

Locke's first charge against the exponents of innate idea theory is that they consider these ideas and principles as *universal* and as those "that are constant impressions which some of men receive in their first beginning and which they bring into the world with them as necessarily and really as they do any of their faculties".[95]

As for the second part of the charge that these ideas are considered as brought by the souls at the time of their birth alongwith other faculties, we have already seen that the exponents of innate idea theory never seriously meant that (with the sole exception of Descartes' innate idea of God which is innate in the sense of being logically necessary along with our ideas of our own selves). Leibniz totally rejects this view and clarifies that by innate ideas and principles is meant the faculty of knowing them or the faculty of finding them in itself and a disposition to approve them when it thinks of them as it should.

---

[94] Leibniz, *Philosophical Writings*, London : J.M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., New York : E.P. Dutton & Co. Inc., 1956.

[95] Locke, op. cit., p. 17.

As for Locke's charge that the upholders of innate idea theory regard some speculative and practical principles universal, this is true of Descartes so far as ideas of God and of oneself are concerned. As for other clear and distinct ideas (adventitious ideas), Descartes regards them innate but not necessary or universal. However, the maxim to which Locke refers, namely, 'what is and it is impossible for it not to be" was certainly regarded by Stoics and Scholastics as universal. But this and some other maxims were considered only as self-evident principles with do not require any proof. Locke also approves of self-evident knowledge, in view of which it is unfair for him to criticise others. Locke's argument that this and such other principles are not innate since not known to children and idiots has no force. For, as Leibniz has pointed out, universality is no criterion of innateness. Particular principles depend upon general principles which are necessary and which constitute the basis of our knowledge but are known after some labour. They are present in all of us at the framework of our knowledge (and are universal in this sense only), but we may not necessarily know them explicitly. They are implicit in our minds, which means that the mind has a faculty of knowing them; it has a faculty of finding them in itself and a disposition to approve them. Locke's argument is based upon the assumption that "no proposition can be said to be in the mind, which it never yet knows, which it was never yet conscious of.[96] This is a totally false claim which has no psychological basis. Everybody knows that there are a number of ideas and principles in his mind of which he is not all the time conscious, but which are stored in his memory. In the same way there are a number of truths which our minds are capable of discovering, but which every mind does not actually discover.

Leibniz rejects Locke's claim that the innate truths, if they are actually innate, should be known to children and idiots. Leibniz argues that the apperception of that which is in us depends upon attention and order. Children give more attention to the ideas of senses, because their attention is regulated by their needs. As for idiots, if they are not capable of discovering these truths, that does not mean that these truths are not innate. The idiots lack the ability of knowing and understanding anything as a defect of their minds, much in the same way as a blind man cannot see as a result of a defect in his eyes. But that does not stop us from saying that man is a seeing animal. Innate principles such as the law of contradiction, referred to above, are implicit in us and without them no reasoning is possible. Leibniz argues that there is no identity between truths and thought. There are a number of truths that never become a person's thought. Leibniz goes even farther than Descartes in maintaining that what is innate is not necessarily known clearly and distinctly. Much attention and method is necessary in order to have its perception.

---

[96] Ibid., Book I, Chap. II, Sec. 18.

Locke argues that if by innate truth is meant that the mind is capable of knowing certain ideas without *actually* knowing, this amounts to saying that all ideas are innate in so far as we all have a faculty to know them, which Locke sees no need to deny, but which for Locke is not a meaningful claim. Locke's argument does not touch the position of Descartes, though this is true that for Descartes all ideas are innate. But when Descartes calls all ideas as innate, by "innateness" he does not understand *simply a faculty of knowledge* that is capable of yielding truth, when it comes in contact with the external world. By "innateness" he means a *definite propensity* to know certain truths. Nor by an "idea," here, he understands what Locke understands by an "idea". For Locke an "idea" is simply an impression or perception or a re-presentation of the object, or, as he put it, "whatsoever is the object of understanding when a man thinks".[97] For Descartes "idea" connotes an intellectual apprehension, an intellectual truth known by the natural light of reason.

Leibniz criticises Locke for his failure to draw a distinction between *truths of fact and truths of reason*. By innate truths, Leibniz understands truths of reason or intellectual ideas. Truths of fact are truths in a very relative sense and they have no deep basis in our soul. In the *New Essay*, Leibniz, while explaining innate ideas as truths of reason, writes:

> "The mind is not simply capable of knowing them, but also of finding them in itself If it had only the simple capacity to receive knowledge, or the passive potency necessary for that, as much without determinations as that which the wax has to receive shapes and the tabula rasa to receive letters, then it would not be the source of necessary truths, as I have just proved that, in fact, it is. For it is incontestable that the senses are not sufficient to make us see their necessity, and so the mind has the dispositions (as much active as passive) to draw them itself out of its own

---

[97] Ibid., p. 15.

> depths, though the senses are necessary to give to it the occasion and the attention required for this, and to lead it rather to one sort than to the other."[98]

Necessary truths are the basis of the truth of experience.

Concerning mind's potentiality to yield innate truths Leibniz believes that it is not simply a naked faculty which consists in mere possibility of understanding them ; it is a disposition, an aptitude, a performation which determines our soul and which make; it possible for them to be derived from it.

Though Leibniz draws a distinction between truths of reason and truths of fact and calls the former innate, yet the system of reality he offers necessitates him to regard all knowledge as innate. Descartes also regards all knowledge as innate. An eternally veracious God ensures that I am not deceived each time I perceive a "clear" and "distinct" idea. Both Descartes and Leibniz maintain that the discovery of innate knowledge requires much method and attention and it is not just present in the mind ready-made which the understanding may make use of whenever necessary, and may also recognise it as innate. But, again, Locke questions: does. not the observation of external object or, what Leibniz calls truths. of fact, also require conscious attention of the understanding

Everyone will grant, says Locke, that the principle of contra-diction, namely, "what is is, and it is impossible for it not to be," is the principle of discovery of the so-called innate truths or, what Leibniz calls, truth of reason. Has the mind to discover this truth in order to discover further truths? This principle is supposed to be the first principle of all deduction. From where does mind get this principle? To say that reason discovers it (which is the principle of discovery of all truth) is begging the question. Locke is right in saying that the laws of thought are the basis of all deductive reasoning. But when Descartes says that all ideas are innate, by innate truth he does not understand deductive truth. An innate truth is a "clear" and "distinct" idea known by the "natural light" or intellectual intuition. The principle of contradiction, which is the basis of all deductive reasoning, is an intuitive truth. Discovery of Descartes does not mean deduction, but immediate intellectual intuition. In every act of deduction the step from the premise to the conclusion is a new intuition. In this way all know-ledge, according to Descartes, is both intuitive and deductive. All clear and distinct ideas are innate in the sense of being intuitively known. However, it is an established opinion of all rationalists that deduction never yields any new truth. All deductive propositions are analytical, whose conclusions are already contained in the premises. Locke later on goes to admit that the principle of contradiction is a self-evident principle, or an intuitive truth. After such admission there hardly remains any distinction between Locke and Descartes when he called this and such others as innate.

---

[98] Leibniz, op. cit., p. 170.

Locke next argues that children and savages exhibit rational behaviour much earlier than they come to make "use of reason" or become aware of this maxim (i.e. "what is is, it is impossible for it not to be"), and sometimes they never become aware of it. But Leibniz argues that universality or implicit awareness is no criteria of innateness. A truth may be innate in the mind without mind's ever being aware of it, for it may still be there implicitly as the guiding principle of all reasoning. However, Leibniz's explanation may save Descartes to some extent from Locke's attack, but it does not work well to save Leibniz's own position. For Leibniz, the theory of innate knowledge is based upon his metaphysical presupposition, namely, all monads arc windowless, or, what comes to the same thing, all knowledge is internal. Leibniz's metaphysics offers only a deductive system of knowledge according to which all knowledge is analytical. An innate idea in Leibniz can mean nothing more than an analytical truth. If this is so, then Leibniz can find no answer to Locke's question as to wherefrom reason gets the principle "what is is, it is impossible for it not to be," which is the guiding principle of all rational knowledge. When Leibniz claims that it is innate, his claim does not amount to anything more than that it is itself an analytical proposition. To say this is only to beg the question.

Locke next argues that common assent of a maxim, as soon as it is proposed, is no criterion of innateness, for if this were the criterion of innateness, then again all principles must be innate, such as "a square is not a circle," "white is not black," "two and two are equal to four," etc. And if these propositions are innate, the ideas of which they are composed must also be innate, and in this way all our ideas of colour, sound, taste, etc., must also be innate. Locke is here making illegitimate claims. This is true that for Descartes all mathematical truths such as "a square is not a circle," or "two added to two equals four" are necessary. Nor would he deny that the ideas of which these principles are composed are innate. But this is very different from what Locke is claiming. The propositions such as "what is sweet is not bitter," "what is red is not green," are not at par with the propositions such as "a square is not a circle," "two added to two are equal to four". The former are truths of experience derived from senses, whereas the latter are mathematical truths; they are necessary. Descartes, however, regards ideas of figure, duration, number, etc., as innate. But by idea he understands an intellectual apprehension or a mental concept and not a perception of a particular figure, number, etc. Locke is simply taking benefit of his double use of the term "idea" which he uses both for a percept or an image and a concept or an intellectual apprehension.

Leibniz considers both kinds of propositions as truths of fact which are arrived at by the application of the necessary principle, namely, "A is A, it is impossible for it to be not-A," which is a truth of reason. The ideas of which these propositions are composed are also ideas of reason and are innate. The ideas of being, identity, impossibility, etc., are also innate ideas. These intellectual ideas which are the source of necessary truth are not derived from senses. When Locke admits the presence of, what he calls, ideas of reflection, he should have no difficulty, says Leibniz, in admitting the presence in the mind of ideas of reason which are independent of experience. Leibniz's does not see that Locke's ideas of reflection arc totally different from Leibniz ideas of reason. The former are derived from experience and are grounded in experience. Locke has already pointed out that ideas of reflection are late in experience as compared to ideas of sensation. The ideas of sensation work as the ground for the latter, much in the same way as Leibniz's truths of reason are grounds for truths of fact.

Though Locke emphatically denies the presence of any universal or innate ideas in the mind, and traces all knowledge to experience, yet he admits that everybody immediately perceives truths of certain propositions such as "a square is not a circle," "red is not green" or "what is sweet is not bitter". Locke calls these propositions self-evident. The faculty through which such truths are immediately perceived is called by Locke intuition. In Book IV, Chap. II, Sec. I of the *Essay*[99] Locke gives an elaborate account of intuitive knowledge as distinct from demonstrative knowledge which contains a lower degree of certainty than intuitive knowledge. Locke does not see that after his admission of what he calls self-evident or intuitive knowledge it will be difficult for him to distinguish his position from

---

[99] Op.cit.

Descartes who also bases all certain knowledge on "clear" and "distinct" perception which comes from the light of reason or, what is the same thing, intuitive apprehension. The only difference between Descartes and Locke is that Descartes goes one step further and calls all intuitive knowledge innate. However, by innateness he understands nothing other than the presence of a faculty of true knowledge called "natural light" (intuitive reason), whose ability to render truth is ensured by an eternally veracious God Who is the creator of this faculty in me and of everything else. Locke bases all knowledge on experience. But he does not tell what kind of "idea" this intuitive knowledge is. It is certainly not an idea of sensation, for all ideas of sensation are derived from sensible objects, which only imprint impressions on our mind without telling what they are. It is not an idea of reflection either, for ideas of reflection are the result of mind's operation upon itself. It seems to be a priori knowledge then which. is over and above his "new way of ideas" which he claimed earlier as the only source of knowledge.

Whatever may be the logical consequences of Locke's admission of particular self-evident principles, Locke firmly adheres to it. Locke anticipates Leibniz's answer that these particular principels are the application of the more general necessary principle such as "A is A and it is impossible for it to be not-A". Locke makes a public appeal and pleads that these particular principles are known more readily and commonly than the so-called necessary innate principles. But this argument of Locke's certainly cannot stand firm before Leibniz's reply that the necessary innate principles need not be readily and commonly known, and that it requires some attention and method to find them out as the ground of particular principles. It is interesting to note here the difference between Descartes and Leibniz on the one hand, and Locke on the other, on the question of self-evident principles. Both Descartes and Leibniz maintain that the self-evident truths are known to be self-evident after some reflection or methods, whereas Locke holds that self-evident knowledge does not need any attention and method. But Locke seems to be confused on this issue. He is not able to draw a distinction between (1) a self-evident truth and (2) the knowledge that a certain truth is self-evident. A self-evident truth may be known readily and without reflection, whereas the knowledge that it is self-evident requires some reflection and attention. Beside a self-evident truth there may be, as Locke says, some-thing that needs no proof, but this is something very different from the question: what is the source of such knowledge? Locke seems to agree with Descartes that the source of such knowledge is intuition or, what Descartes calls, "natural light". Whereas Leibniz strongly holds that the so-called self-evident principles have their basis in a more general necessary truth, and the former is only the application of the latter, which is not immediately known.

Locke again anticipates Leibniz's next objection that the general necessary truths are implicitly present in the mind without our being conscious of them at a given time or at any time. Locke's interpretation of such knowledge is that to say that there are innate truths in our mind which are implicit is to say that the mind is capable of knowing them, and nothing more. And in this sense all principles and demonstrations of mathematics are innate. Leibniz repudiates Locke by adding that being innate does not simply mean that mind is simply *capable of knowing them, but also that it is capable of finding them in itself and has a disposition to approve them*.

As for Locke's point that children know particular truths much before they come to the apprehension of general necessary principles, such as the law of contradiction. Leibniz's reply is that it is not necessary that the general necessary truths should be known before particular principles. The necessary principles constitute the framework of mind without which it will not be possible for mind to perceive any particular truth, much in the same way as without legs it is not possible for a child to walk, but a child may not know the specific function of different muscles and bones of his legs as they help him in walking.

The main burden of Locke's attack on innate ideas can be summarised in two points: (I) that there are no universal principles or ideas in our mind on the basis of which it can be said that they are innate; (2) there is an identity between truth and thought. Whatever ideas or knowledge mind is capable of attaining, it does attain it as a matter of fact and it exists in the mind as a thought or idea. Liebniz subjects these two points of Locke's to a destructive criticism by establishing (1) universality is no criterion of innateness; (2) there is no indentity between truth and thought. A large amount of our knowledge is present within us implicitly which forms the basis of our knowledge of particular truths. These implicit ideas and principles are innate, yet every-body may not be able to discover them. They do not cease to be innate if they are not explicitly .known. Leibniz's criticism of Locke follows from his new psychology that (1) a large part of our thoughts is subconscious, (2) knowledge means unfoldment of the monad of whatever is present in it. It is in this sense that all knowledge for Leibniz is innate and analytical.

When we recapitulate all the points advanced for or against innate ideas by Descartes, Locke and Leibniz, we still wonder what this controversy is about. Why is Locke, who acknowledges man's indebtedness to his faculty of reason, out to refute the innate idea theory? What are the relative claims of Locke and his opponents concerning this faculty of reason which is the point of dispute? If we look deep into the matter we find that both parties glorify the faculty of reason, and yet both dispute about its function. Descartes claims that the function of speculative reason (intuitive reason) is enlightenment and understanding of God-given truths; for Leibniz its function is unfoldment and discovery of concealed truth which is within the soul. But, does this *enlightenment*, *unfoldment* or discovery of truth require any specific labour? Both Descartes and Leibniz give a positive answer to the question. Descartes' method suggests the need of conscious labour for the attainment of truth. Leibniz also emphasises the need of method and order. Locke makes a radical departure from Descartes in maintaining that the function of reason is not discovery or unfoldment of truth. Its function mainly consists in *sifting*, *indentification*, *making distinctions*, *classification*, *judgment* and *association* of data of knowledge provided by experience in the form of ideas. Knowledge, then, is a co-ordinated function of data of knowledge received from outside world and from within mind itself. Experience itself is nothing more than reception by the mind of certain sensations and feelings in a certain determinate manner. But the question is: are there any determinate ways of mind's acceptance of internal and external data? Locke does not specify it; were he to do it, much of the misunderstanding concerning nature of knowledge, whether acquired or innate, would have been clarified. Nor do his opponents expressively lay down the role of experience and external data. Were they to clarify the contribution of sensible data and experience in knowledge, there would have been a fairly good possibility of a compromise concerning nature and origin of knowledge.

BOOK REVIEWS

SHORT NOTICES

Latif Ahmad Sherwani, *Speeches, Writings and Statements of Iqbal.* Lahore: Iqbal Academy, 1977 (3rd rev. ed.). Demy 8vo., xii, 263 pp. Clothbound, Rs 35.00.

This is the revised and enlarged edition of the book, previously entitled Speeches and Statements of Iqbal (under the compiler's pseudonym "Shamloo"). Mr Sherwani has taken great pains, not only in rechecking most of thematerial but also including much fresh material.

The book has been attractively produced and, compared with prices of books of similar size, is reasonably priced.

—M. Ashraf Darr

B.A. Dar. *What Should Then Be Done, O People of the East* (Iqbal's *Pas Chih Bayad Kard* Ay *Aqwam-i Sharq*). Lahore, Iqbal Academy, 1977. Demy 8vo., xii, 146 pp. Cloth-bound, Rs 30.00.

This is a valuable addition to English translation of Iqbal's works by a reputed scholar. Mr B.A. Dar, formerly Director of Iqbal Academy, is fully qualified for the task which he has accomplished meritoriously. He has provided very useful explanatory notes to each piece which go a long way in giving the reader much background knowledge.

—M. Ashraf Darr

G.N. Jalbani, Life of Shah Waliyullah, Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1978. Demy 8vo., iv, 92 pp. Index. Paperback, Rs 15.

Though small in volume, the book under review is a useful contribution to literature on Shah Waliyullah. In spite, of the author's limitations, the work he has done by his writings on Shah Waliyullah and by his translating some of his classics is quite large.

According to the author,the information contained in the book "is mainly gathered from his [Shah Waliyullah's] writings."

Rs 15.00 is a bit too high a price for a paperback book of this volume. The book is well printed and produced.

—M. Ashraf Darr

Islmail A. B. Balogun, Islam Versus Ahmadiyyah in Nigeria, Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1977. Demy 8vo., xii, 122 pp. Rs 17.50.

The author, an earstwhile Ahmadi, describes in this book the cause of his discarding Ahmadism. It was on the Saudi Arabian Embassy's blunt refusal in 1973 to allow Nigerian Ahmadis to perform Hajj of January 1974 that he started to "weigh the beliefs and practices of the Ahmadis against the widely accepted teachings of Islam," finally discovering a "basic congruity between Islam and Ahmadiyyah and also between Muslims and Ahmadis." Forty yea n active Ahmadi himself, he felt 'hesitant to put forward the findings. Eventually, he offered *Tahajjud Istikharah* prayer one night when it was hinted to him to go straight to his desk and start writing. An article was the result which was published in a Nigerian paper. This brought many a rejoinder from the Ahmadiyyah side. The present book includes this article and others that he wrote along with the Ahmadiyyah rejoinders, all of which provide good reading material on the subject.

—M. Ashraf Darr