www.historymarg.com
figures and tables. For anyone interested in Saudi economic development, this volume is a welcome addition to the literature.

David E. Long
University of Pennsylvania

Gail Minault. *The Khilafat Movement: Religious Symbolism and Political Mobilization in India.* Studies in Oriental Culture, No. 16. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
294 pp., glossary, bibliography, index. $24.00

***

In 1919 some Muslim leaders in British India launched a campaign to pressure Britain to preserve the Ottoman Empire and, particularly, to sustain the authority of the Ottoman sultan, the caliph of Islam. This mobilization, known in South Asian history as the Khilafat Movement, created a unity of purpose for Muslims of the sub-continent and briefly shook the foundations of British rule when merged with the nationalist non-cooperation campaign led by Gandhi. Those readers of this journal familiar with the Khilafat Movement (hereafter KM) probably regard it as a bizarre Eastern outlier of pan-Islamic conscience. Professor Gail Minault's superb study will do much to revise such opinions and to enlarge the appreciation of non-South Asianists for the complexities of the KM during its 1919-1924 life span.

Minault's analysis reveals that the KM was "primarily a campaign of Indian Muslim leaders to unite their community politically by means of religious and cultural symbols meaningful to all strata of that community. As such it can be viewed as a quest for a pan-Indian Islam" (p. 2). By uniting Indian Islam these leaders sought to find leverage and a means of participation in the Indian nation in relationship to the British Raj and/or the nationalist Indian National Congress.

The KM emerged simultaneously with new forms of political leadership and communication, including the broad-based mobilizations inspired by Mahatma Gandhi. However, Minault goes beyond the careers and personalities of politicians to emphasize the creative force of religious values and institutions. She clearly delineates the significance of the entry of the ulama into the movement, stressing their creative contribution of religious legitimacy. A figure like Abdul Bari of the Firangi Mahal lineage was as crucial as the politician Ali brothers, Mohammad and Shaukat. Minault correctly resists the opportunity to reduce the story to a chronicle of personalities and political maneuvers.

Ultimately the KM collapsed. Its alliance with Gandhi's movement fractured in 1922 when the Mahatma halted non-cooperation. The Ali brothers were stunned. They had after all given Gandhi the votes for his congress leadership and non-cooperation in 1920—a historical point omitted from the recent film "Gandhi," directed by Sir Richard Attenborough. In the aftermath the new-found Hindu-Muslim unity eroded steadily. As Minault observes astutely, the leaders "had revolutionized the national movement by arousing mass participation, but now found it was a two-edged sword" (p. 197). Communalism—the politicization of religious identities—manifested itself in mistrust among politicians and bloody violence among the masses. In October 1923, Turkey was declared a republic and the following March Mustafa Kemal, anxious to consolidate his own power against religious opposition, led the Turkish National Assembly to depose the Caliph and abolish the caliphate. The

www.historymag.com
KM leaders were aghast. They had never truly understood the realities of the Middle East, whether Arab nationalism or Turkish modernism. Now they felt betrayed. The KM was dead, but Indian Islam, while not yet united, would never be the same. As Minault concludes, "Muslim self-consciousness had become a factor in Indian politics. The new merger of religion and politics in the movement "provided the techniques, and much of the personnel, for the development of a specifically Muslim nationalism in the subcontinent later" (p. 212).

Frank F. Conlon
University of Washington

I. R. Netton. *Muslim Neoplatonists: An Introduction to the Thought of the Brethren of Purity.* London: George Allen and Unwin, 1982.
146 pp, xii, bibliography, index $19.95

***

Since the mid-nineteenth century, the *Rasā'il Ikhwān al-ṣafā'*, the famous Islamic encyclopedia of the late 9th century, has been the subject of scholarly studies and controversy about its date, authorship, religious affiliation, and school of thought. The latest in these studies is the book under review.

Chapter 1 introduces the problems of the interpretation of the encyclopedia's title, contents, and anonymity of its authors, and their time. Chapter 2 describes the *Rasā'il's* indebtedness to the Greek philosophers Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle. Chapter 3 enunciates the neoplatonic content of the encyclopedia. The second and third chapters are central and descriptive and should evoke general agreement with and admiration for the author's efforts.

When Netton turns to the identification of the *Rasa'il's* authors, he is in difficulty. In the concluding chapter he states that the Ikhwan's "focus was the universal concept of purity and not Islam" and that they were "reluctant muslims" (p. 106). Quoting Lane-Poole, he says "in their ideal of the higher life, indeed, the Brotherhood of Purity belong to Christianity rather than to Islam" (p. 76). In chapter 4 on the Christian and Judaic Substrate (pp. 53-77) he argues that the Brethren hold the Christian belief in the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus as opposed to the orthodox Islamic belief in his assumption without crucifixion (pp. 60-61); again "they give equal importance to the Gospel, Torah and the Qur'ān"(p. 70).

In chapter 5 it is admitted that "the corpus of the *Rasa'il* is saturated with the Qur'ān like a sponge" (p. 79), but then the Qur'an is only a "cloak" as a section title suggests (p. 78); and that the Qur'anic quotations are in the nature of "larding" the material (p. 92)!, an example being the treatment of Biblical personalities such as Adam, Noah, Abraham, Joseph, Moses, David, and Solomon (pp. 83-89) which is "infused with the Qur'ān, though not exclusively influenced by this work" (p. 82).

Chapter 6 is devoted to refuting the usual identification of the Brethren with Isma'ilism. There is a presumption that Isma'ilis are fanatical Shi'ites. Netton writes: "If the Ikhwān had been fanatical Shīʿites, we would have expected them to exult over the murder of the third Caliph" (p. 100). Why not characterize the Ikhwan's attitude as Isma'ili liberalism? Another argument against Isma'ilism is stated thus: "the emphasis throughout the *Rasā'il* is much more on the return of the individual soul to God than the return of the Imām" (p. 101).