CHAPTER II
TANZIMAT (1839-1856)
The history of the Middle East over the past two hundred years, whether it is of Turkey, or the Arabic-speaking world, is largely the story of the reaction of the governments and people of the region to the challenges of western civilization. These challenges have been political, technological, social, religious, economic, literary, and artistic in nature.

The encounter of the people of the Middle East with Western civilization has produced two types of revolutions which may be identified as the two aspects of the same phenomenon called Nationalism.

i) The revolution for independence from a colonial power, and

ii) The revolution for change.

The revolution for independence is relatively short, spectacular, and cohesive; whereas the revolution for change is long, tedious, and divisive.

Unlike the Arab world, Turkey has never been ruled directly by a European power. Therefore, the revolution for independence did not occur but revolution for change did. The eighteenth century was the century of defeats and during the 18th and 19th centuries the Ottomans were forced to give up a good deal of what they had conquered during the previous centuries. With Napoleon’s invasion of Egypt in 1798, the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire which had already begun was further accelerated. The invasion once again proved western superiority and showed that the Ottoman Empire was just as vulnerable in the south as in the north. This compelled the Turks to look into their weaknesses and adopt measures to reverse the process.
We have already discussed in chapter I, the reforms introduced by Sultan Selim III (1789-1807) and Sultan Mahmud II (1808-1839) and some grand viziers. Inspired by the developments in the West, they sought to modernize the military and other governmental institutions. These earlier reforms prepared the ground for the more important reforms known as the Tanzimat.  

Tanzimat was thus the second phase of the Ottoman Reforms. During the Tanzimat period from 1839 to 1877, the Ottoman reformers attempted serious reforms on western model but within the Ottoman framework. In fact, it meant the accommodation of western changes in the “whole Ottoman culture” or the introduction of western changes without negating the “Ottoman particularity”. In this way, the Ottoman reformers represented “a mixture of East and West”. In the spirit of the liberal tradition, they introduced modern schools, Western literary and theatrical adaptation, scientific books, and magazines and new concepts like individual freedom and participation in the government. They had to build up a legal system to ensure the equality and security of all the peoples, and emphasized, by implication, the improvement in all fields, particularly military, financial, and judicial. Tanzimat reforms gave the idea of state Nationalism and democracy. The reformists took up democracy and the non-Muslims took up Nationalism and the latter spread throughout the Empire and had the support of foreign powers. 

With the beginning of Tanzimat reforms in 1839, the doors were thrown wide open to the West infiltrating the Turkish economic, political, legal, and
educational institutions impacting the basic social values for the first time. A distinctive feature of Tanzimat Reforms is that they were inspired by the bureaucrats who were career diplomats, the so-called “French knowers” who had had exposure to European environment. Increase in secularisation occurred as more and more European ways were superimposed on the Ottoman society.

Sultan Mahmud II was succeeded by his younger son, Abdul Majid (1839-1861). He clearly conceived the weaknesses of the Ottoman Empire. On November 3, 1839, in the Gülhane, or ‘Rose Bower,’ in the outer gardens of Topkapi Palace, he promulgated what came to be known as the Gülhane Edict, which formally inaugurated the era of Tanzimat. The Edict was proclaimed by his foreign minister, Mustafa Rashid Pasha, in the presence of the Sultan and an assemblage of foreign ambassadors, statesmen and clerics. The Edict (in vernacular, Hatti Sharif of Gülhane) was notified in the official gazette Takvim-i-ikamet and governors were instructed to arrange its ceremonial readings in public places in towns and cities of the Empire. The Sultan announced that he wished the honour and property of all his subjects to remain secure; that the tax-farming would be abolished and the recruiting for the army would be done in a more regular fashion; all criminals would be tried in public and all subjects, of whatever religion, would be considered equal before the law. Seventeen years later, on February 18, 1856, the same Sultan issued another Royal Decree that is known as the “Imperial rescript” (Hatti Humayyun). Two bureaucrats (Ali Pasha and Fuad Pasha) and three European ambassadors played a major role in preparing this second Edict. Both these
statements, though issued under pressure, nevertheless started an era of reform in the Ottoman Empire that is called Tanzimat.\textsuperscript{11} The \textit{Hatt -i Humayun} was basically a reaffirmation of the earlier charter of 1839, it went even further by assuring non-Muslims of religious liberty and equality in the administration of justice, taxation, public employment and military service as well as admission to the civil and military schools.\textsuperscript{12} The \textit{Hatt -i Humayun}, however, ignored the rising tide of nationalism among non-Muslims and failed to appreciate the effects of reforms based upon the \textit{millet} system.\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{Definition and Meaning}

From the foregoing discussion, it is clear that the word Tanzimat is the name given to the ‘Programme of Reforms’ which began in the reign of Sultan Abdul Mejit on November 3, 1839, with the proclamation of a decree known as ‘\textit{Hatt - i - Sherif of G"{u}lhane}’, which sought to modernise the Ottoman State and Society. The word Tanzimat is the plural of Tanzim which means ordering. Tanzimat meant a series of acts that would give a new order to the organisation of the state. It is derived from the Turkish word “\textit{ITMIK}” which means “Drafting the Law”.\textsuperscript{14}

\textbf{Causes Behind – the raison d\textsuperscript{-}etre:}

These reform measures which, in fact, were a logical outcome and continuation of the reforms initiated by Sultan Selim III and Sultan Mahmud II were aimed at:
a) saving the Ottoman Empire from foreign intervention in its internal matters;

b) making the Empire internally strong and united;

c) pacifying the hostile sentiments of all Ottoman subjects (who were constantly involved in revolutionary activities) by providing them justice and equality before law. At a time when Ottomans were facing the nationalist independence movements and nationalist uprisings, supported by European powers, these two Edicts were aimed at securing the loyalty of its Christian subjects and placating the foreign powers; and

d) making the Empire strong militarily and otherwise to meet European challenges which was possible by emulating European modernism.

The Three Phases of the Tanzimat Period:

The entire Tanzimat period has been divided into three phases:

Phase I: (From 1839 to 1856). In this period the main responsibility of the reforms rested on the shoulders of Mustafa Rasheed Pasha who became grand vizier (prime-minister) for six times and twice served as foreign minister

Phase II: (From 1856 to 1871). In this phase the active leaders of these reforms were Ali Pasha and Fuad Pasha, disciples of Rasheed Pasha, who held diplomatic positions overseas and served as grand viziers/foreign minister;
Phase III: (From 1871 till the end). The great personality of this period was Midhat Pasha, who also worked as grand vizier and was also called the “father of the constitution” promulgated in 1876. He was murdered in 1884 at the instance of Sultan Abdul Hamid.

**Hatt-i-Sharif of Gülhane**

Abdul Majeed became the new Sultan of the Ottoman Empire at the age of sixteen years. In view of his upbringing “in seclusion” he, like many other Ottoman Sultans, was not proficient in state matters. He felt more at home in the company of eunuchs and women of the palace. However he had a kind disposition towards his subjects and wished for their well-being. He was fortunate to have a galaxy of very able and competent bureaucrats, grand viziers and governors. As already discussed (supra p. 37 of this chapter), four months later of his accession on November 3, 1839, Sultan Abdul Majeed through his foreign minister Mustafa Rasheed Pasha issued the first Imperial Decree by the name of “Noble rescript of the Rose chamber” (Hatt-i-Sharif of Gülhane), which is regarded as the beginning of the Tanzimat period. The chief architect of these reforms was Mustafa Rasheed Pasha, who was a dominant figure in the government. So he is often called the father of the Tanzimat.\(^{15}\)

This order prepared by a consultative council (*Mejlis - i - Shura*) stated that:
i) the old discarded system had to be replaced by new laws (Kavanin - i - Jadid),

ii) these laws would be in accordance with the Sharia’h;

iii) they would be based upon the inviolability of life, property, and honour as legal fundamentals; and

iv) they would be equally applicable to all Muslims and to the peoples of the millets.\textsuperscript{16}

Under the above guidelines, further reforms were undertaken which may be summarized as under:

i) It abolished capital punishment without a trial;

ii) It guaranteed justice to all citizens with respect to their life, honour and property;

iii) It established a council of justice to frame laws and a new penal code against which no infringement would be tolerated because of personal ranks or influence;

iv) It abolished the tax on farming and instituted the collection of taxes by government officials;

v) Methods of Army recruitment and length of services were to be reviewed by the Imperial Military Council and new procedures were promised to ensure regularity and impartiality for all the parts of the Empire;
vi) It was also embodied in the decree that its provisions pertain to all subjects irrespective of religion or sect.\textsuperscript{17}

These reforms served the dual purpose of appeasing the European powers, which had started meddling in the domestic affairs of Turkey, win over the loyalty of Ottoman Christians, and to re-establish confidence in the home government.\textsuperscript{18}

The "\textit{Hatt-i-Sherif of Gülhane}" was also very significant as for the first time it ensured equality among the Ottoman subjects, introduced secular education and allowed selection of non-Muslims in the military. In addition, representation of non-Muslim subjects to Provincial Mejlis or Council of the Governors made the promises of the "\textit{Hatt-i-Sherif}" more realistic.\textsuperscript{19}

Developments in the area of Law were remarkable. The European law is generally codified (as opposed to English common law which was largely judge-made). Codification is the quickest way of bringing about reform in the legal system whereas judge-made law depends on the accident of litigation – if a case comes for adjudication before the judge only then he will have opportunity to change the law and that too subject to limitations. The Tanzimat reformers did well to adopt the European method of codification rather than the British common law developed by judicial precedents. Legal developments under Tanzimat have been discussed in some detail elsewhere in this chapter—infra. With these reforms, Ottomans had a dual system of law and law courts – the Shariah courts under the supervision of Sheykhul Islam and the state courts under the secular ministry of justice.\textsuperscript{20}
The charter had two important aspects – political and religious. The charter did not provide for any popular representation, the source of legislation would be the Councils of Deliberations (mesveret). The members of these were all appointed by the ruler for the duration at his will. These were only the advisory bodies, with no lawmaking powers. Now they were invested with such powers, but the laws accepted by them through free discussion and majority decision acquired legal sanction only through ratification by the ruler.21

The second facet of the Charter was even more pregnant with problems. This was the acceptance in one breath of both the Sharia’h and secular approaches to laws. On the one hand, a return to the reign of the Sharia’h was implied, and on the other hand, the need was declared to institute new laws based on non-customary rights conferred by the temporal ruler. It is significant that a traditional practice was forgotten when the Charter was proclaimed; although it obviously concerned the Sharia’h it was not accompanied by a fetwa that would bring about its legitimization by the Seykhul – Islam. Thus, the Charter created first formal breach between the “temporal” and the “religious”. The separative characteristic of the Tanzimat— secularism was thus formalised with the Charter. The task of separating, the “temporal” and “religious” is by no means easy. The economic interests of the European powers pressed for secularization while the political — cum — religious interests of the same powers demanded the perpetuation of communal differentiations ranging from the legal and political to the educational field.
The two interests were so contradictory and impelling that the application of the Tanzimat ideas became a matter, not simply of governmental administration or of politics, but of a religious – cultural nature transcending the political, administration and even economic problems.22

**Hatt - i - Humayun – Imperial Rescript:**

On the whole the Tanzimat were carried out in an uncertain and troubled atmosphere in which the Grand Vizier was changed as quickly as he returned to power. This was also the period when foreign intervention (British, French, and Italian) had increased. Calls for new efforts were being made by soldiers, government officials, merchants, journalists and tourists. This was the case with the deliberations which preceded the Peace Conference in Paris.23 Thus, to save Ottoman state from this situation, Sultan Abdul Majid issued a new royal statement on 18th February, 1856, which came to be known as the “Imperial rescript” or “Islahat - i - Fermani” or Hatt-i- Humayun.24 The charter of 1839 was reaffirmed by the charter of 1856. This Charter went even further and assured the non-Muslims of religious liberty, and equality in the administration of Justice, taxation, public employment and military service.25 In other words we can say that the edict implied political, legal, religious, educational, economic and moral reforms in which equality, freedom, material progress and rational enlightenment would be emphasised.

The Reform Edict (*Islahat Fermani*) included:
a) a reaffirmation of the rights granted by the earlier Charter and the need to take measures for their fullest implementation,
b) a reaffirmation of all ancient privileges and spiritual immunities granted to the non-Muslim religious communities,
c) a guarantee of complete freedom in the exercise of all religious beliefs and rites.
d) the prohibition of all designations for any class of people on account of religion, language, or race,
e) a guarantee of equal treatment of all peoples of the communities in all matters of education, appointment to government posts, administration of Justice, taxation and military services,
f) a promise of reform of judicial tribunals and the creation of mixed tribunals, the reform of penal and commercial codes to be administered on a uniform basis and the reform of prisons,
g) a guarantee of the right of foreigners to own real property,
h) the representation of religious communities in the deliberation of the Supreme Council and
i) a proposal for devising the necessary measures for the commercial and agricultural improvement of the provinces with the help to be forthcoming from education, the sciences, and European funds.

The central theme in the rivalries of the European powers over the Eastern Question was the position of the non-Muslim millets and their
relationship with the reforms. The Russian thesis, stated clearly in 1867, was the extension of the privileges of the millets to the point of autonomy or independence.

According to the Tanzimat statement, the millet privileges that were of a purely religious nature would be preserved as they concerned the freedom of conscience, but those relating to civil and judicial affairs ought to be eliminated as incompatible with the uniform execution of the reforms. The Ottoman state could be secularised only when the millets became religious congregations (Jemmat) and each Ottoman subject was individually responsible and equal before the laws. Then Sharia'h would cease to be the basic law. It would remain only as the private law of the Muslims while the state would be administered according to newly enacted administrative, procedural, criminal, civil and commercial codes.26

To say that the two Royal rescripts of the Tanzimat period were Charters of individual liberty would be to exaggerate, for both Sultan Mahmud II (who prepared the way), and Sultan Abdul Majid (who made the Tanzimat possible) who were autocrats and the Charters were issued under pressures from foreign powers and to win over the loyalty of disgruntled Ottoman Christians.

The Problem of the Government:

The implementation of the Tanzimat reforms was a gigantic task for the then Ottoman government. It required great statesmanship, huge financial resources, a very competent and dedicated bureaucracy and full cooperation
from all sections of the society. The government lacked that. Lack of personnel trained to carry out the reforms, inertia coupled with an attitude of resistance to change coming from above, a bankrupt state exchequer, a weak infrastructure, a population suffering from illiteracy, lack of effective channels of communication to convey the new Tanzimat values to remote and diverse lands of the Empire – all these created difficulties in implementing the reforms.

The reform of the government itself was the first priority. But, the Tanzimat did not bring about any substantial change in the highest institution of the state and this was one important reason that the government failed to bring about the desired westernisation effects in this vital area.

The Tanzimat provided no constitutional framework for regulating relations between the governments and governed, between the sovereign and administration, or between the legislative and administrative organs on the one hand, and the judiciary on the other.

Most of the problems to be found in the secular and religious institution started from the threefold consequences of this situation:

a) there was no autonomous development in the religious institution,

b) the secularization of the state took place in the form of a duality, or dichotomy, within the cultural institutions, not in the form of a state and church duality, and state became increasingly devoid of a national substratum, hence, of a popular basis. Removed from its traditional foundations, the state remained baseless in a constitutional sense and rootless in a national sense.
The Muslims, especially the Turks, did not benefit constitutionally from the Tanzimat secularism or Reform Edict. There was no communal organization of the Muslims outside the state apparatus. Neither the Islamic conception of Ummah nor the Tanzimat conception of reform proved helpful. While Muslims in other parts of the world, e.g. in Russia, India and Indonesia, developed community organization closely resembling those of the millets in the Ottoman Empire, the Ottoman Turks continued to place themselves directly under the state which was no longer an Islamic state.

The end of the political Tanzimat came when the Turkish element showed signs of revolt against its economic and political existence. The anti-Tanzimat movement took the form of a mixture of constitutionalism and religious nationalism as was represented by the Young Ottoman Movement. It was more progressive than the Tanzimat. The anti-Tanzimat movement could perhaps have led to the formation of an Islamic state.28

Codification and Changes Brought About By the Tanzimat:

The Tanzimat brought law codification rather than parliamentary legislation as its distinctive feature. Its attempts at codification constituted the first such experiments in a Muslim country.

Codification is putting the laws into writing with some degree of systematization in form and substance. The Tanzimat codification was also used in the sense of reducing to written form by making a selection from among diverse rules, by unifying or reconciling contradictory rules, and by
introducing new rules. Codified law is more easily accessible, intelligible and precise as compared to law scattered in judicial decisions or fatawas.

The Tanzimat Charter had declared loyalty to the Sharia’h and at the same time had emphasised the necessity of framing new laws. It stated that the major cause of misrule, injustice, and disorder was the lack of laws as written instruments, declared and accessible to the public. Neither the Sharia’h nor the laws (Kanuns) fulfilled these conditions.

The secularization of law began in an area that was traditionally outside the scope of the Sharia’h with formation of the first completely secular code. The Commercial Treaty of 1838 led to the codification of commercial law—the Commercial Code of 1850—and to the organization of the first tribunal independent of the Shariat courts on the lines of courts in Christian European countries.29

The supreme council prepared a penal code for promulgation in 1840. It was a marked improvement over the one drawn up in Sultan Mahmud II’s time. It was both the first legal expression of the Charter and the first expression of the duality of the Tanzimat. It contained provisions emanating from modern secular criminal codes side by side with others taken from the Sharia’h. It confirmed the principle of equality and followed the principle that no one would be punished without a trial and court sentence; it ruled that trials would be held in public and that the impartiality of the judges would be ensured; it revived Sharia’h provisions such as blood money (Qasas and Diyat).30
The work on civil code (the Mejelle) had started in 1868 and was completed in 1876. The contents were within the framework of Islamic law of obligations and contract but the form, organisation and arrangements were inspired by the European legal codes. Its administration was placed within the jurisdiction of the newly created Ministry of Justice. The Mejelle was the first attempt in any Muslim country towards codifying Islamic law of obligations. Ali Pasha perhaps toyed with the idea of having a comprehensive civil code on the lines of Code Napoleon, but this would have encountered great opposition. The law relating to civil status of individuals, i.e., law relating to marriage, divorce, inheritance etc., remained untouched under the jurisdiction of the religious courts.

The new codes were applied by the secular courts called nizamiya (statutory) or adliye, which were under the jurisdiction of the ministry of justice. As a result of the policy of separating the secular from the religious, these operated side by side with the Sharia'h courts which were left to the jurisdiction of the Seykhu - Islam.\(^{31}\)

After a long battle between those who desired the adoption of the French civil code and those who wanted to codify a law from Islamic jurisprudence, the government decided upon “drawing up a book in Turkish to be known as Metn - i - Metin (Basic Text) covering the fiqh and written in a language comprehensible to every man.\(^{32}\)

With the extension of the statutory courts (penal, commercial, and civil), the jurisdiction of the Sharia'h courts was severely contracted. The jurisdiction
of the office of the Seykhul – Islam was also curtailed in favour of the new ministry of justice. On the other hand, the statutory courts did not have jurisdiction over cases to be judged according to the ecclesiastical laws of the millets which were administered in their courts.\footnote{33}

The Tanzimat codification secularized the externals of social life by legalizing innovations. By codifying the most secular parts of the Sharai’h, we can say that it put a new border line between secular life and the Sharia’h.

**The Tanzimat and Education:**

Like the field of Law, the Tanzimat accomplished something significant. There was expansion and improvement over the developments of the preceding period. The Tanzimat’s view of education was limited by external factors and by its conception of secularism.\footnote{34}

A few good secondary schools were started, including the well known Lycee of Galatasaray. Some special schools for women, for the poor and for the training of teachers, and a new civil service school for teaching public and international affairs for the new bureaucrats were also set up. Addressing the supreme council in 1845, Abdul Mejid defined the aims of education: “To circulate religious knowledge and useful sciences, which are necessities for religion and the world, so as to abolish the ignorance of the people”. The report drafted by the council expressed the same view in another way: “It is a necessity for every human being to learn first his own religion and that
education which will enable him to be independent of the help of others and, then, to acquire useful sciences and arts".\(^{35}\)

In contrast with the absence of any sign of change in the *medreses* and the slow and confounded developments in primary and secondary education, the institutions of higher learning became more firmly established and enjoyed expansion. The two secular institutions of the previous periods experienced significant development during the Tanzimat. The *Muhendishane* underwent reorganisation and was expanded in 1846-47. Several of its graduates were sent to France, England, Austria, and Germany for study in 1846, 1850, 1854, and 1855 respectively.\(^{36}\)

The school of Medicine continued to be the favourite institution of higher learning. In 1843 it produced its first graduates. The number of years needed to complete the study of medicine was increased to nine – four of which were preparatory. In the preparatory phase, students were taught general courses, among which French literature, geometry, algebra, history and geography were taught in French. The majority of the teaching staff was composed of Europeans, converts and non-Muslim natives.\(^{37}\) In 1840 a Board of Medical Affairs was founded within the school to survey, control and supervise the practitioners of medicine, pharmacy, and surgery and midwives and vaccinators. Those who carried a certificate or diploma, or proved their qualifications by examination, were allowed to practice – others were forbidden. This Board also acted as a court for professional cases involving pharmacists, and as a council of legal medicine.
In 1851, an institution was established called *Encumen - i - Danis* (Society of the Learned), with the object of working out an integration, within the educational field, between the “Secular” and “religious”, or between the “new” and the “traditional”. Ahmed Cevdet Pasha, intellectual and statesman, was assigned the task of formulating the function of this institution. According to him, the *Encumen - i - Danis* was founded to provide the ultimate aims for discussions, scholarly studies, and recommendations directed towards eradicating ignorance and promoting sciences.\(^{38}\)

**The Language Development during Tanzimat:**

The last phase of the Tanzimat was the innovations in language and scripts, journalism and literature.

The governmental and literary language inherited by the Tanzimat period was called not Turkish but Ottoman. There was no official national language called Turkish. Arabic was the language of the madaris learning. Schools taught Arabic, and Persian. Turkish was the language of only the subject class (*raaya*), in many places even of the non-Muslims. The Ottoman language emerged as the language of secular learning, of modern government, and of modern education. With its non-National and composite character it also seemed to fit the international character of the Tanzimat Ottomanism.\(^{39}\)

The language developments of the Tanzimat were tried out in school-teaching, in literature and in the press. A prominent figure during the Tanzimat, Cevdet Pasa wrote the first Ottoman Turkish grammar in 1850 in collaboration
with Fuad. Cevdet used the new Ottoman Turkish as the medium for teaching the religion of Islam in a way different from that of the madaris. In his *Kisas-i Enbiya* the *Tarih-i Hulefa*, he used Turkish to make religion understandable to the common literate people. It seems that, at this juncture, question was also raised on the issue of translating the Qur’an into Ottoman Turkish language. The madaris opposed the translation of the Qur’an into Turkish language; they also opposed writing in a language comprehensible to the people. They believed that the Qur’an was revealed in its Arabic form, so nobody dared to translate it.\(^{40}\)

Ibrahim Sinasi (1824-71) was the first modern Turkish writer. His journalistic contribution did not stop with creating a public taste for reading. He also opened a new phase in the history of Turkish prose. He not only established a new style of prose that was grammatically revolutionary, but also a new mode of thinking, and new words to express it, such as citizens’ rights, freedom of expression, public opinion, liberal ideas, national consciousness, constitutional government, liberty, natural rights of the people, etc. The Turkish language owes to him the first use of the word millet in the sense of “nation”.\(^{41}\)

The translations from European languages had been largely confined to the scientific and technical fields. Interest turned to literary works during the Tanzimat.

The importance of these early movements in language, script, literature, and translation can hardly be exaggerated. Their results will be found in the
subsequent periods. If one were to select the most important contribution of the Tanzimat, it would be found in this area of culture.\textsuperscript{42}

We conclude this chapter with the observation that the Tanzimat reforms largely failed to achieve their desired goals. Instead, they resulted in what we may call the\textit{ crisis of identity}. They exacerbated the growing rift between Muslims and non-Muslims. These failures necessitating another movement – the Young Ottoman Movement – the subject matter of the next chapter.

A society which has deep-seated traditions cannot be reformed overnight by royal edicts. First the mind-set of the people should be changed and a climate of social preparedness be instilled in them and thereafter laws should be promulgated. For Muslims, the best living example is of their own Prophet Muhammad (SAW). How in a period of 23 years he completely transformed the Arab society – a society notorious for its uncivilized customs and traditions making them leaders and torch-bearers of the world. There is no parallel in history where such a great and enduring transformation might have taken place in such a short time. He first worked for almost 13 years during his stay in Mecca in changing their mind-set, strengthening their faith (\textit{Iman}) and once the groundwork was done then, came the detailed rules of conduct which were faithfully obeyed without any hesitation and without recourse to state sanctions.

Another important factor of which we have to take note is: How long and how far will Muslims survive on the cooked dish of others? We want to
compete with the West or want to face the challenges of the West by importing the advance technology of the West, including their weaponry. How can we expect them to make us their equal? Further, importing their technology means economic and political strings which are inevitably attached to it. We have to develop ourselves. The legacy of earlier Muslim thinkers is before us and their original contribution to Mathematics, physical sciences, life sciences, social sciences and humanities at a time when Europe was in the grip of dark ages is all before us and is duly acknowledged by Western scholars.
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