Studia Culturae Islamicae 41

THE JAPANESE AND EGYPTIAN ENLIGHTENMENT

A Comparative Study of Fukuzawa Yukichi and Rif'ā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī

Raouf Abbas Hamed

INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF LANGUAGES AND CULTURES OF ASIA AND AFRICA

TOKYO
1990

Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (ILCAA)
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies

4-51 Nishigahara
Kita-ku, Tokyo 114
Japan

Printed by
Kotobuki Photographic Ltd.
Tokyo

The electronic version of this book was typed and prepared for publishing in 2011 by the grand daughters of the Author: Noor Hatem Raouf Abbas Hamed (age 12) and Amira Hatem Raouf Abbas Hamed (age 10).

To The Memory of

MAEJIMA Shinji (1902-1984)

and

Ahmad 'Izzat 'Abdul-Karīm (1909-1981)

distinguished scholars, great teachers, and dear friends.

Table of Contents

Preface

Despite the major differences in historical and cultural background, the modernization of Japan and Egypt in the nineteenth century offers rich possibilities for comparative research. Modernization is a high-level generalization that points to a change in type of a given society through a variety of more discrete processes and sub-processes. This study mainly concentrates on the compound process of modernization, taking the enlightenment ideas as the core of this process. Fukuzawa Yukichi (1835-1901) and Rifʻā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī (1801-1873) are chosen as subject of this case study for all what they represent, being pioneers of enlightenment in their respective countries.

The writings of the two intellectuals are the main sources of this study, but only the English translations of Fukuzawa's writings and speeches were consulted, while reference has been made to Ṭahṭāwī's Arabic works. However, this work could not bear any fruit without the invaluable help of many Japanese friends who gave up so much of their time to answering my questions, and never hesitate to offer illuminating and instructive ideas, I wish to pay tribute to their kindness.

I am very much indebted to Professor MIKI Wataru and Professor NISHIKAWA Shunsaku of Keiō University. My grateful thanks are also due to Professor YAJIMA Hikoichi of A A ken, Tokyo *Gaikokugo Daigaku*.

Finally, I express my thanks to the Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (A A ken), Tokyo *Gaikokugo Daigaku* for the generous hospitality bestowed on me during my stay as visiting research professor (October 1989 September 1990): and the Fukuzawa *Yukichi Kyokai* of *Keiō* University for offering me research facilities.

Raouf Abbas Hamed

Chapter 1 - The Historical Arena

The emergence of modern state with related problems of development and subsequent social change has been always the main preoccupation of enlightenment pioneers. Being a stimulant of their thought, it has inspired them the progressive ideas about society and its future developments. Both Fukuzawa Yukichi and Rifā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī belonged to two different societies which were passing a formative phase in their modern history. Certainly, both thinkers were influenced by the special historical experience of each country with different phenomenal changes, though they shared the same terms of reference.

The purpose of this chapter is rather to draw the main lines of economic, social and political developments in the formative phase in the life of modern Japan and Egypt, in order to establish the general objective challenge of modern conditions to the traditional view of life, and particularly its concept of the socio-political order with which the two thinkers had to react. We shall endeavour mainly to draw the outline of the emerging new structure which provided a frame for subsequent historical and ideological development.

Japan

The last decades of *Tokugawa Shogunate*, Edo period, and the first three decades of Meiji Era were the formative years in the life of modern Japan. It witnessed the crucial events which have led to force open the doors of Japan for international trade and Western intercourse, Meiji Restoration and the emergence of modern state. It witnessed, as well, the most fruitful years in the life of Fukuzawa Yukichi and most of his thoughtful ideas and his useful activities were performed on this historical arena.

Despite the isolation under Edo, Japanese society developed beyond the bounds of a strictly feudal system. With the national unity established, many of the economic restrictions and limitations of the past were vanished. Trade was on a greater scale than ever before. The long-time peace of Edo period brought to Japan an epoch of unprecedented prosperity and industrial production and trade grew rapidly on the expense of the feudal system which gradually decayed. An expanding merchant class was creating a commercial economy, paper credits of all sorts were developed and commonly used in normal transactions with a great rice exchanges. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, a genuine capitalist class of wealthy merchant families was an important factor in Japan's economic life, and deeply influenced social and cultural life in the cities.[1]

By 1720, Edo removed a long-standing ban on the study of the West and the importation of European books except those related to Christianity. Soon small but intellectually vigorous group of student of Western sciences arose, working through the medium of the Dutch language, which they learned from the Dutch at Nagasaki. By the nineteenth century Japanese scholars were well-versed in such Western sciences as gunnery, smelting, ship-building, cartography and medicine.[2]

During Edo period, national consciousness was developed as a result of political unity and complete isolation and the role played by Shinto scholars in providing the primary text of Japanism to form what could be a spiritual basis of a special version of nationalism.[3]

---

[1] see: Hirschmeier, Johannes, The Origins of Entrepreneurship in Meiji Japan, Harvard Univ. Press 1964: Dore, Roland P., City Life in Japan, University of California Press 1976.
[2] Beasley, W.G., The Modern History of Japan, London 1975, pp. 10-15: Dower, W. (ed.), Origins of the Modern Japanese State, Selected Writings of E.H. Norman, New York 1975, pp. 110-117.
[3] Reischauer, E.O, Japan Past and Present, 3rd ed., New York 1967, pp. 62-63.

Once the door of Japan has been pushed open by the United States in 1854, Edo had signed treaties with England, Russia and Holland, followed by a series of full commercial treaties signed with the concerned Powers. By yielding to foreign pressure, the *Bakufu* aggravated the anti-foreign feelings in the country, and by allowing foreign merchandise to enter Japan it accelerated the economic disintegration of the country by causing a severe inflation in commodity prices with violent fluctuations in the price of rice. Besides, the *Bakufu* had to bear the burden of extraordinary expenditures on the construction of forts, iron factories or indemnities for attacks on foreigners and on the despatch of envoys abroad. Such expenses were met by increasing the extraction on the peasantry and extracting forced loans (*goyokin*) from the merchants, with consequent agrarian revolts and impoverishment adding to the general state of chaos. The economic distress of the lower samurai deepened their hatred of the *Bakufu* and its foreign policy, and the trading operations of the foreign barbarians. Assassination of leading *Bakufu* officials, the advocates of Western learning and the merchants who attempted to profit excessively by usury or by speculating on price fluctuations, became frequent.[4]

The overthrow of the *Bakufu* in 1868 was accomplished through the union of anti-*Bakufu* forces, led by the lower samurai particularly of the great western clans, *Satuma*, *Choshu*, *Tosa* and *Hizen* together with a few of the *Kuge*, backed by the big merchants of Osaka and Kyoto. The new imperial government centred around the person of the emperor Meiji, and the coup d'etat came to be referred to as the Restoration of imperial rule.

The leaders of the new imperial regime had all been deeply impressed by the military impotence of the old regime in face of western military power and the humiliation they have been forced to suffer because of their military backwardness. Naturally, they were preoccupied with the idea of creating a Japan capable of holding its own independence in modern world. Being military men by tradition and training, they thought primarily in terms of military power, but they were enough broad-minded in their approach to the problem, realizing that to achieve military strength, Japan needed economic, social and intellectual reconstruction.

As early as spring of 1869, they set about the liquidation of the feudal system by persuading the *Daimyo* of *Satuma*, *Choshu* and other leading *han* in western Japan to surrender their domains to the emperor, and the other Daimyo felt morally obliged to follow suit. Two years later, in 1871, the *han* were entirely abolished and the land was divided into a number of new administrative divisions called Ken or prefectures. The government made an economic settlement with the old Daimyo and also gave them titles of nobility in the new created peerage. This was followed by stripping the Samurai of their social, economic and political privileges. In the winter of 1872-73 the government introduced universal military service. Under the leadership of young officers an army of peasants was recruited. The Samurai received pensions in place of their stipends, then in 1876 the pensions were commuted into lump sum payments and they were prohibited from wearing their traditional two swords, to turn them into individual citizens.[5]

Other essential reforms were introduced to modernize the administrative machinery. Ministries on Western models in one administrative field after another were created, a prefectural system of rule was organized keeping the control of each prefecture in the hands of the central government. The government adopted the Western calendar, and a policy of religious toleration. The reforms were extended to police system, postal system, currency and creation of a national banking system, establishment of civil service, revision and standardization of the tax system, and revision of the legal and judicial system. Finally, a

---

[4] For further details see: Allen, G.C., A Short Economic History of Modern Japan, 2nd ed., London 1962, Chap. 1: Beasley, W.G., Great Britain and the Opening of Japan 1834- 1858, London 1951, p.39.
[5] I heavily depended on: Beasley, W.G., The Meiji Restoration. Stanford 1972: Akamatsu, Paul, Meiji 1868, Revolution and Counterrevolution in Japan, London 1972: Dower, W. (ed.), op. cit., passim.

Cabinet was established on the German model, and a Constitution was formulated providing for a Diet of Japan as the gift of the ruling oligarchy to the people.

The Meiji government was very much aware of the importance of education in the modern state to meet the demands of the army, navy, industry and the economy in general. In 1871 a Ministry of Education was formed, and Japan embarked on an ambitious program of universal education which made Japan the first country of Asia to have a literate populace. To Meiji leaders, education meant not the development of individual minds for participation in a public life but rather training of a technically competent citizenry to help build a strong state. Education was an essential tool of government to train obedient and reliable subjects who could serve as technically efficient servants in a modern state. Both educational system and military conscription, which fell primary on the peasants, permitted a thoroughgoing indoctrination of the young Japanese, creating in the average Japanese fanatical nationalism and fanatical devotion to the emperor with a remarkable success.

Economic modernization began with agriculture as land was the chief source of government revenue. The experience of the West was introduced through sending agricultural students to study abroad and inviting foreign experts to advise on specific projects. New strains of plants and seeds were imported, some Western farming implements were brought and tried, innovations in irrigation and the use of fertilizers proved generally successful. Also, experimental stations and agricultural colleges were founded. However, agriculture was little changed by these developments, lots remained small and cultivation remained intensive. On the other hand, the commercialization of agriculture, increased with the removal of feudal controls, brought greater concentration in landholding and a steady growth of tenancy, creating favourable conditions for labour supply of landless peasants to meet the demand of industry. With the increase of agriculture production and the highest agrarian share of total tax revenue, agriculture generated much of the savings that supported private and public investment in Meiji industry.

The policies of the government had given stimulus and direction to the growth of the economy. The Meiji oligarchy came early to belief that trade and industry were the foundations of which Western greatness rested, and sought such sources for their country in order to evade Western aggression. Thus, the government had to intervene, both directly and indirectly, in the economy.

The government directly developed and controlled railways, telegraph system and other public utilities. It opened the first railway between Tokyo and Yokohama in 1872 and later the main network of railways has been in the hands of the government while many other lines were built by private enterprise. The government's subsidy for business and industry was represented by loans, capital equipment and various other means, especially in those sections of economy where private investment was slow in coming. It constructed paper-mills and cotton-spinning plants, assisted in the development of modern merchant marine and shipbuilding industry, helped build up silk industry and gave aid and direction to many other essentially private enterprises, contributed to the growth of certain financial and commercial interests.

Towards the end of 1880, it had been decided to dispose of the government's factories, except those engaged in military and strategic industries, by selling them to the highest bidder. Due to the shortage of capital, the prices offered were low, but the government had no choice as it was a financial measure aiming at easing the budget deficit. After disposing of some of its model factories in non-military industries, the government gradually turned over some of its mining and shipbuilding enterprises to private hands to help a steady development of Japanese business concerns.

Industrialization and technical progress slowly raised the standard of living of the average Japanese comparing with other Asian countries, but this improvement was scarcely

commensurate with the rate of industrial and commercial development. This was probably in part because the ruling obligachy was interested in developing a powerful nation rather than a prosperous people, but much more basic reason was the economic drag of an impoverished peasantry and the counter-current created by a rapidly expanding population from 30 million in mid-nineteenth century to over 70 million by 1940. Japan as a nation was growing rapidly in wealth, but because of this population growth, the per capita gain in wealth remained relatively small.[6]

Japan's struggle for national independence inevitably led to expansion. National consciousness, which had been awakened by the threat of foreign encroachment, was sharpened by the stubborn attempts at revision of the unequal treaties which finally gained success in 1899. The struggle for the revision of treaties was an integral part of the struggle for recognition as a world power and for the fruits which such recognition brings. The evolution of Japan's social organization together with the constant pressure of international power politics compelled Meiji Japan to expand in search of the foreign markets to realize the profits which could not be obtained from the narrow home market, and in search of cheap essential raw materials desperately needed. The Meiji policymakers saw that if they were to escape the fate of China or Egypt, they must adopt the political methods and economic policy of those powers who had been responsible for Japan's awakening and for the partial colonization of China. The Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95 marked a definite turning-point in Japanese foreign policy along the path of expansion and the full recognition of Japan as a power on equal terms automatically followed, to inaugurate the entry of Japan into the ranks of imperialist powers. In 1899, Japan became the first Asiatic land to free itself of extraterritoriality and Western powers began to relinquish the treaty rights under which they had restricted Japanese tariffs since the late days of Edo. By 1911, Japan had resumed complete control of her own tariffs. Fifty years after the 'Restoration', Japan went to the peace conference at Versailles in 1919 as one of the great military and industrial powers of the world and received official recognition as one of the "Big Five" of new international order.[7]

Nevertheless, serious attempt to build a new Japan had to deal with continuing strength of tradition as an obstacle to the assimilation of the civilization of the West. It was the hard task of the enlightenment thinkers led by Fukuzawa Yukichi to look for a proper adjustment that help modernization to deepen its roots in the society.

Egypt

Being at the centre of Muslim world on the crossroad of three continents: Asia, Africa and Europe, Egypt went into a different path. Since the fifteenth century, it was settling down to one of the longest periods of isolation and economic and cultural stagnation until the French campaign of Napoleon Bonaparte (1789-1801) and its aftermath awoke it. Within the Muslim community, Egypt suffered most acutely from the isolation because the discovery of the Cape route diverted transit trade from its territory and reduced it to a backwater province of the Ottoman Empire, deprived even of those few contacts with the West that took place at its periphery. The economic stagnation reinforced the static cultural orientation which had already begun to manifest itself in Islam, and which considered the knowledge as "given" and the process of learning an accumulation of the known rather than a process of discovery.

---

[6] The outline of Japan’s economic development in Meiji Era is based on: Lockwood, W.W., The Economic Development of Japan, Growth and Structural Change 1868-1938, Princeton 1969: Marsall, B.K, Capitalism and Nationalism in Prewar Japan, The Ideology of Business Elite 1868-1941, Stanford 1967: Hirschmeier, J., op. cit,. passim.

[7] For further details see: Ike, Nobutaka, The Beginning of Political Democracy in Japan, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press 1950; Brown, D.M., Nationalism in Japan, Berkeley 1955: Shively. Donald H. "The Japanization of Middle Meiji" in Tradition and Modernization In Japanese Culture, edited by Donald H. Shively, Princeton University Press 1971, pp. 77-120.

When Muhammad 'AIī came to power (1805) in the wake of the confusion following the withdrawal of the French expedition, Egypt had completed nearly three centuries of a life of medieval stability under Ottoman domination. The main division of society was that between rulers and ruled, the former enjoyed power while the rest of the society operated under its own traditional institutions almost independently of the rulers. In the eighteenth century, the ruling class was composed of a nominal Ottoman *wālī* (viceroy), assisted by some officials and a ruling military aristocracy of *Mamlûk beys*. The latter acted as provincial governors and lived on the revenues of their *iltizam* domains. They spent their time warring among themselves, raiding the neighbouring provinces, or simply enjoying their lot.

The ruled were organized in their turn into a multitude of small, closely kint, social economic religious units. In the countryside the unit was the village, in the towns it was the guild. These units were headed by their respective *shaykhs* who were responsible for the taxation and behaviour of their people, and formed the only point of contact between rulers and ruled. Villages and guilds were affiliated with their own *Ṣûfī ṭarīqah* (order) and ran their lives according to long-established custom. Public institutions such as schools, mosques, charity houses, and so on, were established and supported by private endowments or *waqf*. Although rulers often contributed to such institutions, they did not do this as part of their function as rulers, but as acts of generosity and charity. Relation between rulers and ruled were restricted to the minimum, since power played almost no social function at all. The true leaders of the community were the *shaykhs* of *Ṣûfī* orders and the *'ulamā'*, religious scholars, who had a rich, independent and powerful stronghold in the mosque-university of al-Azhar.[8]

The French expedition had ended the centuries of isolation of Egypt and drawn it inexorably into the arena of world power politics. It brought down the decline of the foundations of Ottoman system and paved the way for Muhammad 'Alī, an ambitious Ottoman Albanian officer and former tobacco dealer, to obtain power successfully, and to establish a strong rule lasted for more than four decades (1805-48).[9]

But state building needed material power based on a strong army and navy, because the Ottoman Sultan would not allow Muhammad ‘Alī to retain Egypt unless the latter put himself, in a position to be able ultimately to cross swords with him. With the growing strategic importance of Egypt which had been revealed by the French expedition, the great European powers would not tolerate a change in Egypt's position unless she could be capable of defending her territories against possible European aggression. It became necessary for the ruler who wished to hold his own power to broaden his control and extend his regulation to ever more spheres of his subjects’ lives. The centralization of administration, uniform laws, control of the economy by deliberate planning and investment, the construction of roads and development of the means of communication, introduction of modern education and the promotion of science and technology, these and other factors have been bearing great relevance to material power and, therefore, were necessary and legitimate fields of concern for the state. To build up the power necessary to meet these ambitions out of a backward society of slightly over two million people and a medieval economy, nothing short of a complete revolution could suffice. With ruthless determination, amazing resourcefulness, Muhammad 'Alī proceeded to bring about just such a revolution.

Muhammad 'Alī needed funds to realize his political project of establishing a modern state with a strong army and, in setting out to raise it, he revolutionized the whole economic and social structure of Egypt.

---

[8] For a detailed study of political, economic and social structure in Egypt at the end of the eighteenth century, see: H.A.R. Gibb and H. Brown, Islamic Society and the West, London 1950, vol.1, Part 1, pp.200—235, 258-280: and Part ll, London 1957, pp.59-69, 157-164.

[9] For a full and detailed study of Muhammad ‘Alī, see: Dodwell, Henry, The Founder of Modern Egypt, A Study of Muhammad 'Alī, Cambridge University Press 1931, reprinted 1967: Al—Rāfi‘ī, ‘Abd al—Raḥmān, 'Aṣr Muḥammad ‘Alī, Cairo 1951.

In agriculture, he abolished *iltizām* or tax farming system, eliminated the *Mamlûk beys* who were holding land in *iltizām* expropriated almost all the country's arable land. He then redistributed it in quasi-hereditary tenures to individual peasants, making then individually responsible for rents and taxes. He gave large tracts of land to members of his family, high officials, and other people who were willing to bring new reclaimed land under cultivation, creating, a new landlord class. *Waqf* or endowment land was not an exception, he brought it under state control and administration. By construction of a complete network of canals and barrages, the area under perennial irrigation gradually expanded, new crops, especially large-scale cotton cultivation, and new agricultural techniques were introduced. Muhammad 'Alī extended his monopoly over the country's agriculture to intensify its output.[10]

In industry, the government initiated and owned large-scale enterprises, mainly established to equip the new modern army. In a less than three decades, modern industry was founded with output enough to cover the local demand of yarns, textiles, sugar, glass, paper and chemical stuff, with some surplus for export to neighbouring Arab countries. The military and shipbuilding industries were producing supplies for both modern army and navy making possible the expansion in the Levant, Arabia and eastern Mediterranean. But Muhammad 'Alī established his monopoly over the production, sale and purchase of certain goods, the violation of which was punishable. Even women and children working in their own homes became, like everybody else, salaried employees of the state. Many craftsmen were brought under the ruler's monopoly which undermined the whole traditional guild system.

Muhammad 'Alī extended his monopoly over the field of large-scale commerce. Apart from textiles, several other commodities were sold exclusively by his agents. Both wholesale and retail prices of agrarian and industrial products were decided by the state. He brought most of the indigenous large-scale merchants out of business by confiscating their wealth. Almost the only merchants allowed were retail dealers and a certain number of foreigners who enjoyed special privileges and rendered service in the field of export-import trade. This étatisation of both commerce and industry, which spared only foreigners, was largely responsible for the long delay in the development of an indigenous mercantile and industrial class, a factor which was to have important consequences for the political and economic development of Egypt.[11]

The management of the economy made necessary a fundamental change in the character of state administration leading to the creation of modern state bureaucracy. It was developing gradually in three decades and, by the help French expert, in 1836 it took the shape of a merchinery with an established hierarchy of authority, fixed offices with clearly defined functions, and a set of procedures and rules.

In order to manage his enterprises, run his administration, and staff his armed forces with officers, Muhammad 'Alī needed large number of educated personnel. To meet this need, he began by leaning heavily on foreigners, and French in particular, while taking measures to provide for himself an indigenous educated class. He initiated a state- managed school system, imported teachers for his technical schools, and sent students to Europe. In all this, he not only laid the foundations of modern Egyptian system of education, but also largely set its pattern and defined its character. It was he who started the two separate systems of religious

---

[10] For further details see: al-Ḥitta, Aḥmad, al-Zirā‘ah al- Miṣriyyah fī ‘Aṣr Muḥammad ‘Alī (The Egyptian Agriculture under Muhammad ‘Alī), Cairo 1954: Baer. G., A History of Landownership in Modern Egypt 1800-1950, London 1962: Hamed, Raouf Abbas, al-Niẓām al-ljtimā“ī fī Miṣr fī Ẓill al-Milkiyyat al-Zirā‘īyyah al-Kabīrah 1836-1914 (Social Structure of Egypt in Relation to Big Landownership), Cairo 1973: Rivlin, H.A.B., The Agricultural Policy of Muhammad ‘Ali in Egypt, Cambridge Mass. 1961.

[11] see: Fahmy, Moustafa, La Revolution de 1'Industrie en Egypte et ses Consequences Sociales au 19éme ciécle (1800- 1850), Leiden 1954: Al-Giratly, ’Alī, a1—Ṣinā‘ah al- Miṣriyyah fī al-Niṣf al-Awwal min al-Qarn al-Tāsi"Ashar (lndustry of Egypt in the first half of the 19th century), Cairo 1955: lssawi, Charles, Egypt at Mid-Century, London 1954: Crouchley, A.E., The Economic Development of Modern Egypt, London 1938. pp.72—76.

and secular schools by leaving behind the traditional Islamic schooling and founding a parallel modern secular education. This dualism of education was to contribute heavily to the division of Egyptian opinion later and to impede the development of national consciousness. Education was limited to the production of officials and state employees.[12]

In the sphere of politics, Muhammad 'Alī's power was absolute. He had systematically destroyed all centres of potential independent action and prevented the development of any new ones. Although he institutionalized the practice of consultation and discussion before undertaking any public business, even delegated some of his authority, in the final account the decision was his and his alone.

Under him, Egypt emerged as a great regional power. On behalf of the Ottoman Sultan, the Egyptian army took over Arabia, conquered the Sudan and annexed its territories, and occupied the island of Crete. Although the involvement in the Greek war (1826-27) ended into a defeat due to the interference of the Great Powers. Muhammad 'Alī gained the international recognition of Egypt as a regional power. After that he sought to build an Arab Empire by invading Syria and southern Anatolia, and succeeded in gaining victory over the Ottoman army. This brought, again, the European Powers together to protect the integrity of Ottoman Empire, to put an end to the expansion scheme of Muhammad 'AIī and to curtail the source of his power. In 1841, a settlement was reached, guaranteed by the assent of Great Powers, set for the recognition of Egypt's rule a hereditary right by seniority in the direct male descendants of Muhammad 'Alī, drastically limited his military forces and forced the abolition of his monopoly system.[13]

In general, it can be said that Muhammad 'Alī was more successful in tearing down the traditional political, social and economic structures than in building new ones in their place. This is said not only because many of the tangible results of his work (factories and arsenals, army and navy, commercial enterprises, school system, and so on) collapsed once he was assured the hereditary rulership of Egypt and at the same time was decisively checked in his expansionist designs, but because of what survived and endured in his work bore the mark and the defects of having been hastily erected with the single purpose of power expansion in mind. But there is no doubt that, in the final account, Muhammad 'Alī made Egypt into something radically different from what it had been in the beginning of his reign and laid the foundation of a modern state. The subsistence economy under which the country had lived for centuries was replaced by an export-oriented economy, the bulk of Egypt's available reserves of land, water, and underemployed labour were brought into use and its total output and exports increased several times. The developments in the sphere of economy, administration, and education had important efforts on the stratification of the Egyptian society.[14]

The removal of monopoly barriers and the elimination of the state's role in the economic life of the country was an important measure sought by the European Powers to turn the Egyptian economy into a dependent one, and to integrate it into the European market. Due to the absence of an indigenous enterprising class, the vacuum resulted from the withdrawal of state from the economy had been filled by Europeans. The European financial capital was filtered in the Egyptian economy, to be invested in the fields of credit, mortgage, public utilities and commerce. Being privileged by the Capitulations, favourable tariffs and extraterritoriality, the European capital could safeguard its interests and acted as a spearhead of foreign intervention which led to the occupation of Egypt by the British in 1882.

---

[12] see ‘Abdul-Karīm, Aḥmad ‘Izzat, Tārīkh al-Ta‘līm fī Miṣr fī ‘Aṣr Muḥammad ‘Alī, (History of education in Egypt under Muhammad 'Ali), Cairo 1936; Heyworth—Dunne, J., Introduction to the History of Education in Modern Egypt, London 1939: Boktor, A., School and Society in the Valley of the Nile, Cairo 1936.

[13] Dodwell, Henry, The Founder of Modern Egypt, pp.l25 and passim.

[14] Safran, Nadav, Egypt in Search of Political Community, Cambridge, Mass. 1961, pp.26-37.

After the failure of Muhammad 'Alī's industrial experiment, no serious industrial development took place in Egypt for decades. Some of Muhammad 'Alī's factories were liquidated by ‘Abbās (1848-54) and Sa’īd (1854-63), and others were sold by Saʿīd or given *iltizam* or rent to private individuals. These, however, made little headway, since they had to pay a large variety of burdensome taxes. Ismā’īl (1863-79) tried to revive the industrial initiative by privately taking over government enterprises and by sending missions abroad to acquire new factories. A few were bought, but production turned to be uneconomic. Therefore a whole group of factories were liquidated in 1875 and the buildings turned into military barracks. Only two branches continued to flourish: the sugar industry run by the government; and cotton gins, established mainly by foreigners. In general, however, foreign capital was interested in public utility companies (water, gas, transportation) rather than in industry. For the wealthy Egyptian landlord class, industrial investment involved a great risk. In addition to the taxes which discriminated against them, the market was small, and the competition of European product was unchallenged.

Under the pressure of European Powers, Egypt had to build two main transportation projects, railways and Suez canal to meet the strategic demands of both Britain and France. The railway joining Alexandria and Suez via Cairo was completed in 1856, while Suez canal was opened for international navigation in 1869. In the field of basic material services, the state initiated railways, telegraph, roads, canals and barrages construction. In 1866, the port of Alexandria was enlarged and developed. Under Ismāʿīl some other reforms had taken place. The private ownership of land was secured, currency was stabilized and modern commercial banks were established by the Europeans.

In general, the economic and strategic enterprises of the state had been possible by the flow of European financial capital to Egypt, to be invested in the state debt, which became a promising land for credit, where interest and commission rates were left to creditors to decide, or more precisely, to dictate.[15]

In the sphere of politics, the period of Ismāʿīl's reign had certain distinction. When he came to power in 1863, his aspiration was no less than the transformation of Egypt into a part of Europe. He shared Muhammad 'Alī's desire for power and attempted in his turn to build an Egyptian empire by expanding southward into the Sudan, Equatorial Africa and Abyssinia. He attempted to introduce an efficient and modern system of government and tried to achieve independence from the Ottoman Empire by obtaining full autonomy. He exerted great effort in his attempt to reform the judicial system of Egypt by introducing the Mixed Court system, initiated the technical reorganization of the *Shari'āh* courts along modern lines, and codification of the laws of personal status and inheritance. Education was once more vastly expanded, and energetic, if unsuccessful, efforts were made to improve its quality, but the whole system remained centrally directed and the graduates channelled into government service.

During this period, important developments occurred which awakened for the first time a consciousness of the ideological challenge imposed by the new conditions of foreign intrigues, and at the same time stimulated the first attempts to meet it. Sīʿād and Ismāʿīl had obtained from the Ottoman Sultan recognition of wider degree or autonomy for Egypt. Ismāʿīl used this increased independence to contract large loans at exorbitant rates to finance his vast projects, and, when he exhausted his credit, the usual results followed: bankruptcy, foreign control, disturbances and, later, foreign occupation. But also Ismāʿīl had been forced in the wake of his financial embarrassment to make concessions that put definite limitations on his absolute power and on the power of his successors. The foreign creditors compelled him to rule through a responsible cabinet which drastically curtailed his power. The Public treasury, which had always been indistinguishable from the ruler's private wealth, was separated from

[15] Crouchley, A.E., The Investment of Foreign Capital in Egyptian Companies and Public Debt. Cairo 1936, pp.35—42 and passim; see Brinton, J., The Mixed Courts in Egypt, New Heaven 1930.

it and both were submitted to the control of the cabinet and the British and French officials representing the creditors. Ismāʿīl had set up consultative representative assembly in imitation of modern governments, but his repeated recourse to it to support him in imposing new taxes aroused the assembly to claim a real voice in the affairs of the government. This experiment, together with the spread of education, the establishment of a press, the emergence of a new middle class of officials and a landed bourgeoisie, the constant exaction of taxes, and the foreign intervention, produced the first stirrings of public opinion and of civic political activity.[16]

However, the change in Egypt which had taken place since the first decade of the nineteenth century did not proceed gradually, organically and indigenously. It was the result of the initiative of individual autocrats in imposing certain reforms on a reluctant population in an effort to emulate particular aspects of Western civilization. The material changes were therefore not preceded or accompanied by an intellectual reawaken, as they had been in the West. It proceeded independently while the traditional ideology prevailing at the beginning of the process remained unchanged. It was the work of Rifāʿah al-Ṭahṭāwī to introduce the modern ideology of the West and adapt it to the needs of the Egyptian society.

From the above drawn main lines of economic, social and political developments in the formative phase in the life of modern Japan and Egypt we can conclude some important remarks. Both countries set for modernization to protect themselves from the aggression of the Western powers, created modern army, navy, factory, education and government machinery and introduced reforms to the agrarian sector of the economy. The social transformation in both came from above by a brilliant autocratic leadership not through a mass revolutionary process. Both countries sought to win recognition as a great power by expansion and empire building.

Nevertheless, these similarities in the main feature did not correspond to the real nature of action and development of each country. While the leadership who had initiated modernization in Meiji Japan was a group elite of samurai-bureaucrats moved by deep national feeling. The leadership in Egypt was represented in an autocrat individual full of glory dreams depending on self-made narrow circle of Turkish and other alien interest group. This touches the problem of continuity, which was established in Japan and was doubtful in Egypt. There was also the difference in the infrastructure of the two countries, while Japan was going through an internal reconstruction process initiated by the *Bakufu* and some other Han dominions of Western Japan on modern lines backed by an active merchant class. Egypt was living under a stagnant economy.

Finally, the political situation was completely different, and so was the political destiny. While Japan was theoretically an independent sovereign state at the beginning of her modernization, Egypt was a province of the Ottoman Empire. Japan did not become a colony or at least a country of impaired sovereignty such as contemporary China or Egypt[17], while Egypt became victim of Western domination and British occupation for mainly strategic reasons. However, the political destiny of Egypt in the 1880's was very much instructive to

[16] see: Douin, G., Histoire du Régne du Khedive Ismail, 3 vols, Rome 1933-1939: Hanotaux, G., Histoire de la Nation Egyptienne, vol.V1, Paris 1938; al-Rāfiʿī ʻAbd al-Raḥmān, ʻAṣr lsmāʻīl (The Age of ismāʻīl) 2 vols, Cairo 1937.

[17] Norman perfectly excplained why Japan did not become a colony, see: Dower, W. (ed.), Origin of the Modern Japanese State, pp.l50-154.

the Meiji policymakers when they designed their policy of treaty revision and national independence.[18]

[18] A full statement of this Japanese interest in the case of Egypt in the 1880's could be found in the work of Shiba Shirō, Kajin no Kigû (1888). Shiba was the secretary of Tani Kanjō, Minister of Agriculture at the time, he escorted the latter in his mission to Europe. In his way, the Japanese minister stopped at Cylon to see Aḥmad 'Urabī Pacha, the exiled Egyptian national leader, to enquire about the experience of Egypt with foreign interests which led to the occupation of Egypt by the British in 1882. Again, on passing through Suez Canal, the Japanese minister and his secretary Shiba Shirō, made a tour in Egypt to investigate the situation under the British Occupation. see: Raouf Abbas Hamed, Arab Studies in Japan, in The Japanese Arab Relations, Tokyo 1980.

Chapter 2 - Two Pioneers of Enlightenment

Having explored the historical arena on which the two thinkers Fukuzawa Yukichi and Rifā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī played their role in the history of their countries, we draw in this chapter a profile of them. While Fukuzawa's life covered sixty-six years, Ṭahṭāwī's covered seventy-three years, both period comprised greater and more extraordinary changes than any other in the history of Japan and Egypt. For these changes we can hold responsible both the impersonal forces of history and the personal power of certain individual men. Among the latter Fukuzawa and Ṭahṭāwī were the most remarkable. They were the leading educators of modern era, the introducers of new ideas through a deep study of western civilization, and contributed to the development of thought in their respective countries.

Fukuzawa Yukichi (1835-1901)

Fukuzawa Yukichi was born on the tenth of January 1835 in the city of *Ōsaka*. His father, Fukuzawa Hyakusuke was a low ranking samurai of the *Okudaira* clan of *Nakatsu* in the province of *Buzen* in *Kyūshū* island. He was in charge of the clan treasury, responsible for exchanging the clan rice into money at the most favourable possible rate and negotiating loans from *Ōsaka* merchants and money-changers on behalf of his lord. Being mainly interested in the study of the Chinese classics, the father was contempt with his job which he handled as a compulsory service to his lord.[19]

When Fukuzawa Yukichi was eighteen month old, his father died and his mother returned with him, his older brother and three sisters, to the family home in *Nakatsu* where they suffered poverty. The family's stipend was so inadequate as to make side-work imperative. Fukuzawa himself mended the wooden clogs and sandals among other jobs he had to do when he was child.

Throughout his childhood, his mother attempted to encourage him to prepare for the Buddhist priesthood, then the only possible means of escaping the life of a lower samurai. In all the innumerable minute prescriptions for daily human intercourse which characterized the feudal system, the lower samurai had to abase himself before the upper. Nor was he allowed to deviate in the smallest degree from the path prescribed for him by his inherited status. It was during these early years that Fukuzawa developed an intense hatred of the feudal system, considered it his father's mortal enemy, and vowed to destroy. When his brother sent a letter to the chancellor of the lord of his clan, only to have it returned because the address did not contains honorifics appropriate to the chancellor's exalted status, Fukuzawa Yukichi cried to himself, "how foolish it is to stay here and submit to this arrogance". And he resolved then "to run away from this narrow cooped-up *Nakatsu*".[20]

However, he did not show interest in priesthood. It was not until his early teens that he began to take an interest in the Chinese classics that had been left to him by his father. He then entered a local school supervised by a master named Shiraishi, where he was introduced to oral reading, calligraphy and some literature. His chance to leave *Nakatsu* came in the year 1854, when he was nineteen years old. The arrival of Commodore Perry the previous year and the threat his ships had implied to Japan's safety, had stimulated samurai from all over the country to take an interest in western gunnery as a means of national defence. Many were

[19] I relied Exclusively on: Fukuzawa Yukichi, The Autobiography of Fukuzawa Yukichi, trans. Eiichi kiyooka, Columbia University Press 1968; and Carmen Blacker, The Japanese Enlightenment, A Study of the Writings of Fukuzawa Yukichi, Cambridge University Press 1964.
[20] The Autobiography, p.l9.

going to Nagasaki in the hopes of learning the art from the Dutch, whose trading station on the island of *Deshima* was, at the time, the only means of intercourse with foreigners. It was proposed that Fukuzawa should do likewise in the capacity of servant-student to the heir of the chancellor of his clan. He welcomed the opportunity simply because it enabled him to escape from "narrow cooped-up *Nakatsu*".

In Nagasaki he acquired the western alphabet and a certain theoretical knowledge of gunnery, then decided to hold for Edo, where he hoped to obtain employment from a physician who was the father of one of his friends. Under the pretext of visiting his mother in *Nakatsu*, he set out on his long journey. Being short of means, he stopped in *Ōsaka* to see his older brother Sannosuke who had assumed the same clan duties performed by his father twenty years earlier. When he confessed that he had left Nagasaki under false pretences, his brother told him that he could not approve his continuing his trip to *Edo*: and that, instead, he would remain in *Ōsaka*.

In Ōsaka he started in 1855 his Dutch studies proper when he entered the *Tekijuku*, a private school run by Ogata Kōan (1810-1863), a physician and one of the foremost Dutch scholars of the time. For three years, Fukuzawa stayed in this school, studying Western sciences such as anatomy, physics, chemistry and medicine and strove to master the Dutch language.

At that time, there were considerable difficulties in the way of Dutch studies. Books were few and inaccessible. The feudal and Confucian disapproval, and even the assassin's swords were directed against students of foreign learning. Fukuzawa founded himself confronted with the hostility of "everyone in the clan including all his relatives", with the sole exception of his mother. But the *Tekijuku* students worked with fanatical zeal, making no distinction between night and day.[21]

In 1858, when he was twenty-three, Fukuzawa was ordered by his clan to leave the *Tekijuku* and head to Edo, where he was to teach Dutch at the clan headquarters there. Once in Edo, Fukuzawa was assigned a place in the clan's *nakayashiki* or secondary mansion at *Teppōzu* where he stayed to teach about ten pupils who went to him for instruction in Dutch.

But it was not long before Fukuzawa came to realize that knowledge of Dutch alone would be entirely inadequate to meet the needs of the times. Soon after he arrived in Edo, he walked down to Kanagawa (Yokohama) to visit the primitive foreign settlement which had sprung up there as a result of the Five Nation Treaties concluded in the year before. He discovered that his hard-won knowledge of Dutch was useless in communicating with the foreign merchants. He recalled:

> … when i tried to speak with them, no one seemed to understand me at all. Nor was I able to understand anything spoken by a single one of all the foreigners I met. Neither could I read anything of the signboards over the shops, nor the labels on the bottles which they had for sale….It was a bitter disappointment but i know it was no time to he downhearted…As certain as day, English was to be the most useful language of the future. I realized that a man would have to be able to read and converse in English to be recognized as a scholar in Western subjects in the coming time ....[22]

Fukuzawa decided learn English, but there were no English teachers in Edo so he resolved to teach himself English with the aid of a small English conversation book which he had bought in Yokohama, and an expensive Dutch-English dictionary which he petitioned the clan to buy for him. He even encouraged one of his colleagues to share him interest in English and they could make some progress.

---

[21] Blacker, op. cit., p.4.
[22] The Autobiography, pp.97-98.

Later in 1859, Fukuzawa heard that the *shogunate* was planning to send its first diplomatic mission to the United States for the purpose of ratifying the treaty of 1858. It was decided that the *Kanrin Maru*, a Japanese vessel would act as an escort to the battleship *Powhattan* which was carrying three Japanese envoys to Washington. The twenty-five year old Fukuzawa determined to sail on this voyage. He obtained a letter of introduction to Captain Yoshitake, the highest ranking member of the Japanese navy, assigned to the Kanrin Maru, visited the Captain in his home and asked him if he might join the ship as his personal servant, and the Captain agreed. After a thirty-seven days storm-tossed voyage, they reached San Francisco in the spring of 1860.

The crew of the *Kanrin Maru* went no further than San Francisco where they stayed for nearly four months. But there Fukuzawa was able to see such wonders of science as the town could show at the time, and even stranger, the wonders of western everyday life such as had never appeared in the textbooks which he read at home. He was quite overwhelmed by the many surprises which greeted him; the carpets on the floors of hotel; the horse-drawn carriages and the curious spectacle of ladies and gentlemen dancing. It was his first encounter with telegraph, the process of galvanising and sugar refining. He was so impressed by the strange customs with which he was surrounded that Fukuzawa, the samurai," was turned suddenly into a shy, self-conscious, blushing bride".[23] About his impression he said:

> As for scientific inventions and industrial machinery, there was no great novelty in then for me. It was rather in matters of life and social custom and ways of thinking that I found myself at a loss in America.[24]

Shortly before embarking on his return voyage, Fukuzawa and the interpreter Nakahama each bought a copy of Webster's dictionary, which he claimed" was the first importation of Webster's into Japan".[25]

After being away for six full months, Fukuzawa returned to a Japan rent with anti-foreign hysteria, the pro-western Chancellor of the *Shōgun* has just been assassinated, and the slogan of the day was "Expel the foreigners". But this did not prevent Fukuzawa from resuming teaching at his clan quarters and studying of English. Shortly after his return he published his first work, an English-Japanese dictionary entitled *Kaei Tsūgo*, and he was employed by the foreign affairs bureau of the *Shogunate* as a translator of messages for foreign legations, a position which afforded him excellent practice in English.[26]

Fukuzawa's second visit to the West was made in 1862 in the capacity of translator to the delegation sent to Europe to negotiate for the postponement of the opening of the ports of Hyōgo and Niigata to foreign trade and of Edo and *Õsaka* to foreign residence. The delegation sailed in December 1861 on an English war vessel. After calling at Hong Kong, Singapore and other ports in the Indian Ocean, they arrived at Suez where they landed for the railway journey to Cairo in Egypt where they stayed for two days then sailed again from Alexandria to Marseilles across the Mediterranean.[27] In Europe, the delegation visited France, England, Holland, Prussia, Russia and Portugal, their hosts in each of the capital cities were showing them the most impressive examples of western civilization that their country could muster.[28]

---

[23] Ibid., p.114.
[24] Ibid., p.116.
[25] Ibid., p.117.
[26] Wayne H. Oxford, The Speeches of Fukuzawa, A Translation and Critical Study, The Hokuseido press, Tokyo 1973, p.14.
[27] The Autobiography, p.125.
[28] Blacker, op. cit., p.6.

Fukuzawa lost no opportunity for learning all he could, particularly in the fields of politics and economics and the small things of daily life which the westerners considered too obvious to write down in books. He recalled:

> During this mission in Europe, I tried to learn some of the most common place details of foreign culture. I did not care to study scientific or technical subjects while on the journey, because could study them as well from books after I had returned home. But felt that I had to learn the more common matters of daily life directly from the people, because the Europeans would not describe them in books as being too obvious. Yet to us those common matters were the most difficult to comprehend.
>
> So, whenever I met a person whom I thought to be of some consequence, I would ask him questions and would put down all he said in a notebook. After reaching home, I based my ideas on these random notes, doing necessary research in the books which I had brought back and thus had the material for my book *Seiyō Jijō* (Things Western) or (Conditions in the West).[29]

On his return to Japan, Fukuzawa found that the anti-foreign movement was at its height, and he feared for his own life because there were many bands of *rōnin* (lawless samurai) assassinating those who were advocating western intercourse. They "thought we scholars who read foreign books and taught foreign culture were liars misleading the people and opening the way for the Westerners to exploit Japan."[30] Nevertheless, during the next few years, Fukuzawa was able to continue teaching English in his small clan school and translating foreign documents to the foreign office of the *Shogunate*.

The information he collected on his visit to Europe went to form the basis of the book which first made him famous as an authority on the West *Seiyō Jijō*, which was an epoch-making work. Of the first volume alone, which appeared in 1866, 150,000 copies were sold almost at once, and pirated editions raised the number to 250,000. It contained concise accounts of everyday social institutions such as hospitals, schools, newspapers, workhouses, taxation, museums and, even, lunatic asylums. The book's success was due also to its literary style which was so simple and easily comprehensible by any Japanese of any degree of literacy.

The book established Fukuzawa's reputation as a writer and an authority on the West, and ensured the success of his succeeding publications, seven of which appeared before the fall of the Bakufu in 1868. All of these, and also the eight works which he published during the first year after the Restoration, were concerned to introduce either elementary science or elementary information about western everyday life. For example, *seiyō Tabi Annnai* (1867) was a guidebook for travellers to the West, explaining the principles of foreign exchange, insurance, latitude and longitude, climate and the construction of a western ship. *Seiyō Ishokujû* (1867) gave an illustrated description of western clothes, food and furniture. *Kyûri Zukai* (1868) explained some common scientific principles with illustrations, and so on.[31]

In January 1867, Fukuzawa once again went to the United States as an interpreter for the delegation sent to Washington to purchase an American warship and to obtain rifles for the *Shōgun*'s army. The delegation stayed in San Francisco for two weeks, they boarded a ship for Panama, crossed the isthmus by train, and then sailed from Panama to New York. From New York they proceeded immediately to Washington, where there purchases were arranged by the Secretary of State. The delegation returned to Japan in June. It seems that there was no more excitement for Fukuzawa who had become familiar with Western society. In his recollection of that second visit to America, he concentrated on the formal duties of the delegation and his discussion of political situation at home with a fellow interpreter. But on his second mission to America, he had received a much larger allowance than that of the

[29] The Autobiography, p.133.
[30] Ibid., p.142.
[31] Blacker, op. cit., p.8.

previous occasion. With all his expenses being paid by the government, he was able to purchase a good number of books to develop the studies of Western science at his own school. In his autobiography, he wrote:

> I bought many dictionaries of different kinds, texts in geography, history, law, economics, mathematics, and every sort I could secure. They were for the most part the first copies to be brought to Japan.[32]

During the upheaval of the Restoration of 1868, Fukuzawa continued quietly writing and teaching in his school. He remained strictly neutral throughout the disturbances because he had neither sympathy with either of the two contending parties, nor personal ambitions. In the spring of 1868, he moved his family and school to new quarters that he had purchased across town in an area called *Shinsenza*. By April, he was able to resume his teaching. He had a new school building, a new dormitory capable of housing one hundred students, and a good library stocked with Western textbooks that he purchased on his latest trip to the United States. With this large library he was "able to let each of my students use the original for study …instead of manuscript copies for their use."[33] He named his school *Keiō Gijuku* (*Keiō* Private School), after the name of the era, and began to charge tuition fees, which he coined the Japanese term for it, as schools had never before charged a set fee.

Hence, during the time of crisis preceding the Restoration he scarcely left his school, even though the numbers of the students were diminishing and though the rest of the city was in confusion. Even after the Imperial Army had pushed its way into Edo and the battle of Ueno was in progress, Fukuzawa continued to lecture on Wayland's Elements of Political Economy to the remaining eighteen students out of a hundred.

In describing the conditions of education in Japan at the time of the Restoration, Fukuzawa wrote:[34] "At the time all the schools formerly supported by the government of the *Shōgun* had been broken up and all their teachers scattered. The new regime had no time yet to concern itself with education. The only school in the whole country where real teaching was being done was *Keiō-gijuku*." According to him *Keiō-Gijuku* remained, until at least 1873, "The only centre in the country where Western learning was being taught."[35] As a result, *Keiō*'s enrolment, increased dramatically during this period, and for a number of years thereafter, it fluctuated between two and three hundred.[36]

In his own words, Fukuzawa acted “as if I had become the sole functioning agent, for the introduction of Western learning." The chief subject of instruction in his school was English. Chinese, which was the basis of all previous education in Japan, was pushed to the second place. While in other schools the boys had to know Chinese before taking up English, *Keiō-gijuku* was teaching English first and Chinese later. So it happened that there were many students who could not read Chinese at all though they were reading English with ease.[37]

Fukuzawa came to realize that his true mission in life was Western studies and believed that revolutionary change in knowledge was a major requirement” to create in Japan a civilized nation as well equipped in the arts of war and peace as those of Western world,"[38] and to teach the Japanese the value of science and the spirit of independence. To this task of "enlightening" the Japanese people, changing their whole way of thinking from its very foundations, Fukuzawa devoted the rest of his life.[39] In June 1868, he declined several offers

---

[32] The Autobiography, p.119.
[33] Ibid., pp.119-200.
[34] Ibid., pp. 210-211.
[35] Ibid., p.213.
[36] Oxford, op. cit., p. 16.
[37] The Autobiography, p.214.
[38] Ibid., p.2l4.
[39] Blacker, op. cit., p.19.

from the new Meiji government, including the proposal that he would be in charge of the government schools . And in August, he renounced his samurai status and became a commoner. He devoted his writings, which became didactic and critical, to point out to the Japanese the errors arising from their traditional neglect of science and the spirit of independence.[40]

In March 1871, Fukuzawa moved his school to the unoccupied ten-acre estate of the *Shimabara* clan in *Mita*, a hilly section of Tokyo with a view of the ocean. But in order to acquire this property, the government would, first, have to confiscate it and then lease it to Fukuzawa. Fortunately, at that time, Fukuzawa was asked by the governor of Tokyo to advise him on the establishment of a Western-style police system for the city. So Fukuzawa presented his advice to the governor, and the latter, in turn, arranged for him to lease the *Shimabara* property which, a short time later, he was able to purchase.[41]

In describing the location of *Keiō-gijuku*, Fukuzawa said:[42]

> We used the former palace for Classrooms and former ladies' apartments for a dormitory. The ground was so extensive and we felt so free that there was nothing we could say against our new home. Later on when we needed more room, I took at low cost the unoccupied houses of several clans in the neighbourhood, and turned them into an annex for the dormitory. Thus our school became very suddenly a huge institution and the number of students increased accordingly. This removal and reorganization marked a new phase in our history.

But for a private school without private endowment or financial subsidy, it was difficult to hold on steadily. As most of the students were samurai, the decisions of 1871. which had affected the conditions of the samurai, had their reflections on the amount of money they could allocate for education. Also, the hard economic situation of the country following Satsuma Rebellion (1877) and subsequent inflation affected the enrolment of Keiō-gijuku. During the inflation years of 1877-1881, many samurai students left the school due to their poverty because of the inflation. Those who came from Satsuma had returned to join the rebellion forces and had been killed or wounded. To overcome the financial impediments and secure continuity, Fukuzawa supplemented the school budget with his personal income and tried, in vain, to raise loans from the government and private sources. About this financial straits he said:[43]

> Though we had no endowment, we were able to manage the teachers' income by distributing the monthly tuition. All the teachers were former students of the school and they gladly accepted whatever was forthcoming in salary. I myself took not a cent, but rather gave what could for the needs of the school. The teacher had the same attitude. Though they could have earned large salaries elsewhere, they remained in *Keiō* to work for the up-building of the school. It was as if they too donated their private income.

However, the enrolment of *Keiō-gijuku* in the period reflected the changes in the society. The ratio of commoners enrolled grew from one-third to more than a half in 1875, due to the inflation which had increased enough the income of the wealthy farmers, to make them able to send their sons to *Keiō-gijuku*.[44]

---

[40] Oxford, op. cit., p.16
[41] Ibid., p.17.
[42] The Autobiography- PP. 219-220.
[43] Ibid., pp.223-224.
[44] Shunsaku Nishikawa, Profiles of Educators, Fukuzawa Yukichi (1835-1901), Unpublished essay written for the UNESCO magazine, pp. 19-20.

Fukuzawa considered general education was essential for the independence of each individual, and the aim of *Keiō-gijuku* was to provide an elementary level of modern learning. The old textbooks used at the school in the first decade of Meiji, now preserved in the *Keiō* Library, include many elementary school textbooks published in the United States and England, some of them appropriate for first or second grade. Adult students were reading these books for new knowledge. It was the policy of Fukuzawa to consolidate the basic general education first. Even after the establishment of Tokyo University in 1877, he felt it was too early for *Keiō-gijuku* to launch into higher education. It was in 1890 when Fukuzawa organized the university departments as a division of *Keiō-gijuku*. Then, some 4000 alumni and the general public donated funds, and Japan's first private university was inaugurated. It had three departments: law, economics, and literature, with an American professor heading each department, and a total of 59 students in the three departments.[45]

In his autobiography, Fukuzawa mentioned that, "the purpose of my entire work has not only been to gather young men together and give them the benefit of foreign book, but to open this closed country of ours, and bring it wholly into the light of Western civilization."[46] It was to this end that Fukuzawa devoted his writings, which appeared constantly up to the time of his death and earned a wide circulation. Of these writings the most notable were *Gakumon no Susume* (An Encouragement of Learning) seventeen pamphlets which came out at irregular intervals between 1872 and 1876, and which were written in an easy style and contained so many startling criticisms of accepted ideas that their total sales figure reached 3.4 million copies. His second most celebrated work, *Bummeiron no Gairyaku* (An Outline of a Theory of Civilization) published in 1875, a longer work attempting to inquire into the nature of civilization in a more academic manner. In 1878, two pamphlets were published on the debates on the political choices of the contemporary political movement, *Tsūzoku minken ron* (Popular Discourse on People's Rights) and *Tsuzoku Kokken ron* (Popular Discourse on National Right). In 1881, a lengthy critique of the trends of the time appeared entitled *Jiji Shōgen* (A Commentary on Current Problems) dealing with Japan's position in the Orient in regard to Western aggression. A number of essays on the position of women, notably *Nihon Fujinron* (On Japanese Woman Hood) published in 1885; *Onna Daigaku Hyōron* (A Review of Essential learning of Women) both appeared in 1899. The collections of Fukuzawa's essays on miscellaneous subjects were published in 1897, and his autobiography, dictated to a secretary, in 1898.[47]

Fukuzawa, also, founded the daily newspaper *Jiji shimpō* (The Times), in which most of his writings after 1882 appeared serial form. Its policy announced in the first issue was to disseminate the principles of "independence" which for twenty-five years had been the guiding principle of his school. Fukuzawa wrote:

> We want our learning independent, not licking up the lees and scum of the Westerners. We want our commerce independent, not dominated by them. We want our law independent, not held in contempt by them. We want our religion independent, not trampled underfoot of them. In short, we have made the independence of our country our lifelong objective, and all who share these aspirations with us are our friends, all who do not are our enemies.[48]

Fukuzawa initiated the art of public speaking in Japan and coined a Japanese term, *enzetsu*, for it. Public speeches had played no part in the traditional Japanese society, and the Japanese language had been thought by scholars to be unintelligible if used to address large audiences. Fukuzawa, however, proved by his own eloquence that public speaking in Japanese was not

---

[45] Fukuzawa Yukichi on Education, trans. Eiichi Kiyooka, Tokyo Uniiversity Press 1985, the introduction, pp.X-XI.
[46] The Autobiography, p.264.
[47] See the list of Fukuzawa's publication in: Oxford, op. cit., Appendix C, pp. 278-281.
[48] Blacker, op. cit., pp. 11-l2.

only possible, but an effective medium for propagating the idea of independence. In 1874 he founded the *Mita Enzetsukai* (Mita Oratorical Society), and in the following year. he built the *Mita Enzetsukan* (Mita Hall of Public Speaking) on the campus of his own school.

Though an advocate of certain Western values and philosophical ideas of the enlightenment, Fukuzawa remained a strong nationalist. He participated to some degree in the liberal movement and political affairs during the 1880's and 1890's, and witnessed the first fruits of Japanese modernization in the Shino-Japanese War (1894-5) and the promulgation of the Meiji Constitution in 1889. But, perhaps the 1870's were the most distinguished years of his career, when he was a leading figure in the Japanese people's rediscovery of themselves in the light of their sudden experience of the West. His writings of the 1870's clearly illustrate the first mix of old and new values, and were critical reaction to them.[49]

Rifā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī (1801-1873)

Unlike Fukuzawa, Ṭahṭāwī did not write any autobiography or memoires containing such detailed information about his child-hood and family background, he would find in Fukuzawa's autobiography. Throughout his pen career, Ṭahṭāwī never referred to his mission to Paris, when he was twenty-six years old. Almost all his biographers relied exclusively on the limited information about Ṭahṭāwī's childhood introduced by his disciple, Sālih Majdī, in the biography of Ṭahṭāwī which he wrote in the early 1880's, and had been in a manuscript form until 1958 when it was published.[50]

However, Rifā'ah al Ṭahṭāwī was born in 1801, in the Upper Egyptian town of Ṭahṭa, to a prominent family of *'ulamā'*, traditional scholars of the Islamic rite (*sharīf'ah*) which was living on the output of a small lot of agrarian land. His family claimed descent of Muhammad, the prophet, being immigrants to Egypt since the early beginnings of Islam. His father Badawī al-Ṭahṭāwī, who died shortly after his birth, was a literate peasant with little traditional Islamic educational background. But his uncles, mother's family, were renowned *'ūlamā* ' of the town, and after the death of his father it was their duty to bring him up and look after his education. Rifā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī had the usual *Kuttāb* education where he learned language, some arithmetic and recited the *Qur'ān*. Besides this regular traditional *Kuttāb* education, his uncles taught him some traditional Islamic texts at home, in order to prepare him to enrol in al-Azhar, the great Islamic school and the biggest centre of the classical Islamic scholarship. In 1817, Rifā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī moved to Cairo and enrolled in al-Azhar like his ancestors.[51]

At that time, al-Azhar was reflecting the cultural decline of the Muslim world; its curriculum was limited to the explanation of *qūr'ān*, the *Hadīth* or teachings of Muhammad, and some other texts on Islamic ethics. Science proper, philosophy and related disciplines, which had been centuries ago flourishing in this old Islamic school, were not taught anymore. The condition of learning at the time was perfectly described by Shaykh Ḥassan al-'Aṭṭār (1766-1835), a professor of al-Azhar, one of the great scholars of the age, and had been one of the few Egyptians who visited Bonaparte's Institut d'Egypte during the French occupation and

---

[49] See the introduction by David A. Dilworth in Fukuzawa Yukichi, An Encouragement of Learning, Sophia University, Tokyo 1969.

[50] See Majdī, Ṣāliḥ, Ḥilyat al-Zamān bi-Manāqib Khādim al-Waṭan, Rifā'ah Bey Rafī' al-Ṭahṭāwī (The Time Ornament of the Credits of the Nation's Servant, Rifā'ah Bey Rafī' al-Ṭahṭāwī), Cairo 1958: For other biographies of Ṭahṭāwī see: 'Abduh, Ibrāhīm, Tārīkh al-Waqā'i' al-Miṣriyyah, 3rd. ed., Cairo 1942, pp. 92-102; Ḥamza, 'Abdel-Laṭīf, Adab al-Maqālah al-Ṣaḥafiyya fī Miṣr, 2nd. ,ed., Cairo 1958, vol.l , pp. 88-138: Hourani, Albert, Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age 1798-1939, Oxford University Press 1962, pp. 67-83: al-Shayyāl, Jamāl al-Dīn, Al-Tārīkh wal-Mu'arrikhūn fī al-Qarn al-Tāsi' 'Ashar, Cairo 1958, pp.49-83, by the same author, Tārīkh al-Tarjamah wal-Ḥarakah al-Thaqāfiyyah fī 'Aṣr Muḥammad 'Alī , Cairo 1951, pp. 120-146: and, Rifā'ah al- Ṭahṭāwī Za'īm al-Nahḍā al-Fikriyya fī 'Aṣr Muḥammad 'Alī, Cairo 1946: Badawī, Aḥmad, Rifā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī Bey, Cairo 1949.

[51] Majdī, Ṣāliḥ, op. cit., pp. 22-23.

had seen there something of the new sciences of Europe. Being an advocate of a breakthrough in Islamic learning based on the fruits of European learning in order to resuscitate the glory of Islamic culture, al-'Aṭṭar wrote:

> If one looks at (the works of) our predecessors *'ulamā* ', he will find that they were well-versed in *sharī'ah*, but besides, they were very much competent in written by the Of learning, and (studied) books even written by heterodox such as Jews and Christians ....[52]

About the deterioration of Islamic learning, al-'Aṭṭār gave a gloomy impression, he wrote:

> … One who looks at our recent situation will discover that we are no more than commoners (*'āmmah*) of the times (of the predecessors). We do nothing but repeat their ideas without any genuine innovation of our own. We even do not read books except those written by the latest (generation of) scholars (*al-muta'akhkhirūn*) who had taken their very wording from them, and we keep repeating them throughout our lifetime, never have the notion of reading others.[53]

No wonder that the young Rifā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī was not much interested in the teaching of the *Azharite* professors, and ended up with Shaykh Ḥassan al-'Aṭṭār who had most influence on him and introduced him to modern sciences. Besides the regular curriculum of al-Azhar, al-'Aṭṭār privately taught his young student al-Ṭahṭāwī some lessons on history, geography, literature, geometry and mathematics.[54]

In 1822, al- Ṭahṭāwī had been graduated from al-Azhar and was given a teaching position at the same school which he occupied for two years. But the teacher's pay was not enough to cover living cost in Cairo and support his mother who was living in Ṭahṭa. His teacher and patron Shaykh Ḥassan al-'Aṭṭār secured his appointment as imam (chaplain) of a regiment in the new Egyptian army, then in 1826, a1-'Aṭṭār recommended him to be the imām of the first substantial mission sent by Muhammad 'Alī to study in Paris.[55]

Both these experiences left their mark on Ṭahṭāwī. new army was the nucleus of a new Egypt, and all his life Ṭahṭāwī remained conscious of the military virtues and The achievements of Muhammad 'Alī's soldiers. But Paris had a deeper effect on him, he remained there five years, from 1826 to 1831, and they were the most important of his life. Although sent as *imām* and not a student, he threw himself into study with enthusiasm and success.[56] In appreciation of his competence. M. Jomard, the French scholar and superintendent of the Egyptian mission in Paris wrote to Muhammad 'Alī asking to allow Ṭahṭāwī to enrol as a student, besides his function as *imām*, which was granted. After passing an intensive course of the French language, Ṭahṭāwī acquired a precise knowledge of the linguistics, grammar and the problems of translating from the French into Arabic. He read books on ancient history, Greek philosophy and mythology, geography, arithmetic and logic; a life of Napoleon, some French poetry including Racine, Lord Chesterfield's letters to his son; and, most important, something of the French thought of the eighteenth century, such as Voltaire, Condillac, Rousseau's Social Contract, and the main works of Montesquieu.[57] This thought left a permanent mark on Ṭahṭāwī, and through him on the Egyptians and Arabs in general.

---

[52] al-'Aṭṭār, Ḥasan, Ḥāshiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā Jam' al-Jawāmi' (Annotation of al-"Attar on the Collected Collection), Cairo n.d., vol.2, pp.225-226.
[53] al-'Aṭṭār, Ḥasan. Ḥāshiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'ala Sharḥ al-Khabīṣī (Annotation of al•'Aṭṭār on the Explanation of al-Khabīṣī), Cairo, n.d., p.258.
[54] Majdī, Ṣāliḥ, op. cit., p.25.
[55] Ibid, pp.29-39.
[56] Hourani, Albert, op. cit., p.25.
[57] Ṭahṭāwī, Takhlīṣ, pp. 189, 319, 336: Hourani, op. cit., p.69.

On his return to Egypt in 1831, Ṭahṭāwī was appointed as a translator and teacher of the French in the School of Medicine, then transferred, after two years, to the military School of Artillery with the same duties. During four years, he translated some French textbooks on geometry, geology, metallurgy, and geography, in addition to a revision of two translations of medicine textbooks.[58] It was in 1834, when his famous book: *Takhlīṣ al-Ibrīz fī Talkhīṣ Bārīz* (The Extraction of Gold in the Summary of Paris) first published in Cairo, introducing a description of his stay in Paris. It was widely read all over the Arab and Muslim world, being reprinted in 1848, 1905, 1958 and 1974, and its Turkish translation was published in 1839 entitled; *Safarnāme Rifā'ah Bey* (Travels of Rifā'ah Bey).[59]

Since Ṭahṭāwī was one of the first Arabs to travel to Europe in the nineteenth century, and the first to publish a book about the hitherto, mysterious countries, to him fell the most difficult task of introducing an image of the European society to his Arab readers. This task he performed in competent fashion by introducing his readers slowly and carefully to the essence of Western culture. Whenever he had to deal with European terms for which no Arabic substitute was available, he had given a transliteration of the term and explained how it could be pronounced. In some cases he had to coin a new Arabic term for a European object. Similar details had to be given concerning the geographic location of the places mentioned and their physical characteristics. His book included a fairly complete description of the basic political organization of France and the major political events which he had witnessed during his stay there. In addition he discussed the state and nature of learning in Europe and introduced his readers to some of the authors and outstanding European intellectual works on society and literature with emphasis on the political-educational aspect of France.[60]

In his book also, Ṭahṭāwī introduced his readers to the new elements of the European society, such as the status of women and their role in the society, social classes, the state of religion in the society, and the manners and customs of the modern French. But he was not uncritical admirer. For him, the French were nearer to greed for money than to generosity, and their men were slaves of their women. Nevertheless, he found much to praise: cleanliness, the careful and prolonged education of children, love of work and disapproval of laziness, intellectual curiosity, and above all their social morality. Loving change in outward appearances, unstable in little things, they were steadfast in great: their political convictions unchanging, and in personal relations they trusted each other and rarely betrayed.[61]

In the introduction, Ṭahṭāwī emphasized the instructive and illuminating nature of his book, he wrote:

> ….. When was going to set about (to France) some friends, especially my professor al-'Aṭṭār, advised me to be tentative about all whatever may see or encounter of the unusual and mysterious things, and to write all about for the exploration of this prosperous land, and to act as a guide for travellers….
>
> I wrote the book in order to persuade the Muslim countries to pursue sciences, arts, and industries, because the efficiency of the Francs (Europeans) is an established fact ... , and during my stay there I felt grief for the lack of them in the Muslim countries....[62]

Ṭahṭāwī's book achieved great fame and served as a blue-print of Western culture for more than a generation of Arab and Muslim countries. It marked the life mission Ṭahṭāwī of as an introducer and advocate of Western culture through the following decades.

---

[58] Majdī, Ṣāliḥ, op.cit., p.36: al-Shayyāl, Jamāl al-Dīn, Tārīkh al-Tarjamah, p.32.
[59] Abu-Lughod, Ibrāhīm, Arab Rediscovery of Europe, A Study in Cultural Encounters, Princeton university Press 1963, pp.50-51.
[60] Ibid., pp.77-78.
[61] Hourni, Albert, op.cit., p.71.
[62] Ṭahṭāwī, Takhlīṣ, p.2.

In 1835, Ṭahṭāwī became a director of the newly founded School of Translation (*Madrasat al-Tarjamah*) in response to his recommendation to Muhammad 'AIī. In six years, the school was developed, and the curriculum designed by Ṭahṭāwī was expanded to include literature, European law, Islamic law (sharī'ah), philosophy, administration, and European languages with special emphasis on the French.[63] The year 1841 had witnessed two distinguished developments: the school was renamed the School of Languages and Accountancy (*Madrasat al-Alsun wa al-Muḥāsabah*) to correspond to its new functions: and a Bureau of Translation (*Qalam al-Tarjamah*) was established within the school, directed by Ṭahṭāwī, to serve as a central clearing for all translated material. The first graduates of the School of Languages were appointed as translators in the Bureau of Translation which had four divisions: mathematics, physics and medicine, literature and human sciences, and Turkish translations. Not only did students of the School translate works as part of their language instruction, but their teachers as well devoted themselves to translating. In addition, some of the professional translators were assigned to work under the auspices of the school. The quantity of works translated was enormous, and it has been reported that during the period from 1835 to 1848 more than two thousand works were translated into Arabic. The quality of the translated works also improved due to the greater competence of Ṭahṭāwī played a major role in translated works, assigning them to the competent translators, and took part in the revision of some translations.[64]

At the same time, Ṭahṭāwī acted as inspector of schools, examiner, member of educational commissions and editor of the official newspaper, *al-Waqā'i' al-Miṣriyyah* (The Egyptian Events). The newspaper was then a bilingual (Turkish-Arabic) sponsored by the state to publicize government orders and instructions, concentrating on local news. Being the sole newspaper in the country, Ṭahṭāwī tried to make a modern organ out of that pamphlet-like paper. Under his editorship, the newspaper became regular weekly with Arabic as a basic language, besides a Turkish translation. Ṭahṭāwī re-designed it on the lines of modern press by assigning certain columns for international news, industry and commerce, science and literature, news analysis and editorials. He initiated the Arabic press articles by dealing with political, economic and cultural matters in a simple style of writing easy to be understood by all readers.[65]

But, all the activities of Ṭahṭāwī were accommodated with the ruler's desire to develop the country through acquiring Western knowledge and means of power, and depended on the political fortunes of the Egyptian state. The political and military collapse of Muhammad 'Alī devastated the educational system he had earlier launched. In fact, the gradual deterioration of that educational system might be counted as one of the severest casualties of the collapse of Muhammad 'Ali's ambitious plans for Egypt. The restrictive policies toward education of both ‘Abbās I (1848-1854) and Sa'īd (1854-1863), his successors, were perhaps dictated by the elimination of the state's economic powers and the necessity for the conservation of the financial resources.[66]

During the first two years of the reign of ‘Abbās I, the School of Languages was not completely closed, but was left to decline from lack of support. It was officially closed in 1851, and within it the Bureau of Translation. Ṭahṭāwī was ousted to the Sudan in 1850 to act as superintendent (*nāẓir*) of a new elementary school in Kharṭūm, this appointment being in reality an exile, ‘Abbās resented the West and held the policies of westernization under Muhammad 'Alī responsible for the political and military collapse of the state, and so the advocates of western learning headed by Ṭahṭāwī. The elementary school of Kharṭūm never

---

[63] Detailed informations about the School of Languages are availabled in: ‘Abdul-Karīm, Aḥmad “Izzat, Tārīkh al-Ta‘līm fī ‘Aṣr Muḥammad ‘Alī (History of Education in the Era of Muhammad ‘Ali), Cairo 1938. pp. 319-344.

[64] Ibid., p.339: al-Shayyāl, op. cit., p. 147.

[65] ‘Abduh, Ibrāhīm, op. cit., pp.34, 48-49.

[66] ‘Abdul-Karīm, op. cit., p.58; Abu-Lughod, op. cit., pp.42-43.

been in action as an educational institution due to the lack of funds, and Ṭahṭāwī spent his four-years exile in translating Fénélon's Les Adventures de Télémaque, to mark the first European novel to be introduced to the Arab readers.[67] Written as moral reading for Fénélon 's pupil the Duc de Bourgogne, it contains an implied criticism of the uncontrolled despotism of Louis XIV, a moral lesson for autocrats which could well be applied to 'Abbās.[68]

But once more, a change of rulers brought a change of fortune, and when Sa'īd succeeded 'Abbās in 1854 Ṭahṭāwī was allowed to return to Cairo, Once more he became a director of a school with a translation bureau attached to it. It was the Military School (*al-Madrasah al-Ḥarbiyya*) to which Tahtawi introduced the study of literature, mathematics and foreign languages, and re-organized a Bureau of Translation within it. But due to the confusion of Sa'īd's policies, the school was closed in 1861, and all the teachers including Ṭahṭāwī were dismissed.[69]

But after two years, Ṭahṭāwī regained favour when Ismā'īl succeeded Sa'īd in 1863. Ismā'īl, perhaps as a result of his early upbringing in Europe among other reasons, was extremely interested in disseminating knowledge of the French language. To this effect, he reopened the School of Languages and the Bureau of Translation, and appointed Ṭahṭāwī a director of both. It was easy for Ṭahṭāwī to recruit his old students and colleagues to resume teaching and to renew the translation movement.

Not only did the quantity of translations increase perceptibly, but in addition they showed a new emphasis and direction. In place of the eclectic variety which had characterized the translations made during the era of Muhammad 'Alī, there was a noticeable increase in the number of purely military works which were translated into Arabic, and there began the translating of complete European legal works. The increased commercial and legal activities involving European-Egyptian dealings, led to an increased Egyptian interest in European works on legal and juridical subjects. Ṭahṭāwī and some of his associates translated both the Code Napoleon (1866), and the French commercial code (1868), created new legal terms adopted from Islamic sharī'ah. The translation of these two major legal works had tremendous significance in view of later legal changes in the Arab world which derived much of their basis from these European legal documents.[70]

In addition to his functions in the school of Languages and the Bureau of Translation, Ṭahṭāwī was one of the group which planned the new educational system. He was a member of several commissions, but still found time for his scholarly work. In 1870, he was appointed to the editorship of a new literary and scholarly periodical, *Rawḍat al-Madāris* (Schools' Paradise) issued by the Ministry of Education, an appointment he held until his death. He used his editorials as a vehicle to spread his ideas on civilization, and his criticism of certain traditional aspects and manners. In *Rawḍat al-Madāris*, three of his books first appeared on series. First, *al-Qawl al-Sadīd fī al-Ijtihād wa al-Taqlīd* (Accurate Statement on Innovation and Tradition) in which he emphasized the irrelevance of some traditions thought to be related to Islam, and called for innovation to develop Muslim countries. The second, *Risālat al-Bida' al-Mutaqarrirah fī al-Shiya' al-mutabarbriah* (Pamphlet on Established Absurds among Barbarians) was a study on the development of civilization. And the third, *Nihāyat al-Ijāz fī sīrat sākin al-Ḥijāz* (The Last summation on the Biography of the Resident of Hijaz) which was the first modern study on the biography of Muhammad and the history of early Islam.[71]

---

[67] al-Shayyāl, op. cit., pp.142-144.
[68] Hourani, Albert, op. cit., pp. 73-74.
[69] Ḥijāzī, Maḥmûd Fahmī, Uṣûl al-Fikr al-'Arabī al-Ḥadīth 'inda al-Ṭahṭāwī (Origins of Modern Arab Thought of Ṭahṭāwī), Cairo 1974, p.30.
[70] Abu-Lughod, op. cit., pp. 43-44.
[71] Ḥijāzī, op. cit., pp. 31-32.

In 1870, Ṭahṭāwī published a general book on Egyptian society, *Manāhij al-Albāb al-Miṣriyya fī Mabāhij al-Ādāb al-'Aṣriyya* (Courses for Egyptian Minds in the Delights of Modern Literature), which contains the most complete statement of Ṭahṭāwī views about the path which Egypt would take. It was designed to provide edifying reading for the students in the new schools, written in an old-fashioned discursive way, but from what Ṭahṭāwī says we can get his theory of politics and of the nature and destiny of Egypt. And in 1872, Ṭahṭāwī's second book which reflects his thought was published, *al-Murshid al-Amīn li al-Banāt wa al-Banīn* (The Honest Guide For Girls and Boys). It is a book on education reflects his educational and social thought. The last two books and his first book on his life in Paris are the major sources of Ṭahṭāwī's thought.

His book on the biography of Muhammad and the history of early Islam was his second work on history. The first work, *Anwār Ṭawfīq al-jalīl fī Akhbār Miṣr wa Tawthīq Banī Isma'īl* (Illumination of Tawfiq the Great on the History of Egypt and the Origin of the Sons of Isma'īl), published in 1868, was a work of national education, and a summary of what the modern Egyptian should know about his country. It starts by the ancient history of Egypt based, for the first time, on modern European sources. In modern western fashion he divided history into two main categories, ancient and modern: but as a Muslim, his dividing line was the rise of Islam, which he regarded as the most important event in history.[72] The book marks the first attempt to apply modern methodology of history to the study of the history of Egypt.

In the writings of Ṭahṭāwī we come, for the first time, on many themes later to be familiar in Arabic and Islamic thought. All his ideas were to become the commonplaces of later thinkers and to inspire the advocates of Egyptian nationalism in particular.

[72] Hourani, op. cit., p.80.

Chapter 3 - The New Political Order

In the realm of political thought, both Fukuzawa and Ṭahṭāwī had to revise the traditional views justifying rulers and government in order to promote progress in the process of making a modern state. In the case of Japan, the evils of *meibun* and its corollary of "preponderance of power" were just as marked in the relation of ruler and subject as they were in the more intimate family relations of parents and child and husband and wife. Rulers, just as parents and husbands, were thought to be justified in wielding virtually unconditional power over their subjects.[73] It had been generally believed not only men were unequal but that the society was naturally hierarchical. Levelling the hierarchical structure of the society would result in chaos and disorder. Confucian political theory had invoked the idea of *temmei*, the mandate of heaven of which the ruler derived his divine right to rule as far as he observe certain canons of moral conduct. If he violated these canons, he automatically lost *temmei* and ceased to be a ruler by definition. But in the Japanese practice, there was no doctrinal justification for deposing a bad ruler. The ruler's authority, moreover, could be legitimately exercised in every conceivable sphere of his subjects' lives. His authority over them was as unlimited as that of the father over his infants.[74]

In Egypt, as in other Muslim lands, the *shari'ah*, Islamic Code, covered men's relations with each other as well as with God. All Muslims, whatever their culture or racial origin, were theoretically equal members of the community possessing the same rights and responsibilities. But in practice inequality was prevailing, and everybody was strictly attached to a certain station in life. The ruler possessed, under God, the sole responsibility for ruling. In the last resort he was responsible to God and his own conscience alone. The first duty of the community towards the ruler was one of obedience. But obedience should be, in theory, neither passive nor without conditions, it only held so long as he ordered nothing which was contrary to the *Shari'ah*. But later, obedience tended to become an absolute duty, and even unjust ruler was regarded as better than none at all. Moreover, according to the theory generally held, the ruler should consult the leaders of the community and they should give him moral advice and exhortation, although there was no clear idea about who exactly should be consulted, and how far the ruler should be bound by what they said. From the viewpoint of the later Muslim thinkers, ruler was a necessity, without him there can be no justice; he was considered to be ”the shadow of God on earth'', and the community must accept him whoever he be.[75]

Since this background of traditional political heritage did not cope with the development of political system in modern state, it was impeding and obstructing building new politics in both Japan and Egypt, Fukuzawa and Ṭahṭāwī had to introduce a complete set of revisions of this traditional heritage to stimulate progress.

---

[73] Meibun was a Confucian term largely popularized by the writers of Mito school and by people of similar persuasion sch as Rai Sanyō. lt implied that each man posessed a mei, a ”name” which not only defined his position in the social hierarchy, but at the same time summed up in itself the moral qualities required by that position. It followed that each man's bun, his share, lot, or proper station in life, differed according to his mei. Hence, a man with the name ”ruler” enjoyed a bun different from that enjoyed by one with the name ”subject". Consequently, men were naturally unequal.
see: Blacker, The Japanese Enlightenment, pp. 70-73: also, Nakamura, H.: Ways of Thinking of Eastern People, Hawaii 1964, Maruyama Masao, Thought and Behavior in Modern Japanese Politics, Edited by Ivan Morris, New York, 1963.

[74] Blacker op. cit., pp. 101-102.

[75] Hourani, Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age, chap. I, passim: see also, Fazlur-Rahman, Islam, 2d. ed., University of Chicago Press, 1979; and, Al-Fārûqī, Islam, U.S.A.

Fukuzawa Yukichi

The first phrases in section one of *Gakumon no susume* (An encouragement of Learning) read:

> It is said that heaven does not create one man above or below another man. This means that when men are born from heaven they all are equal. There is no innate distinction between high and low.[76]

By this statement, Fukuzawa departed completely from the essence of traditional thought. There was thus a wide gap between the traditional ideas on the functions and justification of government, and Fukuzawa's professed egalitarian ideas. He asserted that the difference in men's fortunes is a result of their work and not decided by heaven as wealth, power, and intellect are relative different conditions of man. Hence, men should love and respect one another, and each person should fulfil his own functions and attain what he wants, as long as he does not infringe upon the rights of the others.

To elucidate his egalitarian views. Fukuzawa added:

> …If we inquire into the balance of human relations, we must say that all men are equal. They may not be equal in outward appearances. Equality means equality in essential human rights. But in external conditions there are extreme differences between rich and poor, strong and weak, intelligent and stupid men.... Thus while they differ like the clouds above and the mud below, still from the point of view of inherent human rights all men are equal without the least distinction between superior and inferior human beings.[77]

Fukuzawa, moreover, emphasized that the outward circumstances of national wealth and power are not irrevocably fixed by nature of heaven; they can be also changed by the diligent efforts of men.

> If we Japanese will begin to pursue learning with spirit and energy, so as to achieve personal independence and thereby to enrich and strengthen the nation, why we fear the Powers of the West? ... We shall achieve national independence only after we achieve personal independence …. But when the people of a nation do not have the spirit of individual independence, the corresponding right of national independence cannot be realized.[78]

In this way Fukuzawa expressed the fundamental principle of the modern age in simple terms easily understandable to the people. How could men lacking the spirit of self-reliance and independence assert their right to independence of foreigners?[79]

> Japan must be filled with the spirit of independence if we are to defend her against foreign threats. Everyone must take the responsibility of the nation upon himself, regardless of personal status or prestige... we should treat our own native soil as our own homes. We should not hesitate to lose not only our fortunes but even our lives for the sake of homeland. This is precisely the great duty of patriotism.[80]

For that goal of patriotism, people must cultivate their own personal independence and help others to achieve theirs. "A common liberation of man and a common share of the nation's

[76] Fukuzawa Yukichi, An Encouragement of Learning, trans. David A. Dilwoth & Umeyo Hirano, Sophia University, Tokyo 1969, p. 1.
[77] Ibid., p.10.
[78] Ibid., p.16.
[79] Irokawa Daikichi, The Culture of the Meiji Period, trans. ed. Marius B. Jansen, Princeton University Press 1985, p.61.
[80] Fukuzawa, An Encouragement of Learning, p.17.

joys and sorrows will be better than the initiative of the few who bind the majority to their will and bear the burdens of government alone."[81]

Before long, a great number of people who were inspired by reading *Gakumon no susume* silently accepted its arguments and rose up to take part in the *jiyû minken undō*, the People's Rights movement, wanting to "spread the spirit of liberty throughout the land." In fact, there were elements in Fukuzawa's early arguments that might have led directly to linkup with the nationalism of the advocates of the people's rights. But Fukuzawa himself followed the path of compromise with the government clearly illustrated by his logic about the contract between the government and people.[82]

This happened as Fukuzawa attempted to apply the idea of modern natural law in the form of a theory of social contract to existing conditions in Japan. His argument goes as follows:

> Each citizen has a double office. The first is to be subordinate to the government with the mentality of a guest. The second is to join together with the other citizens of the nation to form a company, as it were, that is called the nation, to enact and implement the laws of the nation …. To take up first their status as guests, the citizens must honour the laws of the land, and not forget the principle of equality of men. If I do not want my rights violated by others, then I must in turn not infringe upon the rights of others.... To take up secondly their status as masters, the citizens of a nation are at the same time the government itself. Since not every person can directly administer the affairs of state, this is entrusted to the government, which makes a pact to serve as the representative of the people. Accordingly, the people are the real masters and bosses. The government is their representative and manager.[83]

The idea that a government was created by the people's contract was revolutionary because it had as requisite the assumption that sovereign power resided with the people, Moreover such a government could be revamped, changed, or repudiated at any time.[84] But Fukuzawa advocated government continuity with a certain degree of submission to the government, and denial of tough resistance against tyrannical rule. After discussing three different possible choices: surrender, resistance by force of arms, and sacrificing their lives to uphold the principle of justice, he considered the third "to be the best policy," he wrote:

> If rational pressure is brought to bear upon the government, the existing good administration and laws will not at all be harmed, ... Therefore what is not accomplished this year will be accomplished in the following year. Moreover, there is danger that resistance against the government through force of arms will destroy a hundred things in pursuit of one goal, but rational persuasion will sweep out only those evils that should be eliminated, without creating additional troubles. Since their objective is to put an end to governmental injustice, criticism can be stopped as the government returns to just ways. Further, armed resistance will bring angry counter resistance, instead of reconsidering its own evils, the government will brandish its tyrannical power all the more, and may even aggravate those evils still more. But since even a tyrannical government and its officials are men of the same country, the sight of their fellow countrymen quietly advocating truth by sacrificing their own lives to uphold the principles of justice will ultimately win their hearts. Once this happens, they will repent of their own wrongdoings, naturally throw off their arrogance, and reform their ways.[85]

---

[81] Ibid., p.20.
[82] Irokawa, op. cit., p.62.
[83] Fukuzawa, op. cit., pp.41-42.
[84] Irokawa, op. cit., p.63.
[85] Fukuzawa, op. cit., pp.45-46.

This compromise with the government does not correspond to the theory of social contract. But when we take into consideration the context of the situation at the time this essay was written and published, in 1874, when the first memorial calling for establishment of a representative assembly was sent to the government, just as the movement for people's rights was getting underway, we will find that Fukuzawa's compromising attitude went far away from the theory itself for what looks like a tactical political action coping with the political momentum. He discussed in detail the relation between government and people, and considered that dispute they may have over minute points of interpretation contributes to a larger social order and good government through the creation of national laws.[86] But he did not even touch on the question of where the state or government should receive the people's trust and delegation power or where would be the arena for dispute with the government (i.e. the national assembly). He did not also elaborate on the question of where the control should be mutually binding (i.e. a constitution agreed on by the nation). Instead, he stressed only the logic of duty: people should submit to the laws of the state and should even tolerate governmental tyranny, restricting themselves to calls for reason and justice.[87]

Though, a good number of core leaders of the *jiyû minken* movement were deeply influenced by his ideas of social equality and social contract, Fukuzawa resented the movement in equal degree. In his series on *Nippon Kokkai engi* (The National Diet, Circumstances behind its Birth), he described the advocates of the people's rights as a bunch of opportunists looking for a position in the government. He wrote:

> I am obliged to declare that Japan still is a country without real people's rights movement, and that those noisy arguments we hear from time to time are nothing but attempts of those jobless samurai intellectuals, disappointed in obtaining a good government position, turning to annoy the government by bringing up artificially created problems - in short, meaningless devilry.... From my point of view, those men appeared too powerless to do anything substantial against the government. Even if they did resort to some insurrection, theirs would be like a dust before the wind.[88]

In the same series, Fukuzawa maintained that the Diet was not created by the pressure of the people outside the government but it was the wishes of the men within the government which caused its opening, The Diet has nothing evil against the Imperial Household as "our Imperial Household is not like the kings of other countries,…(they) have been monarchs since before the country was born, and are to stay with it forever, the most high, most secure and most long-lasting, indeed, the incomparably sacred monarch."[89]

But this appreciation of the Imperial Household expressed by Fukuzawa was rather rational. He had seen in them the symbol of the nation and an entity outside of the political world and factionalism. He wrote:

> The Imperial Household should be the symbol of the nation: command the spirits of the soldiers. of the navy and the army and give purpose to their devotion; command loyal children and faithful wives in order to raise the moral standard of the nation; take leadership in the encouragement of learning and recognition of able scholars so as to promote the independence of education, save the arts from the brink of extinction and increase our wealth in civilization.[90]

---

[86] Ibid., p.71.
[87] Irokawa, p.64.
[88] Fukuzawa Yukichi, The National Diet, Circumstances behind its Birth, Nippon Kokkai Engi, Jijishimpō, trans. Eiichi Kiyooka, Fukuzawa Yukichi Nenkan, vol.14, F.Y. Kyoukai Keiō University, Tokyo 1987, pp.7-8.
[89] Ibid., p.33.
[90] Fukuzawa Yukichi, On Education, Selected Works, trans. Eiichi Kiyooka, University of Tokyo Press, 1985, p.145.

In short, Fukuzawa had seen in the Imperial Household the guardian of Japanese culture in general who should stand apart from politics, which in a sense reflects his liberal point of view.

However, Fukuzawa was against the early establishment of a national assembly and opposed any overthrow of the autocratic government by *minken* faction. He regarded the Meiji regime as a "progressive government" and advocated balance between the government and people.[91]

Fukuzawa was convinced that it was precisely in her failure to appreciate the importance of this balance, that Japan's great weakness lay. Her people, due to their long subjection to the ideas of *meibun* and their consequent lack of any spirit of independence, have always made the mistake of overvaluing the government's sphere and failing to appreciate the importance of their own. They either imagined that government could do everything much better than they could, and consequently that they should leave all activities of any importance to the government. Or, if they were fired with the initiative and energy to do things themselves, they imagined that they must become members of the government in order to do so. Private scholars might, indeed, go so far as to discuss questions of commerce, religion, language, education and the various other activities which properly belonged to the people's sphere, but all action on them they invariably left to the government.[92]

Fukuzawa maintained that the functions of the government should be limited to holding military power, regulating war and peace, enacting laws to preserve order in the country, and protecting the people's interests by preventing various evils. Sometimes it may lay down laws for the promotion of people's interests, but only in order to overpower hindrances in the way of their development. Members of the government had their task, like any other members of the community, but the mere fact that they were entrusted with the particular task was no reason whatever why they should be respected and venerated more than those performing any other task. The people were under no obligation to the government for its keeping of the peace except paying taxes.

It followed that the people might handle any activities outside the government sphere. The sphere of private enterprise might cover trade, industry, reclamation of land, transport, teaching in schools, publication of books and newspapers, or anything which did not specifically encroach on the government's activities. It was essential, however, that the government and private spheres should be kept separate. The government should not encroach on the private sphere, it should have nothing to do with such activities as religion, schools, agriculture and commerce. Similarly, the people should not encroach on the government's sphere and attempt to take decisions on matters involving law or punishment into their own hands.

Fukuzawa stated that the reason why it was important for the government's and people's respective spheres to be kept separate was that in the proper balance between the two lay one of the secrets of progress in civilization. In the people's sphere, where the activities should be as many and varied as possible, allowing plenty of scope for argument and experiment, lay the energy and initiative to progress. In the government's sphere lay the power to hinder hindrances to the expression of this energy.[93]

Coping with his compromise attitude and the idea of the balance between the government and people, Fukuzawa believed in a tendency for forms of government to gradually develop along a certain recognisable path. As man moved steadily towards his own perfection, the forms of government tended to move from autocracy towards democracy. He wrote:

---

[91] Irokawa, op. cit., p.68
[92] Blacker, Carmen, The Japanese Enlightenment, p.110.
[93] Ibid., 99.107-109.

> Careful study of politics will show us that there is an unceasing force causing autocracy to change to freedom, just as water always flows towards the low ground. There may certainly be reversals of this tendency, but they are only temporary fluctuations. The facts show indisputably that the long-term trend stretching over tens of thousands of years is for monarchy to give way to democracy, and for tyranny to give way to liberalism.[94]

Following this evolutionary trend was Fukuzawa's ideas about Japan's relations with the comity of nations. First he advocated opening the country to foreign intercourse; but not for some years was he troubled by the fear of foreign aggression. By 1876, he had decided that relations between nations were on an entirely different footing from relations between individuals as "none will ever let slip an opportunity of taking advantage of the other," Hence, "a few cannons are worth more than a hundred volumes of international law." The following year, he wrote "A nation does not come out on top because it is right. It is right because it has come out on top." It was impossible to believe that the so-called Law of Nations applied to all nations indiscriminately when confronted with the way in which the Western nations treated the Eastern. From 1882 until the end of the Sino-Japanese War, Fukuzawa devoted all his energies to impressing on people the importance of strengthening the country.[95]

If Fukuzawa's sudden neglect of people's rights in favour of national strength at this period might appear illiberal, the policy he recommended Japan to adopt towards the other Asiatic countries was purely imperialistic. He declared that the countries of Asia must combine together to resist the West. It followed that the only country capable of assuming leadership in the Far East was Japan. For her own sake Japan should take it upon herself to try to strengthen the other Asiatic countries. In 1885, Fukuzawa published an essay titled *Datsuaron* (On Departure from Asia), in which he argued that Japan should distance herself from "bad friends" in Asia. In conclusion, he wrote:

> Our immediate policy, therefore, should be to lose no time in waiting for the enlightenment of our neighbouring countries in order to join them in developing Asia, but rather to depart from their rank and cast our lot with the civilized countries of the West. It is not necessary for us to make special recognition in law for China and Korea just because they are neighbouring countries. We should deal with them exactly as the Westerners do.
>
> Those with bad companions cannot avoid bad reputation. We must resolve to repudiate the bad companions of East Asia.[96]

In other words, Fukuzawa changed his view to argue that it was right and proper for Japan, together with the Western countries, to intervene in the affairs of "barbarous" Asian lands because Japan represented "civilization" and had the mission of awakening less advanced neighbours by the use of force. Ten years later Japan, which had adopted this "civilization" and built up military strength, defeated the Ch'ing Empire, the symbol of Asian "barbarism". A joyful Fukuzawa, on seeing Japan's victory in this war, told the nation: "the great work of the Restoration is now achieved. This victory was nothing other than the victory of Japanese civilization."[97]

Fukuzawa took no part in government throughout his life, but he contributed so much to the strengthening of the Meiji state by his ideological justification of Meiji government. But of all the men of Meiji, his was the loudest call for national independence, self-reliance, and self-respect, for liberation of human nature and desire from oppressive moral restraints, abolition

---

[94] Ibid., p.112.
[95] Ibid., pp. 122-137, passim.
[96] Fukuzawa Yukichi, On Departure from Asia (Datsuaron), trans. Sinh Vinh, Fukuzawa Yukichi Nenkan, vol.11, F.Y. Kyoukai, Keiō University, Tokyo 1984, p.4
[97] Irokawa, op. cit., p.213.

of feudal system, and rejection of an ethos that exalted government at the expense of the people.[98]

Rifā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī

Perhaps the most important aspect of political organization noted by Fukuzawa and Ṭahṭāwī was the European principle of a government of laws rather than of men. In the case of Ṭahṭāwī, he noted that the distinguishing characteristic of European government was its "constitutionalism", regardless the type of the regime. He also noted that there were very explicit distinctions made between the various branches of government, i.e., the principle of separation of powers.

In order to explain that system more fully, Ṭahṭāwī translated the constitution of France and annotated it with detailed explanations of meaning and application, insofar as can be determined this was the first time anything of this nature appeared in the Arabic language. This was the first time in Arab history that a document representing a coherent political system in operation in a Western country was made available to an Arab audience. So alien were both the form and the content of this document that the author felt it necessary to be extremely detailed and explicit in his commentary.[99]

In the course of his translations and descriptions a number of ideas appeared which were entirely alien to the intellectual system of the Arabs. For example, the basic freedoms guaranteed in the French constitution were explained by Ṭahṭāwī in the following manner:

> The French people are equal before the law despite their differences in prestige, position, honour, and wealth. These latter distinctions may have utility in social convention and society, but they have no significance in the *sharī'ah* (i.e. Constitution of France). Therefore, all people are admitted to military and civil positions.... The *sharī'ah* guarantees for every man the right of personal freedom so that no man can be arrested except in accordance with the terms of laws.... And one of the corollaries of freedom among the French is that each man may pursue his own religion under the protection of the State.... Each Frenchman has the right to express his political and religious beliefs, provided that he does not infringe on or cause damage to the order established in the statutes. All property is sacred and cannot be infringed upon; no man can be forced to give up his property unless it is required for the public interest and unless he is recompensed for its value according to a judgement handed down by the courts....[100]

Some of the leading ideas of the French political system would not indeed have been strange to one who brought up in the tradition of Islamic political thought: that man fulfils himself as a member of society, that the good society is directed by a principle of justice, that the purpose of government is the welfare of the ruled. But there were new ideas as well, of which the influence can be seen throughout Ṭahṭāwī's writings; that the people could and should participate actively in the process of government; that they should be educated for this purpose; that laws must change according to circumstances, and those which are good at one time and place may not be so at others. The idea of the nation too he could have derived from Montesquieu. Montesquieu emphasized the importance of geographical conditions in moulding laws, and this implies the reality of the geographically limited community, the society constituted by living in one place: and he taught too that the rise and fall of States was due to causes, that the causes to be found in the spirit of the nation, and that the love of country is the basis of political virtues and vice versa. These were more than abstract ideas for

---

[98] Ibid., p.67.
[99] Abu-Lughod, Arab Rediscovery of Europe, pp. 88, 92.
[100] Ibid., p.93: Ṭahṭāwī, Takhlīs, p.94.

Ṭahṭāwī. At the same time as he was becoming acquainted with them, his experience in Paris was suggesting how they could be relevant to his own society.[101]

Ṭahṭāwī's ideas about society and the State are neither a mere restatement of a traditional view nor a simple reflection of the ideas he had learnt in Paris. The way in which his ideas are formulated is in the whole traditional: at every point he makes appeal to the example of Muḥammad, the Prophet and his Companions, and his conceptions of political authority are within the tradition of Islamic thought. But at points he gives them a new and significant development.[102]

In spite of what he has seen in Paris, his view of the State is not that of a liberal of the nineteenth century. It is a conventional Islamic view, he wrote:

> The government is an essential to country as soul to body.... A society needs two great elements: government to safeguard public interests and prevent evils; and subjects who enjoy complete freedom and benefits of a prosperous life.... The government must be central, consisting of main three powers: legislative (*quwwat taqnīn al-qawānīn*), judicial (*quwwat al-qadā' wa faṣl al-ḥukm*), and executive (*quwwat tanfīz al-aḥkam*). All these powers are integrated in the sole power of the sovereign ruler according to the terms of law.... Good relations between the ruler and his subjects must prevail, and the ruler who cherishes his people tends to choose good advisers.[103]

That government should be in the hands of the people was an idea familiar to Ṭahṭāwī from his readings and experience in France, he had witnessed the revolution of 1830 and gave a long description of it in his book on Paris. But it was not, he thought, an idea which was relevant to the problems of Egypt. His country was ruled by a Muslim autocrat, and the only hope of effective reform was that the autocrat should use his powers properly.[104] His idea of the enlightened autocrat was as follows:

> Since the powers of government are burdensome to be carried out by one person, the ruler should mandate certain powers to the assemblies and courts of law, provided that each institution must has special statutes and regulations. The ruler may keep management of supreme and public affairs in his own hands....
>
> Ruler's rights are called privileges, but he is bound by duties toward his people. As far as privileges are concerned; the ruler is God's representative, answerable to God alone not to any of his subjects. But he should be advised by scholars (*'ulamā'*) and politicians to draw his attention, courteously, to what might be missed. Fear of God could impel the ruler into good actions and guide him to justice. But so too could fear of public opinion, and in the modern world opinion played an active part in the life of the State. History also judges the actions of the rulers, and fear of history makes rulers cling to justice and benevolence.... Concentration of power in his hands without association is among the ruler's privileges. It is mainly legislative, as executive power should be mandated to ministers and directors of government departments. The ruler enjoys all sovereign rights: issuing decrees, appointing high ranking officials, holding the high command of armed forces, deciding demotic and foreign policies, and ratifying legislations suggested by the Assembly which acts as a consultative body.... The ruler should be patient, benevolent, and compassionate..., but he must not interfere with the judgements of courts, or give amnesty to convicts and outlaws unless their crimes were political.[105]

---

[101] Hourani, Arabic Thought in The Liberal Age, pp.69-70.
[102] Ibid., p.73.
[103] Ṭahṭāwī, Manahij, p.349.
[104] Hourani, op. cit., p.73.
[105] Manahji, pp.354-37O. passim.

Therefore, Ṭahṭāwī's idea of the autocrat corresponds to modern Muslim autocrat bound by both *sharī'ah* and law. To explain the Islamic idea of the *sharī'ah* as standing above the ruler he referred to Montesquieu's distinction of the three power, and the idea of restraints on the sovereign's absolute power was certainly strengthened by what he saw in France. But his argument for limits on the exercise of authority starts from the traditional idea of corporate society in which people are categorized according to their specific function and status.[106]

Ṭahṭāwī argued that rulers and ruled are closely linked to each other by rights and duties; the subject should obey, but the ruler should consider their rights and fulfil his duties. To protect their rights, citizens should have enough knowledge of *sharī'ah*, civil law, and the government procedures. He argued:

> Men have rights and duties as well, but they cannot get their rights or accomplish their duties unless they have proper idea about. It means that they should know about the laws of the government which must be familiar to any private citizen and government official as well.... Government's duty is to guarantee equal rights, freedom, and protection to the people in accordance with law. The ruler must observe law in all actions related to citizens.[107]

Besides the people's right vis-ā-vis government which he called common rights, Ṭahṭāwī mentioned another category of people's rights, the so-called civil rights (*al-Ḥuqûq al-madaniyya*). He elaborated:

> It means the rights of citizenry vis-ā-vis each other known as personal rights.... It reflects solidarity of citizens in mutual protection of their lives, property, interests, and honour, in order to defend them (against any inconvenience), within the limits of law.

Elucidating the concept of civil rights, Ṭahṭāwī advocated the idea of municipal government. Being alien to the Muslim political thought, he described the historical background of municipalities in Europe, coined the term (*baladiyyah*) for it, and added:

> Municipal rights are integral part of civil rights. Each community within the State has the right of self- government in the field of local administration such as public utilities, schools, hospitals, charitable institutions, tax collection, and related affairs in the locality. But municipality should obtain consent of the central government on matters of levies, loans, court suits, and deals in communal land property.[108]

This idea of self-government in local administration was introduced for the first time to the Arabic political literature. It reflects the compromising attitude of Ṭahṭāwī, while he asserted the concentration of power in the sovereign's hands and looked at the government as central institution: he advocated the people's right of self-government in the from of municipalities. It means that Ṭahṭāwī believed in the gradual evolution of the autocratic rule through development of municipalities bearing in mind the European experience. This argument could be supported by his ideas of equality and freedom.

About equality, he stated that:

> All men are equals by nature. But if we look carefully, we will find that equality is relative.... There are differences between men in physical power, intellect, and wealth. Nevertheless, people are equals whatever their station in life could be. They have equal rights in accordance with law, and share equal duties as citizens towards

---

[106] Hourani, op. cit., p.75.
[107] Ṭahṭāwī, Manahij, p.365.
[108] Ibid., pp. 368-369.

> their country. The nation whose law is based on equality is a powerful and distinguished one.[109]

Ṭahṭāwī maintained that equality is fundamental part of people's rights in civilized societies, freedom as well is the core of people's rights in a civilized nation, and an indicator of the independence of the country. He wrote:

> In independent countries, citizens are free to move and domicile anywhere, and to do whatever they like to do as far as they do not infringe upon the rights of others. lt is not permitted to jeopardize personal freedom either by banishment or punishment without a court judgement. All citizens should be free to conduct their wealth or property without any restriction. They are free to express their views within the limits of law.[110]

Ṭahṭāwī distinguished five types of freedom: natural, behavioural, religious, civil, and political. Natural freedom is related to satisfaction of physical and biological needs of man. Behavioural freedom is related to manners and morals adopted by men and integrated to their conscious. Religious freedom is related to belief, opinion, and sect including choice of political doctrine. Civil freedom is attached to the rights of citizens vis-ā-vis each other, provided that everyone is not entitled to infringe upon the freedom of others. Finally, political freedom is related to the State which should safeguard private property and the freedom of citizens. Taxation and military conscription imposed by the state do not infringe upon the citizens freedom, being part of their duties. It help the State to secure national independence and safeguard freedom of citizens.[111]

Following a principle long established, Ṭahṭāwī distinguished four social categories: the ruler, the scholars and men of law, the military, and those engaged in economic production. He gave special attention to the second of these and its role in the State. The ruler should respect and honour the scholars (*'ulamā'*); he should treat them as his helpers in the task of government. It is a theme common to Islamic jurists, but Ṭahṭāwī gave a new turn to the idea of the *'ulamā'*. In his view, they were not simply guardians of a fixed and established tradition, it was necessary to adapt the *sharī'ah* to new circumstances and it was legitimate to do so. He suggested that there was not much difference between the principles of Islamic law and those principles of natural law (*al-qānūn al-ṭabī'ī*) on which the codes of modern Europe were based.[112] This suggestion implied that Islamic law (sharī'ah) could be reinterpreted in the direction of conformity with modern needs, and he suggested a principle which could be used to justify this: that it is legitimate for a believer, in certain circumstances, to accept an interpretation of the law drawn from a legal code other than his own insofar as it does not infringe upon his religious belief.[113] Taken up by later writers, this suggestion was made use of in the creation of a modern and uniform system of Islamic law in Egypt and other Arab countries.[114]

Ṭahṭāwī asserted that knowledge of Islamic ethics alone is not enough for *'ulamā'* to interpret the *sharī'ah* in the light of modern needs. They must study the sciences created by human reason in order to know what the modern world is. The *'ulamā'* must come to terms with the new learning: and the scholars of that learning should have the same social position as the *'ulamā'*. They should be honoured and consulted by the ruler. In other words, the traditional idea of partnership between ruler and *'ulamā'* has been brought up to date by Ṭahṭāwī, and the idea of the *'ulamā'* reinterpreted in terms of Saint-Simon's "priest- hood" of scientist.[115]

---

[109] Ṭahṭāwī, al-Murshid, p.126.
[110] Ibid., p.127.
[111] Ibid., p.128.
[112] Ibid., p.124.
[113] Ṭahṭāwī, Manahij, pp.387-391.
[114] Hourani, op. cit., p.75
[115] Ibid., p.76.

When Ṭahṭāwī emphasized that the *'ulamā'* should have a modern education and all citizens should have a political education, he was implying that the nature of society and the function of government were different from what they had been in the past. He would no doubt have accepted in principle the Islamic idea of political stability, of the function of the government as being to regulate the different orders of society and keep them within the sharī'ah. But we can see in him a new idea of change as a principle of social life, and government as the necessary instrument of change. He assumed that society has two purposes: to do the will of God, and to achieve the well- being in this world. This statement had nothing new, but what was new the meaning given to welfare. It was identified with progress as Europe of the nineteenth century conceived it, and in this sense welfare had two bases: the first was spiritual related to religious and human virtues, and the second was material related to economic activities which lead to wealth and improvement of conditions and contentment among the people as a whole.[116]

Ṭahṭāwī was the first Arab thinker who formulated the idea of "fatherland" and nation state out of the historical heritage of international Islamic community (Islamic nation, or *Ummah islāmiyyah*), to help the creation of an Egyptian national consciousness. Effectively, this marked the passing of medieval Islamic political concept of undivided Muslim nation (*Ummah*) identified by religious belief which had been common in Egypt and other Muslim countries until the early nineteenth century, and the active irruption of Western concept of nation. The acclimatization of the new nationalism based on geographical factor within the moulds of nation (*ummah*) and fatherland (*waṭan*) was initiated by Ṭahṭāwī.

In the *Manāhij al-Albāb*, as in the *Murshid*, the word *waṭan* and the term *waṭaniyyah* occur again and again. By the time Ṭahṭāwī uses the word *waṭan*, it already carried the emotional charge of the French patrie and must be a translation of the latter, as Hourani points out, but *waṭaniyyah* was a new term to imply patriotism. In the classical literature, *waṭan* rarely has much of the evocative or emotional about it, except when the writer refers to his own birthplace, in strictly local sense, or to his native city. But Ṭahṭāwī gave the word the specific meaning of territorial patriotism in modern sense, and the fatherland became the focus of those duties which, for Islamic jurists, bound together members of *ummah* and that natural feeling existed between men related to each other by kinship (*'aṣabiyyah*).[117]

The transition to this new way of thought can be seen in the Manāhij where Ṭahṭāwī discussed the brotherhood in religion. He quoted the Prophet's *Hadīth* "the Muslim is brother of the Muslim, and then added:

> All that is binding on a believer in regard to his fellow believers is binding also on members of the same *waṭan* in their mutual rights. For there is a national brotherhood between them over and above the brotherhood in religion. There is a moral obligation on those who share the same *waṭan* to work together to improve it and perfect its organization in all that concerns its honour, greatness, and wealth.[118]

In the *Murshid*, Ṭahṭāwī gave a new definition of *ummah* marked a departure from the traditional Islamic concept, as he did not include religion into what he believed the essential foundations of a nation. He argued:

> Nation is similar to race: it is a community of people living together in a country; speaking one language: sharing the same manners, customs, and morals: subject to one government and law. A nation as such, should be courageous, rational, looking for glory and honour, highly evaluate independence, revere efficient ruler, and submit to law and government policies....

---

[116] Ibid., p.77: Ṭahṭāwī, Manahij, pp.225, 228
[117] Hourani, op. cit., p.79.
[118] Ibid., p.79: Ṭahṭāwī, Manahij, p.99.

> The citizens are like a family and the country is their parents' home which should be a base of solidarity. A nation must be united, not to be fragmented to different factions with contradictive views, because this may lead to dispute and resentment, and so endanger the country's security.[119]

By this new conceptualization of nation-state, Ṭahṭāwī gave some shadowy idea of Arabism, but when he talked of patriotism he did not mean the feeling shared by all who speak Arabic, it is that shared by those who live in the land of Egypt. Egypt for him was a distinct and historically continuous country. He considered modern Egypt the legitimate descendant of the land of the Pharaohs. His imagination was filled with the glories of ancient Egypt, first seen during his years in France. He wrote poems in praise of the Pharaohs, and ancient Egypt for him was more than a source of pride: it had both constituent elements of civilization, social morality and economic prosperity, and what it had possessed modern Egypt could regain. Ṭahṭāwī maintained that Egypt had lost her ancient glory because of the historical accident of foreign rule.[120]

Ṭahṭāwī, however, tried to accommodate Egypt within the Muslim nation (*ummah*) by stating that Egypt is part of Islamic *ummah*, but he added that she had also been a separate *ummah* in ancient and modern times alike, and as such is a distinct object of historical thought. Though it was no easier for him than for any other believing Muslim to accept the idea of a completely secularized *ummah*, his attitude toward non-Muslims was amazingly tolerant.[121] All who live in Egypt, he maintained, are part of the national community sharing the same rights and duties without any distinction. Being equals, the compatriots should be united against the enemies of their country. He added:

> The relation between citizen and society is as organic as a human body. A citizen who adores his country should sacrifice everything for her; wealth and life, and defend her against evils. He should be honest, courteous and benevolent in dealing with his compatriots, and work for the public interest of the society.[122]

Ṭahṭāwī advocated, in the *Manāhij* religious tolerance and emphasized the rights of Copts and Jews to submit to their ethics on the matters of family status, but his argument begins with the traditional Islamic concept of Christians and Jews as protected people (*Ahl al-dhimmah*) although he did not deny them equal rights as citizens.[123] In this, he attempted to accommodate the idea of equal rights of citizens within the traditional thought.

Ṭahṭāwī patriotism was a warm personal feeling, not just a deduction from the principles of political thought. He wrote a number of patriotic poems (*waṭaniyyāt*) in which mixed with praise of the ruling family, there is praise of ancient Egypt and also of the Egyptian army. He hailed the expansion policies of Egypt especially in the Sudan. As one of the civilized nations of the world, he argued, Egypt has taken her place alongside Europe, and the less developed peoples of the southern Sudan were criticised as examples of backwardness. He justified Egypt's encroachment there saying that the lands they inhabited supported only a population of a million while it could easily support ten millions, an argument not unfamiliar to the advocates of European colonialism.[124]

Significantly, Ṭahṭāwī was not preoccupied with the danger of the western expansion in the Arab world. Europe, for him, was the source of knowledge and innovations of modern civilization, but not aggression. He adopted a tolerable attitude towards the European

---

[119] Ṭahṭāwī. al-Murshid, pp.127-128.
[120] Hourani, op. cit., pp.79-80.
[121] Wendell, Charles, The Evolution of the Egyptian National Image, From its Origins to Aḥmad Luṭfī al-Sayyid, University of California Press 1972, p.123.
[122] Ṭahṭāwī, al-Murshid, p.128.
[123] Ṭahṭāwī, Manahij, p.405.
[124] Wendell, op. cit., pp. 130-131.

emigrants who had settled down in Egypt, and looked at them as Egyptian citizens as far as they participate in the economic activities of the country. In all his writings, he did not touch the question of foreign investments. Capitulations or any other aspect of foreign gradual encroachment on Egypt which led to the British occupation in 1882, only nine years after his death.

On the contrary, he talked about the European colonial expansion in Asia, Africa and America as an example of the West's praiseworthy aggressiveness. This statement appeared twice in the *Manāhij*, first he wrote:

> Britain is aware of the fact that to be a wealthy nation, trade and industry must flourish. Both need to be free so that the country could be able to widen imports and exports, make tremendous profits, and enrich the nation. To achieve this goal, Britain has conquered vast lands in many countries, such as India, America, and some other overseas countries. Her main aim was to develop industry and trade for the benefit of her own people and, subsequently, the people of other countries. Other European countries: Spain, Portugal, France, and Holland have done the same.[125]

Again, he praised the British conquest of India as a model of how countries achieve wealth, and elaborated:

> The zeal of these nations is bent toward diligent effort, hard work, and toil, and to facing up to all other deterrents in order to acquire glory and riches, to achieve greatness, and to secure renown and good fortune....[126]

In their pursuit of a new political order, both Fukuzawa and Ṭahṭāwī have denunciated the prevailing traditional political ethics, advocated a government by law based on the fundamental rights of the people and equality. But Fukuzawa had to demolish the whole traditional ethics of the Chinese Classics, while Ṭahṭāwī attempted to resuscitate the fundamental Islamic political ethics of equality, people's rights, solidarity, and government commitment to law, in a modern perception. Therefore, the political ideas of Fukuzawa marked a complete departure from the traditional political ethics while Ṭahṭāwī's sounded like reforming ideas aiming at the abandonment of malfeasance. Although they were deeply interested in liberalism being influenced by the Western political literature of late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, they advocated autocracy as a framework of political order in their respective countries. But while Ṭahṭāwī's attitude was in harmony with his line of thought, Fukuzawa's was contradictive to his advocacy of social contract as the basis of people-government relation. Nevertheless, Fukuzawa was conscious to the aggressive policies of the West and emphasized independence as the final goal of Japan which should be realized through personal independence and self-reliance. But Ṭahṭāwī neither elaborated on the idea of independence and patriotism nor been aware of the dangers of Western aggression. Finally, the two thinkers adopted different views on the participation of scholars in the government. While Fukuzawa has found it essential for the scholars of Western learning to act as social leaders independent from any links with the government, Ṭahṭāwī has seen the scholars of both Islamic and Western learning as associates of the ruler. This fundamental difference of opinion could be understood in relation to their different careers; Fukuzawa was always an independent writer and educator, while Ṭahṭāwī was a high-ranking government servant.

---

[125] Ṭahṭāwī, Manahij, p.136.
[126] Ibid., p.147.

Chapter 4 - Toward New Social Order

The changes which had taken place subsequent to modernization in early Meiji Japan and around mid-nineteenth century Egypt, made it necessary to formulate new ethics coping and stimulating socio-economic development. It was the initiative contribution of Fukuzawa and Ṭahṭāwī to the development of moral system in their respective countries. Here, again, terms of reference were originally western, but Fukuzawa and Ṭahṭāwī turned them into genuine indigenous ideas suitable for the circumstances of the society.

The traditional ethics related to the economy and economic activity were impeding development of modern economy, and the society needed new ethics to be moulded through complete revision of the traditional moral heritage. Also, it was necessary to formulate new basis for family as a social nuclear institution by redesigning husband-wife relation and parents-children relations on modern lives. This trend involved complete revision of women status and attributed new rights and duties for womanhood.

In other words, modernization gradually generated a new social order accompanied with the economic developments, and related traditional ethics could not be accommodated with. Hence, new ethics were deemed necessary, and it was the pre-occupation of the enlightenment thinkers to meet that demand. For both Fukuzawa and Ṭahṭāwī, it had been an integrated part of their contribution to the formulation of new ethics suitable for building modern society.

New Economy

Fukuzawa showed his early interest in economy when he wrote about paper currency and commercial companies in his book *Seiyō Jijō*. He, also, translated the first half of J.H. Burton's Political Economy (Edinburgh 1852), and made it a supplementary volume to *Seiyō Jijō*, dealing mainly with social economy. Seven years later, in 1873, he translated a textbook on Methods of Bookkeeping, written in 1871 by two teachers of an American school of commerce. What concerns us here is the preface which he wrote to the latter and his criticism of the traditional ethics related to business and commerce. He mentioned that in Japan, since older times, ”the wealth of rich men was often tremendous, so much so that they sometimes put their gold in earthen pots and buried them for safe keeping, but they had no concept of learning the economics of the world and to extend the effects of their trade.”[127] He blamed the traditional scholars for refraining from studying economy because they did not give respect to trade and failed to recognize trade as a respectable subject of learning. "The more a scholar absorbs himself in his studies, the loftier he becomes, until he is ready to rise to the heavens. In contrast, ignorant farmers and merchants will grow ashamed of themselves.... Thus, these two have never approached each other.”[128] It was the task of scholars of western learning, Fukuzawa has maintained, to enlighten the millions of farmers, artisans, and merchants by their studies on economy.[129]

The translation of Burton`s chapters on Political Economy by Fukuzawa contained an explanation of monopoly and competition to which he coined the Japanese term. The first passage of his explanation reads as follows:

---

[127] Fukuzawa Yukichi on Education, p.80.
[128] Ibid., p.81.
[129] Ibid., p.82.

> The exclusive privilege of making or dealing in any particular article is monopoly. The freedom for all to make or deal in particular articles induces competition, which is for the public advantage.

In the succeeding passages emphasis was made on the advantage of free competition and the disadvantage of monopoly.[130]

This attitude reflects Fukuzawa advocacy of liberal economy which was obvious in his speeches. He was always against traditional ethics binding people to a certain station in life, leaving no room for social mobility. Advocating individualism he said:

> Wealth and fame no longer belong to the family, but lie with the person himself.... Ours is a time in which a person's own talents are valued and his shortcomings questioned....[131]

He declared that his theory on economics was "that every man should earn his living with the sweat of his brow, which is the law of nature."[132] If jobs are not available at home, one may emigrate to a foreign country where labour is demanded. But Fukuzawa did not encourage unskilled labour emigration giving example of Chinese labour in America, they were treated "like dogs and horses", though they return back to their country with fortune after spending some years in America. He suggested that the Japanese who have received a western-type of education and could not be fully employed by enterprises in Japan, might better emigrate abroad.[133]

Business and industry, Fukuzawa maintained, "are like a mother to scholarship," and nothing could be realized in the field of education without the industrial and commercial prosperity of Japan. He was preoccupied with the progress of the Japanese economy. In a speech of February 3, 1884, he acted as an astute and knowledgeable critic of the commercial malpractices of his day, and suggested new ideas for the development of business. He said:

> First, we should establish an unchanging and uniform system of measurement for all goods sold commercially.... Secondly, attention should be paid to counterfeit articles..., and it would be easy to make laws against them. But such practices as publishing pirated editions of a book or falsifying the maker's name of a product, are more involved crimes which are harder to detect or to prevent.... There be no discrepancy between sample goods and the goods actually sold... and this bad practice results ultimately in stagnant business.... The third, … that a clear line be drawn between the wholesale business and retail, business....[134]

Fukuzawa suggested, in the same speech, a certain version of modern market study to avoid shortcomings of commercial dealings, he said:

> There are some who ignore the cost factor altogether and sell their goods at an indiscriminately low prices. Or they hand out their goods regardless of whether or not the customers pay for them.... As a result, many retailers have ended up destroying each other. Moreover, the relationship between wholesalers and retailers has suffered great problems which have led to their mutual destruction.[135]

In another speech known to have been ghost-written by Fukuzawa for *Asabuki Eiji*, a man who had just become manager of a trading firm, and who needed to present a speech at the

---

[130] Nishikawa Shunsaku, The Historical Legacy in "Modern" Japan: Competition, Paper Currency, and Benevolence. The Japan Foundation Newsletter, vol.XVI, No.1, July 1988, p.3.
[131] Oxford, W.H., The Speeches of Fukuzawa, p.220.
[132] Fukuzawa Yukichi on Education, p.236.
[133] Oxford, W.H., op. cit., p.218.
[134] Ibid., pp.208-213.
[135] Ibid., pp.213-214.

opening ceremony of his firm in August 1880, Fukuzawa adopted an aggressive approach toward foreign trade. Talking about foreign trade in Japan, he wrote:

> ...That these foreigners have taken the upper hand in trade is a very natural result. From political point of view, Japan has not lost an inch of land. But from the point of view of trade and commerce, it can be said that foreigners have, to a great extent, infringed upon our borders. Today, there is a way-and only one way - for us to take back from the foreigners their preferential rights in business and to expand our national trade boundaries. We Japanese people, ourselves, should go to those foreign countries and sell our goods directly in their land, and we ourselves, should bring their products back to our country. This is what is called: direct import and export.[136]

In addition to the brief explanation of paper currency in Europe in the first volume of *Seiyō Jijō*, Fukuzawa published, in 1878, a small book titled *Tsūkaron* (On Currency), in which he discussed the monetary and fiscal problems of early Meiji Japan. He had asserted that the monetary authority needs no reserve for conversion, and that apart from what was needed for emergency import of food in the case of famine, there would be no need for specie reserves, or it would be at the minimum necessary to satisfy the demands for conversion by "foolish, uneducated people." This easy-money approach reflected Fukuzawa's experience with the domanial note, looking at paper currency as stimulus to business and economic growth, and was not concerned about the convertibility of notes.

Later, in March 1882, Fukuzawa revised his idea of currency in an editorial of *Jiji-Shimpō*. He admitted the incompetence of the argument in his book On Currency and accepted the policy of reducing the amount of circulating money, but he maintained that the tight money policy of *Matsukata* was too drastic to sustain the favourable economic progress which had taken place at the time. In this sense, Fukuzawa was heavily relying upon the Tokugawa legacy of inconvertible paper currency.[137]

But it was not the sole case in which Fukuzawa sustained traditional legacy in the realm of economy. In his criticism of the labour legislation issue in 1896, Fukuzawa suggested that the traditional benevolent and affectionate relationship (*onjō* and *jōai*) that had prevailed between landlords and tenant farmers should be practiced in industry, because Japan had different customs and practices regarding labour. In addition, he justified his opposition to the legislation by the possible limitation of working opportunities and reduction of the workers' earning when the working hours are to be reduced, and claimed that the draft of legislation was not suitable to the Japanese situation being a translated version of some Western legislations. In this, Fukuzawa echoed the arguments of business circles in Japan at the time and reflected their interests. Nevertheless, his argument about the practice of the traditional village work ethics was introduced as a temporary measure. He believed that when Japanese industry achieves certain level of development, modern industrial relations could be applied and the labour legislation would be possible.[138]

In so far, Fukuzawa was against depriving the workers of their freedom and civil rights. He had objected police intervention in the labour strikes of 1898, and supported their right of form unions in order to defend their interests. His advocacy of applying village work ethics to industry was relying on the character of relations among commoners of the villages, in which landlords and tenants are differentiated only in terms of wealth but not in social status.[139] However, his concept of benevolence was characteristic of the compromising attitude he had adopted. He did not negate traditional ethics as such, but accepted whatever he believed to be pragmatic and practically useful.

---

[136] Ibid., p.202.
[137] Nishikawa Shunsaku, op. cit., pp.3-4.
[138] Ibid., p.5.
[139] Ibid., p.6.

While Fukuzawa maintained a pragmatic attitude toward economy, he was absolutely liberal, supporting development of business and industry on the path of capitalism, and so was Ṭahṭāwī.

Ṭahṭāwī discussed economic aspects and problems in his *Manāhij*, and his arguments were deeply influenced by the western liberal economic thought of the early nineteenth century. But first he had to revise the traditional ideas about wealth which had been prevailing among Muslims at the time. It was believed that accumulation of fortune might lead people away from the way of God and would make them neglect seeking happy eternity. Although this belief had nothing to do with fundamental Islamic ethics being among the consequences of the spread of superstitions in the period of Islamic cultural decline, it was common as integrated part of folk-religion. Ṭahṭāwī criticized that common disgrace of wealth and advocated appreciation of wealth as means of enjoyment of God's benevolence, he wrote:

> Not everyone who seeks the pleasures of life is blameworthy; rather the one to be blamed is he who seeks it for himself (alone), and the one who seeks it for its own sake. But he who seeks it to improve his lot in this world and the eternal world is praiseworthy.[140]

This assertion of secular life of man in this world was fortified by many *Ḥadīth* extolling the virtues of the Prophet's Companions and their assiduous accumulation of vast fortunes during the early conquests of Islam, not for their own sakes, but for "God's face."[141] Wealth was praised because it can be used for charity and good works which will benefit the generations to come, for example: public utilities, religious foundations, and so on. The wealth of nation is obtained only through regulating social transactions and acquiring public benefits (i.e. economic production) which should be shared equally by the compatriots.[142]

Economic production, for Ṭahṭāwī, is based on two main foundations: labour and capital. He emphasized the role of labour in making the wealth of nation, as it adds tremendous value to the natural resources. Being as such, labour is an important determinant of the nation's level of development comparing with other nations. Ṭahṭāwī wrote:

> The more a nation acquires perfect labour system and proper working machinery, the wealthiest she would be.... Unlike nations with vast area of fertile land and scarce labour, a typical characteristic of a poor and needy nation, ... this is an established fact when we compare between Europe and Africa.[143]

Ṭahṭāwī discussed the relation between labour and capital, favouring the former as a source of the wealth of nation contributing to the development of natural resources. He wrote:

> Labour is the most advantageous (in making wealth) than land which comes next. It is a fact well known by peasants who believe that land fertility cannot be preserved without constant labour... as labour makes everything valuable.[144]

But, although labour is so valuable for the economy. Ṭahṭāwī elaborated, its share of production is rather limited to the minimum, and capital comes out with most of the output. He gave the example of the relation between landlord and peasants in Egypt, though he was one of the biggest landlords. He stated:

> These who gain the fruits of the improvement of agriculture and the advantages of agrarian reform resulting from hard work and use of machinery, and monopolize cash

---

[140] Ṭahṭāwī, Manahij, p.39.
[141] Ibid., p.40.
[142] Ibid., p.99.
[143] Ibid., p.59.
[144] Ibid., p.57.

> crops, are the landlords. They get the utmost of the output and do not leave any considerable share for the workers except their poor wages.... They do not pay wages equivalent to the real value of their labour. Compared with the gains of landlords, what the workers or makers of machinery actually get is frivolous. The landlords take the biggest lot under the pretext of covering the costs of production.... They believe that they are entitled to enjoy the riches of the production by the right of ownership.... The workers have no choice but to accept lower wages barely enough for sustenance especially when labour supply exceeds demand.[145]

It does not mean that Ṭahṭāwī's economic ideas were restricted to agriculture. When he made the above example it was a way to introduce the idea of imbalance between labour and capital to an audience of a mainly agrarian society. His statement included reference to the capital invested in industry and commerce as well. He continued:

> As the landlords obtain the biggest lot of agrarian production, the owner of capital monopolize the output of industry and commerce which are correlated to agriculture.[146]

He warned the landlords and entrepreneurs that minimizing the lot of labour may lead to troubles and social unrest.

Ṭahṭāwī's interest in economy had been widely open to various economic activities; such as the control of natural resources, invention of tools and machinery, and finding out new methods of production in the various fields of the economy. He wrote about productive and non-productive capital. He classified agriculture, industry and commerce under the first category, and public services under the second. [147]

He had drawn the attention of his Arab audience for the first time to the principles of modern economy as a fundamental branch of knowledge. He maintained that:

> When economic knowledge (in Egypt) achieves progress, it would be reflected on business and industry. It may lead to the invention of new tools and machinery for the advantage of agriculture, industry, and commerce. Studies of economics (by scholars) contribute to the development of the economy and make prosperity possible and rationalize exploitation of public resources.[148]

Ṭahṭāwī considered capital accumulation the foundation of nation's wealth, acting as a major generator of the national production. He advocated investment of personal wealth in the assets of corporate business, such as joint-stock companies, financial companies, and banks (which he called: Credit Societies, *al-Jam'iyyat al-Iqtirāḍiyya*). He suggested:

> There are many useful things for the public benefits (economic activity), such as joint-stock companies (*al-sharikāt al-salmiyya*) and credit societies (*al-jam'iyyat al-Iqtirāḍiyya*). They can provide credits to be invested in industry and agriculture. Without them, the country cannot achieve progress in economy and prosperity.... The government should help their development by lifting all restrictions and granting economic liberty to the populace whenever they show their competence.[149]

Ṭahṭāwī believed in competition as an indispensable factor in capital formation and the development of the economy. He criticized the traditional ethics which discouraged competition being considered a bad virtue. He wrote:

---

[145] Ibid., p.62.
[146] Ibid., p.63.
[147] Ibid., pp.70-73.
[148] Ṭahṭāwī, al-Murshid, p.130.
[149] Ṭahṭāwī, Manahij, pp.371-372.

> Competition is the best of all virtues of the society, and the most advantageous.... Competition made the achievements of the civilized nation.... It should be restricted to the fields of knowledge and public benefits (economic activities), not to pretense and luxury.[150]

Ṭahṭāwī considered production of both quantity and quality is relevant to civilization, acts as an important determinant in distinguishing civilized nations. He maintained that "it is the art of business in the fields of agriculture and commerce that helps enrichment and development of the nation." He distinguished between production and services, favoured the former as rendered value while the latter is a by-product. The services provided by the state, he mentioned, is not a part of national production, however it is indispensable for the general regulation of production. But the main function of the state in the realm of economy is to safeguard economic liberty. He considered that:

> Liberty of agriculture, commerce, and industry is the greatest of all liberties. It has proven to be the best of public benefits, and people were attached to it since the emergence of civilization. For those who care about prosperity, it is not reasonable to tighten this (economic) liberty.

However, it might be possible, in certain circumstances, that the government suspends this liberty for a certain period, suggested that:

> Rulers may infringe upon this liberty if their subjects were not ready for such practice due to hindered development. In such case, they may suspend economic liberty until the populace become well prepared for it.[151]

Ṭahṭāwī suggested that the state should issue and observe legislations regulating business dealings and commerce. He discussed in details the validity of western Commercial Code from the point of view of Islamic *sharī'ah*, which admits reasoning (*ijtihād*) in the field of commercial deals (*mu'āmalāt*). He wrote:

> Who looks in the books of Islamic law (*Fiqh*) will find that they contain information about the useful means of public benefits. They even contain chapters on business forms such as companies, speculation, loans, deals, and so on. No doubt, the European laws of commerce were taken from them.... Intercourse with the western merchants and their dealing with the Oriental people encouraged the latter to take part in the movement of commerce, resulting in a kind of regulation. Now, in Muslim cities, there are Mixed Commercial Courts… applying western law, though the Islamic *Fiqh* could be useful if codified....[152]

Ṭahṭāwī asserted that it is the duty of the state to encourage foreign trade by securing transportation facilities and ensuring safety of foreign merchants. He suggested that the state should turn endowments (*waqf*) into a productive economic institution by investing its income in financing public services, such as medical care and social subsidies for the needy citizens. He also suggested that the state should levy an income tax, without any social distinction, in order to finance public services.[153]

He emphasized the correlated prosperity to the achievements of the economy in a given society.

> By the progress of public benefits (economic activity) the whole society achieves progress. People then tend to enjoy the pleasures of life and luxury resulting in the

---

[150] Ṭahṭāwī, al-Murshid, p.262.
[151] Ibid., p.129.
[152] Ṭahṭāwī, Manahij, p.108.
[153] Ibid., pp.31, 69, 86.

> prosperity of all the country. Business would flourish in a completely free market, and the circles of agriculture, trade, and industry would be widened.[154]

It is obvious that Ṭahṭāwī was more interested in economic theoretical thought than dealing with current daily economic affairs as Fukuzawa has done. Ṭahṭāwī has written about what an ideal economy, he believed to be a like. While Fukuzawa was treating the shortcomings of his country's economy, nevertheless, they shared the same compromising attitude and criticism of the traditional ethics. So were their ideas about re-designing new family relationship on modern lines.

New Family Relationship

Fukuzawa's approach to new family and family relations was guided by his interest in strengthening the Japanese nation and securing her independence. In suggesting new family order, his starting point was the husband-wife relation which led him to launch the issue of women status for a detailed discussion. His analysis of the contemporary state of women took the form of a criticism of the Great Learning for Women (*Onna Daigaku*), the Confucian ethics of traditional position of women and their behaviour. It was an image borne out of feudal society and its underlying thesis was the preservation of a male-dominated society in which men are linked to heaven and women to earth. Women were destined to serve and obey men, to be gentle and meek, pure and clean, and accomplished in housework. The mastery of these virtues was the ultimate aim of womanhood.[155]

In his critic, Fukuzawa maintained that the Great Learning for Women was written by a man for the comfort of men, and the humiliation of women. Giving some example, he wrote:

> The wife who bears children is no different from the cooker that boils rice... A cooker unfit for boiling rice will be discarded, and therefore, a wife who does not bear children may be divorced. If a pot can take a place of a cooker. Then a concubine may be just as useful as a wife... From this attitude stems the saying so often heard that the womb is a ‘borrowed’ thing. The meaning of this saying is that a child which is born into this world is its father's child and not its mother's-the rice that grew this year is born from the seed that was sown last year and the soil has no relation to it.[156]

To prove the falsity of this argument, Fukuzawa gave his readers a lesson on biology to conclude that “when a child is born, half of its body is inherited from its mother and the other half from its father,”[157] thus, there was no ground to treat women as an inferior. He continued:

> When a man arrogantly wields his power and places women beneath his feet, it causes suffering not only to those oppressed, but it robs him of what might have been his own ‘right arm’. The loss is his as well as that of his house and the whole country. It only increases the gloom and discontent among the general populace, weakening himself and the nation.[158]

Fukuzawa was very much preoccupied with the improvement of the Japanese nation both physically and intellectually, and believed that this aim cannot be fulfilled without a drastic change in the status of women. He wrote:

> My idea for the improvement of our race is to enliven our women’s mind and encourage their physical vigour to grow with them, thus to obtain better health and physique for our posterity... Confucian education, the so-called Greater Learning for

---

[154] Ibid., p.136.
[155] Fukuzawa Yukichi, On Japanese Women, the introduction.
[156] Ibid., p.48.
[157] Ibid., p.50.
[158] Ibid., p.57.

> Women school of thought is simply out of the question, because the more one teaches it the more restricted women become. It is nothing but a philosophy to oppress the mind and, in the process, destroy the physical body too.[159]

And again:

> The basic purpose of my argument is not to side with women to contest their rights. My purpose is the improvement of the Japanese race.... The leaders in the forefront of our social progress... should quickly endeavour to unchain the women of Japan.[160]

Freedom of women, for him, was the cornerstone of the advancement of human society. He elaborated:

> Should social leaders today claim that the present day society is an advancement over the old, they must contrive to give freedom to women according to the rate of advancement over the old. Men and women were both free in ancient times. As human society advanced, freedom came to be monopolized by men, and women were deprived of it. There cannot be any plausible reason or excuse for this phenomenon. And I place the blame for this on the false affection of the great doctrine that developed during the long peace of the Tokugawa period.[161]

Fukuzawa believed in equality between men and women, and has seen marriage as a union of two independent individuals forming a cooperative unit called a family. A husband must regard his wife as a full-fledged human being and place her on an equal level with him, talk to her about everything, consult with her on every problem, share with her both riches and poverty, love and respect.[162]

> It is an irrefutable fact that men and women do not differ in their body structures and in the working of their minds, and that they are equal beings. When human beings are called the masters of creation, both men and women are masters of creation. When it is said that without men a nation cannot exist, no household stand, it should also be declared that without women a nation cannot exist. To the question of which of the two, men or women, should be rated as more important, we know of no reason to say that one is above the other in importance, rank, or nobility.[163]

Fukuzawa suggested that the relation between husband and wife should depend on love, intimacy, and mutual respect. It will be a great advantage for men to train women to be fully capable because that will increase the manpower of each household, and the work force of the country two fold.[164] If the rights were to be equal between husband and wife, a new law for insuring equality in ownership of property will be needed. At the time, no women in Japan possessed any property, as it was said: a woman has no house of her own in this world.[165] Fukuzawa believed that when women become economically independent:

> Their responsibilities will multiply, and their worries will increase. However, this increase in worries will bring with it increase in pleasures. When both worries and pleasures grow, women will have to grow active in both mind and body, whether they want to or not.[166]

---

[159] Ibid., p.7.
[160] Ibid., p.36.
[161] Ibid., p.27.
[162] Ibid., p.64.
[163] Ibid . p.39.
[164] Ibid., p.33, 54.
[165] Ibid., p.10.
[166] Ibid., p.32.

In other words, Fukuzawa believed that the right of property-ownership and subsequent independence of women would be positively reflected on the character of the new Japanese women. He also advocated equal rights in inheritance for both sexes, and called for equal rights for women in marriage and divorce.

In order to realize equality between men and women in marriage, Fukuzawa proposed a new system of family names. He suggested creating a totally new name instead of adopting either the man's or woman's family name upon marriage, giving this interesting example:

> For instance, when a woman named Hatakeyama and a man named Kajihara are married, they could form a new family named Yamahara. Suppose the son of this Yamahara family marries a girl named Itō; the new family could be called Yamatō.[167]

But to realize equality of women, they should be liberated from poor physical and mental conditions. Fukuzawa noticed that centuries of social oppression had made Japanese women physically inferior to men. He elaborated:

> There is another factor that has greatly affected women in Japan, kept them constantly in gloom, made them nervous and sensitive, undermined their health, and finally made them as sickly as they are today. This is social oppression, which kept them from satisfying their sense of love, confining them in hidebound customs. This evil custom is seen among those of middle class and above...[168] Pleasure is the food for the emotions. And the women in Japan are starving for this food.[169]

Fukuzawa maintained that women should not be confined to their homes, and they should be free to go out and make friends among women and men too. Also, their interest should range over things both inside and outside their homes.

> They need to realize that half the country belongs to women. They should alter their attitude from the bottom of their hearts, and decide that in all matters they will never be behind man.[170]

Fukuzawa advocated the association of men and women, in order to save them from the contemporary depressing atmosphere, and from the trend leading to immorality, and guide them to the wonderful benefits of civilization. He suggested that:

> If social pressure could be decreased to allow some freedom in the association of two sexes, then just as positive and negative electric charges attract each other, there will be great satisfaction. Society will be imbued with beautiful and harmonious relations, and the association of the two sexes will be lifted to nobler planes so that last-resort escapades and illicit affairs under cover will become things of the past. People will be able to enjoy what they should be enjoying in the new world of decency.[171]

He argued that the association of men and women would facilitate exchange of knowledge and heighten moral standards.[172]

Fukuzawa was highly critical of the custom of polygamy prevalent in his country. He based his argument on the fact that there were equal numbers of men and women in the population and therefore as a matter of simple arithmetic, one man could marry only one woman.[173] To abandon polygamy and to practice monogamy, he wrote, will be the dividing line between

---

[167] Ibid., p.29.
[168] Ibid., p.14.
[169] Ibid., p.21.
[170] Ibid., p.60.
[171] Ibid., p.126.
[172] Ibid., p.127.
[173] Fukuzawa Yukichi, An Encouragement of Learning, p.52.

animals and humans,[174] He believed that it was the duty of social leaders who had the spirit of civilization to cure the Japanese society from the social disease of keeping concubines and practicing adultery. In order to decrease such illicit acts, he introduced twofold suggestions:

> First, exclusion of all concubines from the society of ordinary women. Those who rose from a concubine's position to the position of legal wife shall be treated as concubines. The same shall go for women who were legal wives from the beginning, but in whose marriage transactions, money was involved and they were in actuality purchased by their husbands...
>
> Second, whether a geisha or a prostitute, anyone who, openly or privately, commits illicit acts for money must be ostracized from human society and barred from association with honourable people.[175]

Education for women was one of Fukuzawa's primary concerns, and he wrote a good deal on both school education and education at home. From his three visits to the West, he had become familiar with the conditions of school education for women there. His observations were recorded in *Seiyō Jijō* (Things Western) and *Sekai Kuni Zukushi* (All the Countries in the World). In Japan at the time, there was no female education for girls, and they were generally taught at home. But because of these two publications, the concept of girls attending school every day must not have been totally new. And in 1882, public education became a reality with a government proclamation for the education of the whole nation, including women. Fukuzawa believed that all girls, regardless of wealth or rank, should receive an education. In 1888, he had plans for the establishment of a girls' school within *Keiō Gijuku*, and although the plans were never realized, he had visualized such instruction there.[176]

In his series “On Japanese Women, Part Two”, he placed great emphasis on education at home. He suggested what he considered to be an ideal way to bring up girls, he wrote:

> When a baby girl is born, love her and care for her as much as one would a baby boy; never slacken in vigilance over her because she is a girl. When she grows up, see to her healthy development, first in body and then in mind. In her schooling and other education never discriminate because of her sex. Give her freedom to meet people and make friends, and let her learn about society and the world as much as about household affairs. If the family has property, hand it down to the children, giving her a share equal to the boys, and letting her manage it herself. On top of all this have her learn a skill or profession of her own by which she will someday be able to earn her own living... This is the way to bring up a woman through practical education at home and knowledge of worldly affairs acquired first-hand, instead of depending entirely on a school education.[177]

Fukuzawa made it his lifelong goal to educate women to become independent and self-reliant, believed in teaching moral education to foster a strong and independent spirit. *Yōchisha, Keiō Gijuku's* elementary school, established in 1874, began with a large enrolment of girls, but their number decreased as public schools became better organized and also because tuition was high. Parents were willing to spend money on the education of their sons but not on their daughters. As the female enrolment dwindled at *Yōchisha*, Fukuzawa decided to educate his daughters at home with tutors.[178]

Fukuzawa believed that the most urgently in need of reform were the relationships which made up the family circle. It is obvious that he paid particular interest to the husband-wife

---

[174] Fukuzawa Yukichi, On Japanese Women, p.148.
[175] Ibid., p.100.
[176] Ibid., The introduction.
[177] Ibid., p.51.
[178] Ibid., The introduction.

relation, making detailed attacks on the old ethics and specific recommendation for suitable new standards of conduct by which they might be replaced. So was his attitude toward the traditional parent-child relation which displayed all the very worst features of preponderance of power. He strongly criticized the Confucian teaching in which:

> Nearly all moral admonitions are directed at children and the weaker parties generally, the stronger parties being given scarcely any cautions and injunctions at all. They are careful to teach children filial piety, but make no mention at all of the duties of parents. They insist that children labour for the sake of their elders, yet demand of the elders absolutely no return for these labours.[179]

In short, Confucian teachings made filial piety an unconditional duty, binding on children irrespective of whether or their parents according them affectionate and considerate treatment.

In *Gakumon no Susume*, Fukuzawa launched a broadside against all too frequent selfishness and cruelty of parents. He maintained that in the parent-child relationship, just as in any other, the duties of preserving harmony should be borne by both parties. Parent could not reasonably expect filial behaviour from their sons and daughters unless they in their turn cherished, educated and set them a good example.[180] The extreme of paternal selfishness was perhaps reached by those parents who, though often still quite capable of work, allowed or even encouraged their daughters to sell themselves into prostitution in order to maintain them in greater comfort. Such conduct, Fukuzawa declared, was just as horrifying as cannibalism. Parents battened on their daughter's filial virtue as they might on her flesh.[181]

Nor was it any excuse to argue that filial piety, involving constant sacrifice and even suffering on the part of the children, was the due and reasonable recompense for sufferings and anxieties undergone by their parents at their birth and during their infancy. He wrote:

> They give such reasons as that the child has been a source of pain to the mother during pregnancy and child-birth, or that it cannot be separated from its parents for three years after birth. They therefore say that it owes a great debt of gratitude. But the birds and beasts all bear young and support them. The only difference is that human parents must educate their children and teach them the ways of human life in addition to providing daily necessities. Parents give birth to children easily enough, but they do not know the principles of educating them.[182]

In a civilized society, therefore, parental authority over children should be subjected to certain limitations. In the first place parents should cease to exert absolute authority over their sons and daughters once these had come of an age to think and act for themselves. It was ridiculous to treat responsible adults as though they were irresponsible children on the plea that the way of filial piety was constant and unchanging. Particularly immune from paternal interference should be married children, who should so far as was convenient live in separate establishments away from the parental roof. A further legitimate limitation should be that supplied by reason. Children should not be expected to obey unreasonable or immoral commands or demands of their parents.[183]

While Fukuzawa's approach to new family relationship was guided by his main interest in creating an independent self-reliant Japanese citizen, as a fundamental requirement for civilization and national independence: Ṭahṭāwī's approach was not different. He aimed at building a new modern society through readjustment of family relationship by remoulding

---

[179] Blacker, Carmen, The Japanese Enlightenment, p.73.
[180] Fukuzawa Yukichi, An Encouragement of Learning, pp. 54-55, 69-70.
[181] Blacker, op. cit., p.74.
[182] Fukuzawa Yukichi. op. cit., p.54.
[183] Blacker, op. cit., pp.75-76.

husband-wife and parent-child relations. His quest for a balanced husband-wife relation led him to launch, for the first time in Arab and Muslim world, a call for women's rights.

Women status was deteriorated through more than three centuries of cultural decline. Women seclusion, especially in urban areas, was the worst consequence of decline, where women had to be socially isolated within the household. Girls were kept illiterate, stayed at home to help with the housework and with the care of younger children. A girl had to obey her father, mother, and brother, the lines of authority were clearly laid down, and her freedom was strictly limited. Early marriage was regarded as both normal and desirable and girls were carefully sequestered before marriage from all contacts with males outside the limits of the immediate family and never had any voice in the selection of future husbands. After marriage, the husband traditionally replaced the father as the sole controller of the household, and the wife had to render him service and obedience. Her prime function was to look after the household and to produce children, preferably boys. Even in the control of children she had a very little authority, the father being the final court of appeal. Polygamy was common as traditional Muslim law (*sharī'ah*) permits a man, under certain conditions, to have as many as four wives at the same time. By both religious rite and social practice children have to obey blindly their parents, they are not permitted neither to argue with them or to neglect their advice, and have to support them when aged.[184]

Knowing that social circumstances were not ripe enough to launch a radical change in women status, Ṭahṭāwī had to tackle the question with courtesy and did not touch the problem before 1872 when his book *al-Murshid al-Amīn lil-Banāt wal-Banīn* (The Honest Guide for Girls and Boys) was published.

The origins of Ṭahṭāwī's ideals on womanhood could be found in his European experience. He recognized the prominent position occupied by women in France. In addition to participating in the intellectual life of the country, the French women also took part in daily transactions of business. Thus, Ṭahṭāwī pointed out that "it is the custom in this country to assign the activities of buying and selling to the women, while the men perform other tasks." Nevertheless, his image of the French women was not an altogether complimentary one. For example, he stated that "Paris can be described as the Paradise of Women but the Hell of Men", a fact which he attributed to the independence of women and their special social status. In addition, he criticized what he described as:

> the lack of moral purity among a great number of French women... Men in these lands are slaves of women.... Their women's transgressions are many.... It is well known that purity of the women exists only in the middle class, but not in the upper or lower classes....[185]

Ṭahṭāwī, however, rejected the idea that the lack of moral purity on the part of French women resulted merely from their failure to veil. He noted:

> The questionable virtues of French women should not be blamed on their failure to veil, but rather on the true causes, which are to be found in the nature of their training, in their devotion to a single person, and on an incompatibility between husbands and wives....

Ṭahṭāwī's other observations about French women concerned chiefly their frivolous clothes and their excessive preoccupation with appearance.[186]

---

[184] For further information about women status in Egypt and family relationship at the time see:
Amīn, Qāsim, al-Mar'ah al-Jadīdah (New Woman), Cairo 1901: Salim, Laṭīfā, al-Mar'ah wa al-Taghayyur al-Ijtimā'ī fī Miṣr (Women and Social Change in Egypt), Cairo 1986; Tucker, Judith E., Women in the Nineteenth Century Egypt, Cambridge University Press 1985.
[185] Ṭahṭāwī, Takhlīṣ, pp.251-252
[186] Ibid., p.251: Abu-Lughod, Arab Rediscovery of Europe, p.126.

When he elaborated, later, his ideals of women in Egypt and Arab countries, he emphasized the equality of men and women. He maintained that women are equal to man physically and mentally, having no difference except in sex.

> God created woman for man to be united (in marriage) and to work together. Women ease men's pains, bring them pleasure, and improve their living standard by safeguarding household economics. They are the best creation of God: they are not physically different, they help men in managing household affairs, bring up children, and share riches and poverty. Although women are created for the pleasure of man, they are not different except in this (sex). They have the same physical organs, needs, senses, features... In short, there is no difference, even a slightest, except in sexes.[187]

He supported his statement with a full description of physical, biological, and psychological characteristics of females. Referring to the history of Islam, he reminded his audience with the women who had distinguished contributions in the fields of science, literature, and law (*sharī'ah*) to prove that they have the same intellect. Finally, he concluded that women are more sensitive, emotional, and even nicer than man.[188]

Being equals, husband and wife, Ṭahṭāwī suggested, should have equal rights in the household, share mutual duties and responsibilities.

> Husband and wife sharing one home, united by love and cherishing, should do their best to ensure the prosperity of their household. They should manage together all home affairs, and cooperate in bringing up children.. They should be patient and courteous in dealing with each other to safeguard their friendship.[189]

The relation between husband and wife should not be a lord-servant relationship. Love, friendship and mutual respect are the criterion of husband-wife relation. Ṭahṭāwī stated that:

> Marriage contract is a mean to unite a man and woman together to make a family by giving birth and bringing up children.... It cannot be concluded unless there is sincere love and cherish, besides honesty and chastity....[190]

> Mutual respect is the only mean to preserve love between married couple.... They should be always tolerant and consider truth their guide in life.[191]

For this reason, Ṭahṭāwī did not show his sympathy for early and arranged marriage, and warned parents who force their daughters to get married with person who are not in love with.

> The best thing to do for your daughters is to allow them to get married with those whom they love ... A household based on love would realize happiness for parents and children as well.[192]

But for women to be real equals to man they must be educated. He maintained that teaching girls was necessary for three reasons: for harmonious marriages and the good upbringing of children: so that women could work, as men work, within the limits of their capacity: and to save them from the emptiness of a life of gossip in the harem. He wrote:

> Girls should be educated with boys, in order to be trained about harmonious marriage life. Girls should learn reading, writing, arithmetic, and so on, in order to be of some intellect. It prepares them for obtaining knowledge, taking part in debates with men,

---

[187] Ṭahṭāwī, al-Murshid, p.37.
[188] Ibid., pp.37-40.
[189] Ibid., pp.364-367.
[190] Ibid., p.226.
[191] Ibid., p.293.
[192] Ibid., p.475.

> and knowing how to formulate an opinion. This might make them look prestigious when they are liberated from the emptiness of life in the harem. Education helps women to be engaged in works and jobs handled by man, when necessary, according to their abilities and capabilities.[193]

He suggested a kind of division of labour between men and women, in which the latter handle fundamental professions such as nursing and education, beside upbringing children which he considered the greatest of all women's function. He elaborated:

> All the work which could be done by women should be left for them.... Work protects women from being involved in absurdity, and brings them nearer to virtues. If unemployment is bad for man it is, as well, worse for women.[194]

But this does not mean that women could be engaged in politics or hold government office, Ṭahṭāwī suggested:

> Women should not be rulers or judges.... It might be the rule of *sharī'ah* which does not allow women to associate with men, that would prevent them from accomplishing government duties.... It is enough for women to dominate man's heart, by this they can influence rulers and even mastermind their decisions.[195]

This statement was supported by many stories about the great women who ruled their countries in both East and West including two queens of Egypt; Cleopatra and *Shajarat al-Dûr*. He considered their rule generally successful as if he wanted to hint that history gives an evidence that women could do the job which *sharī'ah* may not permit.[196]

Ṭahṭāwī gently touched the problem of polygamy which is authorized by Islamic *sharī'ah*. As polygamy is not forbidden, he maintained, Islam do not make it unconditional right for man. It is only allowed if husband is capable of doing justice between his wives and treating them evenly. Marriage being a union of man and woman in love and cherish cannot be realized by polygamy, because man cannot be in love with more than a woman. So only sexual passionate might be an incentive of such practice and this degrades the essence of marriage. He supported the statement with many stories taken from the classical literature about inconvenient physical and social consequences as shown by the experiences of some polygamists, to conclude that it is not recommendable. Once, there would be no ground for doing justice between wives, polygamy lacks its main legal foundation.[197] By later thinkers, this point was taken up and turned into a virtual prohibition on having more than one wife.

Ṭahṭāwī advocated new foundation for parent-child relation. Bringing up children, he maintained, is the duty of parent and cannot be regarded as favour. Both physical and spiritual training are involved in upbringing children. He elucidated:

> Bringing up children, be male or female, is the art of developing their physical and mental capabilities, and a method of sophisticating human behaviour... Perfect training of individuals, males and females, makes a perfectly trained nation. A nation as such, prepares her citizens to safeguard national interests and realize national goals.[198]

---

[193] Ibid., p.104.
[194] Ibid., loc. cit.
[195] Ibid., pp. 186. 197.
[196] When Ṭahṭāwī launched this argument (1872), the political rights of women were not a common issue in the West. American and British women had to wait until the 1920's to obtain their political rights, and women of other European countries got them after World War II.
[197] Ṭahṭāwī, al-Murshid, pp.219-221.
[198] Ibid., pp. 7-8.

In order to be respected, adored, and cherished by their children, parents should treat them equally without prejudice, distinction, or discrimination whatever. This would protect children from the evils of jealousy and make them love each other. Subsequently happiness and prosperity would prevail in the household.[199] The rights of children to property inheritance were not touched by Ṭahṭāwī, being decided by Islamic *sharī'ah* which makes male entitled to a share as twice as female's lot.

Although the target was similar, Ṭahṭāwī, and Fukuzawa tackled different approach to the issue of new family relationship. While Fukuzawa's approach was aggressive based on the absolute rejection of the traditional ethics, Ṭahṭāwī, sought support for his arguments from the Islamic *sharī'ah*. Equality of all human beings, males and females, including property rights was granted by *Qur'ān* and tradition (*Ḥadīth*). According to *sharī'ah* cherish and compassion should be the core of relationship between husband and wife but woman must be obedient. Ṭahṭāwī had to elaborate on the positive aspects of the traditional ethics to serve as a foundation for a new conception in a compromising formula. But Fukuzawa was completely departed from the traditional ethics, declared its invalidity, and suggested different order. To a certain extent, his ideals were more liberal than Ṭahṭāwī's especially those related to women independence and association with man, but Ṭahṭāwī's were more liberal as regards the issue of women's education and their right of work.

[199] Ibid., p.35.

Chapter 5 - Modern Education and Learning

With the emergence of modern state in Japan and Egypt, learning new Western knowledge has become indispensable. It was the function of great educators, like Fukuzawa Yukichi and Rifā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī, to conceptionalize modern education in their respective countries. They had to accommodate the new type of learning borrowed from the West within the indigenous cultural framework to create a new version of knowledge suitable for their countries. In other words, they rather sought building new indigenous cognition which could meet the demand of a developing society without severance of the cultural links with the main characteristics of their cultures.

Fukuzawa Yukichi

In the first pamphlet of *Gakumon no Susume*, Fukuzawa introduced his new view of learning:

> Learning does not essentially consist in such impractical pursuits as study of obscure Chinese characters, reading ancient texts which are difficult to make out, or enjoying and writing poetry. These kinds of interests may be useful diversions, but they should not be esteemed as highly as the Confucian and Japanese Learning scholars have esteemed them since ancient times... such forms of learning are ultimately without practical value and will not serve daily needs. Such impractical studies should thus be relegated to a secondly position. The object of one`s primary efforts should be practical learning that is closer to ordinary human needs...[200]

There are many additional areas as knowledge worth to be studied, Fukuzawa noted, such as geography, physics, history, economy, and philosophy. These areas of new learning, and others, cannot be studied without translation of Western books and knowledge of Western languages. By grasping the practical matters of each science which vary in subject matter and content, one can search for the truth of things and make them serve his present purposes.[201]

> Those great inventions of steamships, steam locomotives and guns and other weapons or telegraphy and gas lights - they all appear grand and formidable, but they all emerged from minute studies, analyses, and inferences of seemingly trivial principles that scholars applied to human affairs. One must not be surprised by only the greatness of results; one must never neglect seemingly trivial ideas....[202]

In *Keiō Gijuku*, Fukuzawa's school, freshmen were taught physical sciences exclusively, and when they advance to upper grades, they were taught the outlines of philosophy, law, politics, and economics. Fukuzawa believed in a balanced learning of both physical and social sciences. Teaching the latter, he noted, is important to acquaint students with worldly affairs as they approach adulthood.

> In our *Keiō Gijuku*, the reason why books on philosophy and law or social sciences are permitted is to give the students an opportunity to understand the true reasoning of those disciplines, and thus to clarify judgments between right and wrong.[203]

---

[200] Fukuzawa Yukichi, An Encouragement of Learning, pp. 1-2.
[201] Ibid., p.2.
[202] Fukuzawa Yukichi, On Education, p.126.
[203] Ibid., pp. 129-131.

Fukuzawa criticized those who ignore the study of modern sciences while enjoy the achievement of modern civilization.

> For a person to be ignorant of science and to be taking advantage of the conveniences of civilization without being conscious of their nature is like a horse that eats its feed without knowing anything about the nature of feed, consuming only what it finds tasty and avoiding the untasty.[204]

But, unless knowledge was based on laws, there could be no hope of any progress at all, for unless it was formed in terms of precise, easily communicable laws it would die with its possessor. Therefore, it was due to lack of interest in the laws of nature, Fukuzawa was convinced, that Japan had failed to progress to the blessed state of civilization. She had put far too much emphasis on one particular kind of knowledge, ethical knowledge, at the expense of ethically neutral scientific knowledge. She had believed that virtue was the sole element of civilization, whereas it was abundantly clear that what caused progress in civilization was not virtue but knowledge.[205] He elucidated:

> Knowledge has increased a hundredfold since ancient times. What the ancients feared, modern people scorn. What the ancients stood in awe of, modern people laugh at. The products of intelligence have increased day by day. Inventions are too numerous to list, and there is no foreseeable end to future progress.[206]

Fukuzawa believed that the new learning is a kind of knowledge which everybody alike should take steps to possess, a discipline of the mind which should be given a place of primary importance in school education. People should not leave the comprehension of the laws of nature to professional scholars and content themselves with merely saying that the products of civilization were wonderful and marvellous. They should try to make themselves continuously aware of the physical laws which entered constantly into their daily lives.[207]

For Fukuzawa the world was one of experiment and the spirit which led to such a world was one of independence. The new practical learning, however, did not imply a substitution of material for spiritual values. It simply postulated a spirit which should view man and nature in such a way as to require an entirely different approach towards ethical and spiritual values.[208]

Fukuzawa had refuted the call for reviving Confucian teaching in schools to improve moralities among young men. He mentioned that Confucianism is a compound of politics and morality to the extent that it was difficult to be called neither political doctrine nor moral doctrine. Therefore, the idea to make use of only the moral portion from the Confucian literature for immediate application was "the fantasy of unlearned men.” In addition, the Japanese society of the time had complete reversal structure from that in the ages of the sages. Thus, there was no reason to expect the theories of those days to apply in modern times.

> The Confucian scholars of today, though they claim to have inherited the three-thousand-year-old school, do not attempt to fathom the true spirit of the sages in consideration of the changes in time and place. They simply continue reciting the old precepts and expect to apply them to modern world.[209]

An integral part of his critique of the changes in educational policy which had taken place in 1881 and the encouragement of Confucian teachings was Fukuzawa's denunciation of moral education.

---

[204] Ibid., p. 128.
[205] Blacker, Carmen, The Japanese Enlightenment, pp. 53-54.
[206] Fukuzawa Yukichi, An Encouragemnt of Learning, p. 85.
[207] Blacker, op. cit., p.55.
[208] Ibid., p.56.
[209] Fukuzawa Yukichi, On Education, pp.189-199 passim.

> The policy of bringing back the old moral education confined general education into a narrow, useless moral education: loyalty to one's lord, obedience of one's parents, and extreme patriotism. Furthermore, funds were provided to establish newspapers and hold public lectures. The government did its best to hinder the progress of civilization.[210]

But this does not mean that Fukuzawa was against morality, he had his own vision of a morality suitable for modern society.[211] He called for a total revision of the Confucian ethics that would include self-discipline, family management, national government, world pacification, plus foreign intercourse and extension of national rights.[212] He elaborated:

> Instilling loyalty, filial piety, and patriotism is not by any means objectionable. In making a home and conducting oneself in society, one must follow proper rules as a man and as a citizen. Also, toward one's country, one must fulfil one's duty as a subject. These are acts of the patriotism which I expect of every citizen. And yet, this beautiful spirit can cause great harm when loyalty and filial piety are interpreted in their narrow senses as the old school leaders do. A man is labelled disloyal if he does not act according to traditional rules: in his conduct toward the country, he will be called a traitor if he does not follow the traditional way. This kind of reasoning can do great harm to one's sense of loyalty and patriotism.[213]

Fukuzawa believed that the separation of education and politics and strict prohibition of their intermingling would be an advantage to the society. He advocated the separation of the schools under the direct control of the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Industry from those ministries. To justify this separation, he argued that learning and politics have too different characters.

> Politics is of an active nature, and it must continue to move, but learning is profound and quiet. They are incompatible, and it will be impossible to avoid harm in having these two keep an unnatural alliance.[214]

To support this argument, he referred to history to show that the idea was actually practiced in *Tokugawa* period when the chief scholar was not allowed to hold the least amount of power in the administration though he ranked next to ministers (*rōjū* and *wakatoshiyori*). In an emergency, this scholar might be consulted, but his role was strictly limited to giving advice. But this separation of learning and politics did not mean that scholars should refrain from the study of politics or that schools should not give instruction in politics and reading books on the subject. What meant by was that Japan needed schools run by principals and teachers who are totally unrelated to the government and whose minds are devoid of prejudice in politics. This would be, he maintained, for the advantage of the society.[215]

> It is natural that the head of a school should guide his pupils freely according to his ideals, and sometimes his school can come into opposition with other schools, in extreme cases becoming hostile to them. As long as the conflict stays within the bounds of learning, no harm can be done to society; rather the competition will stimulate further studies.... However, as soon as the scholarly groups acquire a political interest, the tranquil and profound nature of the scholars is transformed into activity and severity, which will lead to no end of harm.[216]

---

[210] Ibid., p. 224.
[211] For further informations about Fukuzawa's ideals on morality, see: Fukuzawa Yukichi Moral Code, in Ibid., pp.269-273
[212] Ibid., p.197.
[213] Ibid., p.224.
[214] Ibid., p.166.
[215] Ibid., p.166-168.
[216] Ibid., p.169.

When politics and education are interlocked, he added, a change in one would cause a commotion in the other, and when the change is large in scale, the commotion will turn into an upheaval. To prevent this inconvenient result, Fukuzawa suggested that all the schools should be placed under the supervision of the Imperial Household. In this case, the Imperial Household would grant the control of the schools to private citizens of recognized experience and willingness and let them reorganize the schools into private schools under cooperative management. At the same time, the schools should receive financial aid from the Imperial Household, either in onetime grants of large sums sufficient for permanent support of the schools or in yearly grants out of the Imperial finances. A council of scholars of high reputation from throughout the nation should be established for regular academic conferences, to be the centre of leaning and education of the nation. It should be granted the authority to supervise all literary and scholastic activities and study methods in education, judge books, as research on ancient history, study new theories, serve as the final authority on language usage, edit dictionaries, and such myriad cultural activities without government interference. In short, the council should be a kind of supreme overseer of Japan's culture, but should not have any say in political matters.[217]

But, Fukuzawa was not advocating the abolition of the Ministry of Education, because it was needed to accomplish administrative function of education.

> For instance, issuing orders to various areas to survey the children of school-going age, or considering the increase or decrease in children and the proportion between the general population and school-age children; surveying schools on their status and their history, and their capital and its management; or at times sending officials out for on-the-spot supervision - such activities cannot be done without the authority of the Ministry of Education. In particular compulsory education cannot be realized without the authority of the government.

This suggested function would not meddle in the duties of the scholar's council.

> The decisions on what kind of education, on books to be used for instruction, on books to be kept away from the children, and on actual instruction in the classrooms must not be made by the ministry. In short, all the important decisions on learning should be left to the scholar's council, while the reports, supervision, and other administrative chores should be managed by the ministry. In other words, matters on learning and matters of administrative business should be handled separately, each depending on the other.[218]

The Imperial Household should not only sponsor all the private education of Japan but also honour, encourage, and support the most outstanding scholars in the country by bestowing on them special honour and yearly stipends, allowing them the freedom to devote all their attention to the studies of their own choice. By this Imperial patronage, Fukuzawa stated, scholars of special ability would be assured security for life, and scholarship in Japan would take on a new dimension and soon reach the level in Western nations, and the Japanese scholars would begin to compete with the scholars of the world. Fukuzawa added:

> The way to provide peace of mind is to assure security of livelihood - security of body is the key to security of mind. Therefore, should the Imperial Household give aid to the maintenance of private schools and also to support scholars, it will set an example for the nation. The public will come to respect learning, which, by extension, will result in a secure living for the scholars.... To enable scholarship to become a respected and secure profession, scholars should be kept from the temptation of politics.[219]

---

[217] Ibid., pp.173-175.
[218] Ibid., pp.175.
[219] Ibid., pp.182-188 passim.

Fukuzawa was convinced that "Japanese civilization will advance only after we sweep away the old spirit that permeates the minds of the people." It could not be swept away, he argued, by neither the government nor the scholars of Japanese or Chinese learning. It was the first duty of the scholars of Western learning to awaken the people to a sense of independence. But, they cannot fulfil this duty unless they were independent by refraining from holding government posts. In other words, he considered the scholars of Western learning as social leaders of the society whose duty was to rationalize the government's actions and guide the people.[220]

This argument caused a great commotion among Fukuzawa`s fellow scholars who were government officials. They wrote rebuttals in the scholar's association magazine *Meiroku Zasshi* in which they argued that with the use of government power, it was possible to educate the people and spread the influence of the West quickly, while the efforts of a private enterprise were bound to be small in scale. Japan must be modernized quickly, they insisted. Fukuzawa's point, in contrast, was the planting of a solid foundation of modern civilization in people's minds, not cursory introduction in new knowledge.[221]

For him, education cannot alter what a man has been endowed by nature. Its main essence is to seek out deeply-hidden talent and to cultivate this talent toward the betterment of life. He refuted the argument that education makes youth conceited.

> It is not because they receive education that they become conceited; it is because education is not wide-spread that the problem of conceit arises.... When youngsters go home, they are met by illiterate parents and elders. When they turn toward the public, they are met again by the many illiterates. And when such illiterate people overhear conversations between educated young men and women, it is only natural that these conversations will seem strange and conceited to their ears.

It was either untrue that a person, when educated, begins to look down upon agricultural labour. But education is not something which has infinite power and which can perform infinite wonders.[222]

Fukuzawa suggested that education must be a practical art directed to the benefit of the society, as "the great school." He advised his students that:

> One must always be aware of the great school called society outside of the classroom, constantly training in this great school. This point is where the civilized learning of the West differs from the old learning of China and Japan, and this is where the value of civilized learning lies. If a student is able to study while learning from the society, he will be prepared to serve in society or at home, in private enterprise or in an official capacity, in industry and in commerce. He will have the training to become a leader of men. Academic activities, when they remain aloof from human affairs, will only be mental exercises, and the researcher, too, will become a playboy of society.[223]

He warned his students that one should not lose one's self in learning. In the opening ceremony of *Keiō*'s new university program (January 27, 1890) Fukuzawa presented a speech on that occasion. He concluded by saying:

> Concerning my insistence that one should not lose one's self in learning, I am not changing my position in any way when speaking to university men, for I consider learning, even on the university level, to be a practical art. So, once you have graduated, store deep within yourself whatever you have learned and go about your

[220] Fukuzawa Yukichi, An Encouragement of Learning, pp.24-27.
[221] Fukuzawa Yukichi, On Education, introduction.
[222] Oxford, Wayne, The Speeches of Fukuzawa, pp. 174-176.
[223] Fukuzawa Yukichi, op. cit., p. 203.

> active business in this world. Be with the countless ordinary people of this human world. Do their kind of work and socialize with them. By talking with them and getting close to them, you will gradually bring them away from their lowly worldliness to a more proper outlook. This is how you should spread the domain of education.[224]

This reflects how Fukuzawa viewed higher education. For him, it was appropriate for a few gifted persons who were willing to work for the independence of the country. Simply put, general education was for the independence of each individual, while higher education was for the independence of the country.[225]

It had been the unique policy of *keiō* to emphasize the study of the English language, both spoken and written. Fukuzawa insisted that "teaching Western subjects in the Japanese language is not really effective." He was convinced that an educational system conducted in English from the very lowest to the highest level would be the most beneficial to the Japanese people. He predicted that there would be a day soon when English civilization holds a dominant position in the academic world of Japan. He had elucidated his point of view saying that:

> English has become vitally important in the political, military and commercial affairs of today. No matter how well trained a person may be in the 'new education', or how thoroughly he may be imbued with new ideas, if he cannot speak or read English, he will be of no use and nobody will employ him.[226]

But teaching English and using it as an educational media did not imply that Fukuzawa's school made no contribution to the development of Japanese scholarship. The selection of Japanese words for some of the new terms in western learning was actually made of *Keiō Gijuku*. For instance, *Keizai* for political economy and *shūshingaku* for moral science were, among other terms, invented at *Keiō*. Fukuzawa also introduced the art of speech-making and holding of conferences, for the first time in Japan, and created the word *enzetsu* for speech.

Rifā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī

Ṭahṭāwī had explicitly noted that European progress in political, scientific, and economic affairs could not have occurred without prior progress in the field of education. So little was known concerning Western forms of learning that Ṭahṭāwī, in his recollection on Paris (*Takhlīs*), found it necessary to familiarize his readers with even the subjects included in the European education. The fact that the educational system was open to females as well as males elicited an enthusiastic response from him. He also felt a deep admiration for the vitality of French education and pursuit of new knowledge and for the scholars who devoted themselves to these ends.[227] Thus he wrote of them:

> Their scholars (*'ulamā'*)... are well-versed in a number of fields and are specialists as well in one subject. They explore many areas and make many new discoveries... These are the qualities which distinguish the scholar. Not every teacher or author is a scholar, and do not imagine that the French scholars are the priests. The latter are scholars only in the religious field, although it is possible for a priest to become a scholar (if he possesses the qualities required).[228]

It was very unusual for the Muslims and Arabs to imagine that there could be scholars other than those of religion, learning being a monopoly of *'ulamā'* who were mainly trained in

---

[224] Oxford, op. cit., p. 173.
[225] Fukuzawa Yukichi, op. cit., Introduction.
[226] Oxford, op. cit., pp. 180-182.
[227] Abu-Lughod, Arab Rediscovery of Europe, pp. 115-117.
[228] Ṭahṭāwī, Takhlīṣ, p.115.

Islamic schools, But even those schools, Ṭahṭāwī insisted, were not providing real practical learning. He elaborated:

> ... Scholarship is an attribute of the person who has a great deal of knowledge in the intellectual sciences... The virtue of these Christians in the attainment of learning is readily apparent. It is also apparent that our own country is devoid of such achievements. The Azhar, the *Umayyad* (in Damascus) and the *Zaytūnah* (in Tunis)... and the rest of the Muslim schools are distinguished by their emphasis on traditional learning (*'ulūm naqliyyah*) and on certain intellectual fields such as logic and Arabic literature... But scientific progress in Paris is continually developing. No year passes without the addition of some new discovery.[229]

In addition, Ṭahṭāwī described with open admiration the European approach to the scholarly life bearing in mind the deteriorated condition of Muslim traditional learning. He informed his audience that the European scholar did not cease his education after completing his formal training but viewed the latter as merely the first step in the attainment of knowledge. He also emphasized that the mission of the European scholar was not to master what was already known so that he could transmit that knowledge intact to his students (as it used to be in Muslim scholarship), but rather to sue that knowledge as a point of departure, adding to it and modifying it according to the fruits of his own investigations. To this spirit of continuous inquiry he attributed Europe's capacity to enrich herself through the pursuit of knowledge.[230]

Ṭahṭāwī's chief interest was in the system of higher education which he described in details. His main interest was with the variety of subjects taught in Western schools, rather than with the administrative organization of the educational system. He attributed the progress of Western learning to two basic factors: the natural inclination of Europeans toward learning and the spontaneous sense of curiosity and inquiry; and the fundamental role played by the government in encouraging free inquiry and scholarship. The first factor was an important element in the development of their intellectual life, while the second contributed to the development of education.

Ṭahṭāwī, by describing the Western approach to learning and Western institutions for the dissemination of knowledge, made a basic contribution to the entire process of transmitting Western ideology to the Arab world. His was the first source of information about the content and context of modern Western scholarship. He was the first to suggest that the Western technical achievements had not developed in a vacuum but were rather the by-products of an entire pursuit of knowledge in which free inquiry and unfettered scholarship were accepted and even encouraged. Later Arab writers on the same subject were to draw heavily on his analysis.[231]

Thus, Ṭahṭāwī introduced a new conception of learning and knowledge. Islamic traditional learning, he insisted, was not the practical learning to meet all the demands of modern society. Besides, there were numerous fields of knowledge as necessary as *sharī'ah*; such as medicine, astronomy, economy, geography, history, physics, mathematics, and many other sciences which need competence and scholarship. Specialization in a certain branch of science would help achievement of progress in realm of knowledge, and subsequently, enrich the nation and realize prosperity for the well-being of the society.[232]

Without the development of sciences and arts, he believed, progress on the path of civilization cannot take place, as "sciences and arts are usually stagnant in the less civilized countries." Therefore, with knowledge as means of civilization it is the duty of the government to encourage learning and patronize scholarship. To support his argument, Ṭahṭāwī wrote:

---

[229] Ibid., loc. cit.
[230] Abu-Lughod, op, cit., p118.
[231] Ibid., pp. 119-120.
[232] Ṭahṭāwī, Manāhij, p.34: al-Murshid, pp.63, 78-80.

> At the time of the *Caliphs*, we (Muslims) were the most perfect of all countries. The reason for that was that the *Caliphs* used to patronize scholars and artists. Some of the *Caliphs* even occupied themselves with such pursuits... From this one knows that learning does not spread in any era except through the support of the State.[233]

It is also the duty of the State to ensure freedom of publications and ban all restrictive measures, "to widen the circle of civilization by the increase and circulation of publications and encouragement of scholars to write major works and make them available."[234]

Ṭahṭāwī suggested that the head of the state should encourage men of letters and scientists by grants and prizes. In the *Manāhij*, he wrote:

> The ruler who is preoccupied with the achievement of progress and adores his country, should make it a rule to honour writers, educators, and inventors.... This would activate competition in the fields of learning and research, improve science and arts, and secure continuity of learning and application (of science).[235]

Education, Ṭahṭāwī maintained, is as essential for human beings as bread and water. Being gifted by mind, man should be trained how to think and behave because human beings are privileged by mental capabilities while beasts have only physical ones. Ṭahṭāwī invented the term "*nāṭiqiyyah*" to mean the expression ability of man to which he attributed the pursuit of knowledge. He believed that:

> Man is guided by instinct to live in a community in association with others. By his power of expression (*nāṭiqiyyah*) he can utilize his intellect in creating civilization.... When he associates with others, they exchange experience and knowledge. As a result, his intellect and ability for research in sciences would be widened and strengthened. By this (achievements of science) the nation would surpass others and gain all the benefits that could be available to them.[236]

Education being the cornerstone of civilization was regarded by Ṭahṭāwī as essential for all citizens without any distinction. He wrote:

> The proper education of individuals, males and females, realize the education of the whole nation and consequently progress could be achieved... A nation with sound education can reach a distinguished stage of civilization enough to gain freedom.[237]

The aim of education, he suggested, should be to form a personality, not simply to transmit a body of knowledge; it should include the importance of bodily health, of the family and its duties, of friendship and above all of patriotism, the main motive which leads men to try to build up a civilized community.[238]

> The government should utilize education as means to mould the mentality of youngsters, males and females, according to the condition of the nation and her social system.[239]

Most of Ṭahṭāwī's life was spent as a teacher and organizer of schools, and he had a clear view of what should be done. He put forward his ideas in his book on education; *al-Murshid*. Teaching, he asserted, must be linked with the nature and problems of the society.[240] Primary

---

[233] Ṭahṭāwī, Takhlīs, p.9.
[234] Ṭahṭāwī, al-Murshid, pp. 80, 125.
[235] Ṭahṭāwī, Manāhij, pp. 147-148.
[236] Ṭahṭāwī, al-Murshid, p. 43.
[237] Ibid., p. 8.
[238] Hourani, Albert, Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age, p.78.
[239] Ṭahṭāwī, Manāhij, p. 12.
[240] Ṭahṭāwī, al-Murshid, p. 6.

education should be universal and the same for all, males and females, without any social distinction, being the source of general knowledge.[241] Secondary education should be of high quality and the taste for it encouraged by careful selection of students according to their competence. Those who are not qualified should be trained as craftsmen or workers.[242] Higher education should be restricted to the wealthy and aristocracy. He emphasized that:

> As the stage of higher education is designed to train those who are supposed to be politicians, administrators, and decision makers in the State, it must be limited in size and enrolment, and restricted to a little number of people. This means that whoever wanted to enrol must be wealthy.[243]

While he insisted on the right of all citizens to have access to general education in primary and secondary schools without any prejudice or discrimination, he considered higher education a privilege of certain social class. Ṭahṭāwī, however, was the first in Arab and Muslim world to advocate the necessity of extending general education to women, and to consider women education a criterion of a civilized society.[244]

In harmony with the idea of practical learning for the benefit of the society, Ṭahṭāwī suggested a curriculum for general education. In primary education, it was: "reading and writing, *Qur'ān*, arithmetic, geometry, and grammar"[245], besides sports and some vocational training.[246] For secondary education, it was "mathematics, geography, history, philosophy, biology, physics, chemistry, civil administration, arts of agriculture, composition, speech, and some foreign languages.[247] General education, he suggested, should familiarize students with the principals of *sharī'ah*, civil law, and the executive procedures, in order to make them aware of their rights and duties as citizens.[248]

Ṭahṭāwī considered religion one of the spiritual foundations of civilization that should be included into the curriculum of general education. He believed that religion education was the cornerstone of perfect morals and sound behaviour. The subject matter should be the *Qur'ān*, tradition (*sunnah*), and reasoning.[249] He rejected the idea that personal behaviour is created by rational moral precept, and insisted that reason cannot be applied to the matters decided by religion. The limits of human behaviour were, therefore, decided by religion to be adopted by man. He elaborated:

> Any action beyond the limits of *sharī'ah* would not bear any fruit. Those who have immature personalities, and rely on absolute reason to decide right and wrong should be disregarded. Persons must be trained on the rules of *sharī'ah*, and not absolute reason. It is established that *sharī'ah* does not prevent beneficial things or approve illicit actions. It never negates the innovations invented by those who are gifted with sound minds and guided by God in their art.[250]

He was convinced that teaching religion in schools is an essential training in pursuit of civilization, and believed that Islam could build a glorious civilization. In addition, religion is the criterion of civilization and Islam must be the core of education.[251]

---

[241] Ibid., p. 62.
[242] Ibid., p.64.
[243] Ibid., loc. cit.
[244] Ḥigazi, M.F., Uṣûl al-Fikr al-'Arabī al-Ḥadīth. pp. 101-103.
[245] Ṭahṭāwī, op. cit., p. 62.
[246] Ṭahṭāwī, Manahij, p.45.
[247] Ṭahṭāwī, al-Murshid, p.28.
[248] Ṭahṭāwī, Manahij, p. 65.
[249] Ṭahṭāwī, al-Murshid, p. 61.
[250] Ibid., pp. 61-62.
[251] Ibid., p. 124.

This attitude towards religion and moral education has been one of the issues of departure between Ṭahṭāwī and Fukuzawa. Others were independence of education, separation between education and politics, emphasis on personal independence as the target of education, and the use of a foreign language as educational media. To all these issues Fukuzawa's approach was more radical and aggressive than Ṭahṭāwī's which was compromising and conciliatory. Religion issue in Japan was, and still is, not as overwhelming and irritating as it has been always in Muslim world, where it is believed that word of God cannot be negated by man. Besides, Ṭahṭāwī was an orthodox Muslim and well-versed on Islamic *sharī'ah*. He owed his personal career and even wealth[252] to the State, and the autocrat rulers in particular, while Fukuzawa was independent self-made man.

Nevertheless, both Fukuzawa and Ṭahṭāwī had similar approach towards Western learning as the main foundation of knowledge, both advocated a balanced education of human and natural sciences, and agreed that the pursuit of knowledge leads to civilization, and that scholarship should be patronized by the sovereign. They also adopted similar views concerning higher education restriction to a certain social category, but Ṭahṭāwī's ideas on women education were considerably advanced than Fukuzawa's.

[252] Ṭahṭāwī received land grants from Muhammad 'Ali and Ismā'īl, and emerged as a landlord. His land property (donated by the rulers) amounted to 1500 feddans. see, Hamed, Raouf Abbas, al-Niẓām al-Ijtimā'ī fī Miṣr fī Ẓill al-Milkiyyāt aI—Zirā'iyya al-Kabīrah, Cairo 1973.

Chapter 6 - The Pursuit of Civilization

Progress always has been the major interest of the advocates of enlightenment being the core of their future ideals, and so it was for Fukuzawa and Ṭahṭāwī. Both looked at history as a progressive process of development towards the achievement of civilization. It was by means of a careful study of the past that both intellectuals could discover where the glories of civilization lay, how the present had come to be so much better than the past, and hence in what way the process might be expected to continue in the future.

The pursuit of civilization, and precisely its Western model, has led Fukuzawa and Ṭahṭāwī to formulate their views on the issue aiming at the realization of an indigenous version of civilization that could be suitable for their respective societies.

Fukuzawa Yukichi

Fukuzawa never made an attempt to write a detailed history of Japan but his writings on civilization led him to make what was in fact the first consistent criticism of the traditional school of historiography. In the first place, he contended, previous historiography was totally misleading in the importance it attached to the moral conduct of the ruler and his ministers. It was absurd to imagine that a country could be contended and prosperous merely because its rulers happened to be good. Whether the people were contented and prosperous depended on what stage they had reached on the ladder of progress, and this in its turn depended, not on the moral character of the ruler, but on the "spirit of the times" or what Fukuzawa called *jisei*. The "spirit of the times" inevitably exerted a limiting and determining influence on the actions of great men. For heroes and great men could not hope to initiate events outside the scope of *jisei*. They would meet with success only when they worked with its course.[253] Because progress was a natural law, Fukuzawa believed, man's nature was such that he was bound and destined to progress, and hence would naturally, even unconsciously, fulfil the conditions which would lead to progress. The process could, certainly, be arrested artificially for a certain time, but ultimately it would prove to be like a tide which would sweep all obstacles out of its way. In such cases *jisei* might start as the opinion of only a small minority of people, but because it was the expression of this inevitable process it would sooner or later manifest itself as the general opinion, the next rung on the ladder.[254]

For Fukuzawa, the concept of civilization was relative:

> When we are talking about civilization in the world today, the nations of Europe and the United States of America are the most highly civilized, while the Asian countries such as Turkey, China, and Japan, may be called semi-developed countries, and Africa and Australia are to be counted as still primitive lands... Since these designations are essentially relative, there is nothing to prevent someone who has not seen civilization from thinking that semi-development is the summit of man's development. And, while civilization is civilization relative to the semi-developed stage, the latter, in its turn can be called civilization relative to the primitive stage.[255]

Fukuzawa believed that civilization is vital and moving, not a dead thing. It must pass through sequences and stages; primitive people advance to semi-developed forms, the semi-

[253] Blacker, Carmen, The Japanese Enlightenment, pp. 93-94.
[254] Ibid., pp. 98-99.
[255] Fukuzawa Yukichi, An Outline of a Theory of Civilization, pp. 13-14.

developed advance to civilization, and civilization itself is even in the process of advancing forward.

> Hence present-day Europe can only be called the highest level that human intelligence has been able to attain at this juncture in history. Since this is true, in all countries of the world, be they primitive or semi-developed, those who are to give thought to their country's progress in civilization must necessarily take European civilization as the basis of discussion, and must weigh the pros and cons of the problem in the light of it.[256]

Throughout his book *Bummeiron no Gairyaku* (An Outline of a Theory of Civilization), Fukuzawa's own criterion was that of Western civilization, and in terms of it he evaluated things, but he did not mean that European civilization would be taken for granted as the model of modernization for every country. He advocated the adaptation of Western civilization to each country's own sentiments and social customs:

> We should be selective in applying foreign civilization to a semi-developed country. We can distinguish in civilization between its visible exterior and its inner spirit. It is easy enough to adopt the former, but difficult to pursue the latter. Now, when one aims at bringing civilization to a country, the difficult part must be done first and the easier left for later… But if the wrong order is followed and the easier part is adopted before the difficult, the easier part often will prove not only useless but harmful as well.[257]

The externals of civilization, Fukuzawa maintained, are all of empirical details, from food, clothing, shelter, implements, and so forth, to government decrees, laws, and institution, if only these external things were regarded as civilization, each country should be selective in adapting them to her distinctive ways. Therefore, Asian countries, being different from the West, should not imitate Western ways in their entirety, because that could not be called civilization.

> The civilization of a country should not be evaluated in terms of its external forms. Schools, industry, army and navy, are merely external forms of civilization. It is not difficult to create these forms, which can all be purchased with money. But there is additionally a spiritual component, which cannot be seen or heard, bought or sold, lent or borrowed. Yet its influence on the nation is very great. Without it, the schools, industries, and military capabilities lose their meaning. It is indeed the all-important value, i.e. the spirit of civilization, which in turn is the spirit of independence of a people.[258]

Fukuzawa argued that Japan must not import only the external forms of civilization, but must first make the spirit of civilization hers. He believed that:

> The cornerstone of modern civilization will be laid only when national sentiment has thus been revolutionized, and government institutions with it. When that is done, the foundations of civilization will be laid, and the outward forms of material civilization will follow in accord with a natural process without special effort on our part, will come without our asking, will be acquired without our seeking. This is why I say that we should give priority to the more difficult side of assimilating European civilization. We should first reform men's minds, then turn to government decrees, and only in the end go out to external things... We can reverse the order and seem to

---

[256] Ibid., p.15.
[257] Ibid., P.16.
[258] Fukuzawa Yukichi, An encouragement of Learning, p. 30.

> have easy going, but this latter course will lead to a dead end. It will be like coming up against a stone wall…[259]

The political form, he maintained, should not be taken as the criterion of an entire civilization, it should be changed if proved inconvenient. Civilization being the only goal of mankind could be reached through many roads, and reasonable progress would be possible only through a long process of trial and error. Therefore men's ideas should not be turned exclusively in one direction, because "experimentation is the soul of progress." He added:

> There never has been a perfect civilization, and there never has been a perfect form of government. Should we ever attain a perfect civilization, government would become entirely superfluous. At such a point, there will be no need to choose one form over another or to fight over names. Because civilizations in the world today are in the midst of their progress, politics is also clearly in a state of progress. Nations differ only in the rate of their evolution.[260]

Fukuzawa, moreover, believed that civilization is a contract between men and its attainment thereof is mankind's essential goal. This contract contains a kind of division of labour, where:

> Each and every person must carry out his function in the pursuit of that goal. The government is in charge of maintaining order and handling current affairs; scholars focus upon a wide spectrum of ideas to discover future alternatives of action; both industry and commerce manage their respective enterprises to contribute to the wealth of the nation. Each function thus makes its own contribution to civilization.[261]

For him, the progress of civilization refers to both the intellectual and moral development of a people as a whole. In other words, it is related to both knowledge and virtue which are different. He argued that:

> Morality pertains to the conduct of an individual. Its range of influence is narrow. Intelligence is speedily transmitted to others and its range of influence is wide. From earliest times morality has been fixed and cannot progress. But the workings of the intelligence progress day by day, without limits. Morality cannot be taught to men through any concrete methods. Whether a man learns virtue or not depends entirely upon his own efforts. Intelligence, on the contrary, can be verified by means of tests. Morality can easily be lost, but once intelligence is acquired it is never lost. Knowledge and virtue achieve their results by complementing each other.[262]

But, what was the goal of Japan's quest of civilization? It was to be clear about the distinction between domestic and foreign, Fukuzawa answered, and to preserve the country's independence. The way in which to preserve independence, he added, could not be sought anywhere except in civilization.

> The only reason for making the people in our country today advance toward civilization is to preserve our country's independence. Therefore, our country's independence is the goal, and our people's civilization is the way to that goal.... Without civilization independence cannot be maintained. Whether one speaks of independence or of civilization makes no difference.[263]

Therefore, it was essential for Japan to acquire an advanced stage of civilization in order to preserve her independence, and Fukuzawa felt that Japan had to learn Western civilization to

---

[259] Fukuzawa Yukichi, op. cit., p. 18.
[260] Ibid., p. 45.
[261] Ibid., p. 62.
[262] Ibid., p. 104.
[263] Ibid., pp. 193.

achieve her own modern civilization. For this purpose he wrote his work *Bummeiron no gairyaku* to mark the Japanese road to civilization and the creation of a new version of Japanese civilization by taking Western things, refining them with Japanese spiritual powers, and advancing them. He undertook simultaneously a general interpretation of 'civilization' and an historical analysis of Japanese civilization. The two senses of the term civilization were thus commingled, but this was not simply a matter of linguistic games. It was because he had to consider the progress of Japanese civilization to the level of Western civilization.[264]

Rifā'ah al- Ṭahṭāwī

Like Fukuzawa, Ṭahṭāwī looked at history as a process of progress and as a record of human civilization. Among the works of his later years, his two volumes on the history of Egypt has been mentioned. They were intended to be the first two of a series, and to be the work of national education, a summary of what the modern Egyptian should know about his country. He believed that a study of history would be instructive to the nation.

> History is like a public school attracts the nations which pursue learning. It contains all the experiences of the past from which we can learn how to solve our contemporary problems.[265]

Two main conclusions were drawn from history: first, that "civilization" is merely a stage in temporal development and not a sign of inherent superiority: and second, the people must be want and be willing to sacrifice in order to reach such an enviable position. Europe's ultimate success in achieving her ascendency was attributed to three main causes. First, the Europeans had shown great initiative and vitality. Second, they had gradually evolved a sound political system based upon freedom and political justice. And third, the Europeans had been willing to profit from their contacts with Muslim peoples, a contact that was negative, as in the Crusades, as well as positive as in Spain and Italy. They were able to profit from their contact with Islamic lands only because they were open-minded, that is because they were willing to learn whatever they considered valuable from others, even from those whose religious affiliation differed from their own. Now, it is the turn of the Arabs to learn from Europe without any hesitation.[266]

Ṭahṭāwī emphasized that contact with Europe acts as stimulus of developing modern Arab civilization.

> Foreign intercourse is equivalent to freedom of labour. Without freedom they cannot prevail. Their main incentives are learning and patriotism which help accomplishment of the nation's goals. Intercourse with foreigners, specially learned men, brings to the country marvellous public benefits even if it has been a result of conquest and domination.[267]

He praised Muhammad 'Ali for ending the isolation of Egypt and encouraging foreign intercourse which was helpful, Ṭahṭāwī believed, in the development of the Egyptian economy and the pursuit of civilization.[268]

All Western fields of knowledge, except theology, were recommended for study. Only Ṭahṭāwī expressed any reservations, and even recommended caution rather than abstinence. When describing the philosophy of the French, he warned his readers that: "Some of the ideas in philosophy and related sciences are misleading since they contradict all Divine Books.... " This statement was the only dissenting view concerning indiscriminate study of Western

---

[264] Ibid., The Preface.
[265] Ṭahṭāwī, Takhlīṣ, p. 206.
[266] Abu-Lughod, Arab Rediscovery of Europe, pp. 146-148.
[267] Ṭahṭāwī, Manāhij, p.188.
[268] Ibid., p. 232.

subjects. It is significant that Ṭahṭāwī did not tell his readers to avoid entirely the study of philosophy; he merely warned them of the possible repercussions which such study might have on the minds untutored in traditional Islamic studies. He continued: 'Anyone wishing to study French philosophy must be extremely well-versed in the Book (*Qur'ān*) and Tradition (*Sunnah*) if his beliefs are not to be undermined.[269]

Ṭahṭāwī used the term *tamaddun* (civilization) in describing social and economic development of Europe. He has seen three stages in the development of civilization and gave very interesting examples of each stage.

> People are classified into three categories according to their achievement of development: the primitive savagery; the tough barbarian; and the civilized sophisticated urbanized people. The primitive people of the Sudan are an example of the first: they are like beasts, cannot distinguish between right and wrong, illiterate, ignore all about things which make easy life in this world and in the other (eternity), they act by instinct like animals and engage in primitive cultivation and hunting. The beduin Arabs are an example of the second: they achieved a certain degree of development, religious and literate, but they lack development in economy and knowledge. Egypt, Syria, Turkey, Persia, Europe, Morocco, America, and the islands of the ocean are examples of the third. They are civilized, they have political systems, laws, knowledge, and they acquire industrial and commercial skills. But they are different in the degree of development: for example, the Europeans have reached the highest stage of scientific knowledge…[270]

By the criterion of civilization, Ṭahṭāwī denunciated the traditional Islamic division of the world into two main groups of people: Muslims and non-Muslims. In the above classification, he put beduin Arabs, who were believed to be the original founders of Islam, into the category of barbarians: while he put the Christian Europeans into the same category with other Muslims (Arabs, Persians, and Turks) and recognized their superiority in the realm of knowledge. This new definition of Europe has made it necessary to find a suitable term to identify the Euro-Arab relations in modern world. In the writings of al- Ṭahṭāwī the phrase al-*Bilād al-gharbiyyah* appears, for the first time in Arabic, to denote the West, as opposed to the world of Islam. He tried to convey the basic view that there were two worlds: Islamic, and Western, each of which possessed different but complementary attributes. Whereas Muslims possessed the *sharī'ah*, the distinguishing characteristic of their culture, the West was distinguished by its possession of scientific knowledge.[271]

In this attempt to distinguish between the basic elements of the two cultures can be found the first hint of the dichotomy between the spiritual East and the materialistic West. In another part of the *Takhlīs*, Ṭahṭāwī described the French as materialists who love the pursuit of material wealth, being very unlike the Arabs in this respect.[272] For this reason, he did not see the possibility of the westernization of Arab countries in order to be integrated into European culture, he rather wanted to explore the main foundations of civilization in Europe which Arabs can learn and adopt.[273]

Ṭahṭāwī distinguished two components of civilization: spiritual and material. He elaborated:

> The first is related to morals, customs, and behaviour, which means religion and law. Nations are distinguished by religion and race... The second, is related to public benefits such as agriculture, commerce, and industry... It is essential for the progress of civilization.

---

[269] Abu-Lughod, cp. cit., p.148; Ṭahṭāwī, Takhlīṣ, p. 131
[270] Ṭahṭāwī, Takhlīṣ. pp. 6-7.
[271] Abu-Lughod, op. cit., p. 139.
[272] Ṭahṭāwī, op. cit., pp. 124-125.
[273] Ṭahṭāwī, Manāhīj, pp. 5-6.

The achievement of civilization needs the integration of both elements otherwise it would be a lopsided development. External changes, such as adopting Western clothing, implements, or daily life etiquette do not realize the development of civilization. Only structural changes in material and spiritual foundations could make possible development of civilization.[274]

Ṭahṭāwī suggested that Arabs (and Muslims) ought to accept and adopt certain beneficial aspects of Western culture, but only when the adoption and adaptation could be made within the framework of the legal and moral system of the *sharī'ah*. He hinted that complete confidence in "rationality" might be somewhat incompatible with the *sharī'ah* when he criticized what he considered to be the excessive French belief in the method of knowledge to the exclusion of divine revelation. But he did not make this explicit nor did he elaborate on this point. Whether or not he perceived a potential threat to Islam from this source cannot be ascertained. He did urge the pursuit of all branches of Western learning in addition to the fields of utilitarian technology.[275]

Ṭahṭāwī believed that a nation who neglects the development of civilization in the country to reach a progressed level would be backward and dominated by others.[276] The advantages of civilization, for him, were numerous:

> There are many advantages of civilization: number of wars would decrease and so hostility: conquests would be lessened and so changes until it vanishes. Then slavery and domination would disappear and with them poverty... Civilization leads to keeping law and order: pursuit of learning and knowledge; development of agriculture, trade, and industry; discovery of new lands to help economic development: invention of implements and machinery to facilitate means of production... It was the encouragement of scientists and men of letters to compile works on science, law, literature, and politics: the freedom of publications: and the development of the press, that had widened the sphere of civilization.[277]

Much of the ideals of both Fukuzawa and Ṭahṭāwī on history and civilization were taken from the Western literature, both relied heavily on Guizot's History of Civilization in Europe, to which Fukuzawa added Buckle's History of Civilization in England. Both intellectuals highly evaluated Western civilization as the highest level of civilization at the time, made it their countries' goal to reach such stage of progress, but not without reservations. They agreed on the basic cultural differences between their respective countries and the West, sought an indigenous path to civilization, and believed that external changes do not realize development. They also looked at civilization as means to preserve their countries independence.

But there are some basic differences between the ideas of Fukuzawa and Ṭahṭāwī concerning the suggested indigenous version of civilization. While Fukuzawa sought a new moral system launched by "the spirit of the times", Ṭahṭāwī insisted on Islamic morals as criterion. Nevertheless, they advocated a selective approach concerning adoption of Western civilization.

---

[274] Ibid., pp. 6-7.
[275] Abu-Lughod, op. cit., p. 145.
[276] Ṭahṭāwī, al-Murshid, p.43.
[277] Ibid., pp.211-212.

Chapter 7 - Conclusion

Fukuzawa Yukichi and Rifā‘ah al-Ṭahṭāwī were pioneers of Enlightenment in their respective countries, deeply influenced the development of modern thought, gained a wide circle of audience, and could inspire a generation of intellectuals. They have attempted, in both radical and compromising ways, to formulate new ideals in the realms of politics, economics, social order, education and learning, and had their own approach to civilization and the possibilities of its achievement. Being influenced by the Western liberal thought of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, they shared the same source and terms of reference. Though they have openly admired Western ideas and civilization, they did not suggest their adoption without reservation. They rather adopted a selective approach correlated to their indigenous culture. Hence, they emphasized the necessity of an authentic development of civilization based on the fundamental characteristics of their respective countries, and were against random and external adoption of Western civilization. This, in a sense, reflects their awareness of history, their comprehensive understanding of civilization, and their mature national consciousness. It reflects, as well, the influence of their early education.

Being influenced by the same terms of reference, their ideas, in many cases, were similar in the issues of equality, people’s rights, family relationship, learning and civilization, regardless the absolute difference in the historical and cultural background of Japan and Egypt. Fukuzawa, however, was more radical and aggressive in the criticism of the traditional ethics on certain matters like women and family status, and his denunciation of the traditional moral system and traditional learning. Ṭahṭāwī, on the other hand, treated the same issues with noticeable courtesy and tolerant compromise. It was easier for Fukuzawa to fight boldly against Confucianism and the traditional Chinese learning, to severely criticizing the sages and degrading their teachings. In Egypt, the traditional ethics were correlated to religion, and their precepts were deeply rooted in Islamic *sharī‘ah*. Due to his early training and religious conscious, Ṭahṭāwī attempted to mobilize what supposed to be positive and stimulus in Islamic fundamental ethics, to support his arguments in a rational way. He blamed malpractices for the shortcomings of the traditional ethics, and sought to rationalize them to serve the pursuit of development.

Further, Fukuzawa obviously had national consciousness derived from a combination of *Shintō* and modern nationalism. Consistently, the terms: "Japanese nation"; "Japanese race"; and "Japanese culture" appear as ipsofacto in his writings. As the Japanese people has been always self-conscious and shared a deep feeling of an undoubted national identity, Fukuzawa did not need to touch this irrelevant issue. For Ṭahṭāwī, it was essential to identify the national entity of Egypt out of a common feeling of affiliation to a wider Muslim world. He acted as the godfather of the idea of Egyptian nationalism which was elaborated by the next generation of the Egyptian intellectuals.

Significantly, Fukuzawa’s awareness of the aggressiveness of the West was the stimulant of his idea of national independence, which he sought to realize through personal independence, self-reliance, and the pursuit of Western civilization as means of independence. But Ṭahṭāwī overlooked the Western aggression, though he was insisting on possession of Western knowledge and means of civilization to safeguard tolerant attitude towards foreign encroachment on Egypt as it might be helpful, he believed, to the development of the country. He did not give a thought to the potential dangers of West aggression.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

‘Abduh, Ibrāhīm; *Tārīkh al-Waqā’i‘ al-Miṣriyyah* (A History of al-Waqā'i' al-Miṣriyyah), Cairo 1942.

‘Abdul-karīm, Aḥmad ‘izzat; *Tārīkh al-Ta‘līm fī Miṣr fī ‘Aṣr Muḥammad ‘Alī* (A History of Education in Egypt under Muhammad Alī), Cairo 1936.

Abu-Lughod, Ibrahim; Arab Rediscovery of Europe, A study in Cultural Encounters, Prinston University Press 1963.

Akamatsu, Paul; Meiji 1868, Revolution and Counterrevolution in Japan, London 1972.

Allen, G.C.; A Short Economic History of Modern Japan, 2nd ed., London 1962.

Amīn, Qāsim; *Al-Mar’ah al-Jadīdah* (The New Woman), Cairo 1901.

Badawī, Ahmad; Rifā‘ah al-Ṭahṭāwī Bey, Cairo 1949.

Baer, G.A.; History of Landownership in Modern Egypt 1800-1950, London 1962.

Beasley, W.G.; Great Britain and the Opening of Japan 1834-1858, London 1951.

Beasley, W.G.; The Meiji Restoration, Stanford University Press 1972.

Beasley, W.G.; The Modern History of Japan, London 1975.

Blacker, Carmen; The Japanese Enlightenment, A Study of the Writings of Fukuzawa Yukichi, Cambridge University Press 1964.

Boktor, A.; School and Society in the Valley of the Nile, Cairo 1936.

Brinton, J.; The Mixed Courts in Egypt. New Heaven 1930.

Brown, D.M.; Nationalism in Japan. Berkeley 1955.

Crouchley, A.E.; The Economic Development of Modern Egypt, London 1938.

Crouchley, A.E.; The Investment of Foreign Capital in Egyptian Companies and Public Debt, Cairo 1936.

Dodwell, Henry; The Founder of Modern Egypt, A Study of Muhammad ‘Alī, Cambridge University Press 1931, Reprinted 1967.

Dore, Ronald P.; City Life in Japan, University of California Press 1976.

Douin, G.; Histoire du Régne du Khedive Ismail, 3 vols, Rome 1933-1939.

Dower, W.(ed.); Origins of the Modern Japanese State, Selected Writings of E.H. Norman, New York 1975.

Fahmy, Moustafa; La Révolution d’Industrie en Egypte et ses consequences Sociales au 19éme ciécle (1800-1850), Leiden, 1954.

Al-Fārûqī, Ismā‘īl; Islam, New York 1979.

Fazlur-Rahman; Islam, 2nd ed., University of Chicago Press 1973.

Fukuzawa Yukichi; The Autobiography of Fukuzawa Yukichi, trans. Eiichi Kiyooka, Columbia University Press l968.

Fukuzawa Yukichi; An Encouragement of Learning, trans. David A. Dlworth & Umeyo Hirano, Sophia University, Tokyo 1969.

Fukuzawa Yukichi; An Outline of the Theory of Civilization, trans. David A. Dilworth & G. Cameron Hurst, Sophia University, Tokyo 1973.

Fukuzawa Yukichi; On Education, Selected Works, trans. Eiichi Kiyooka, University of Tokyo Press 1985.

Fukuzawa Yukichi; On Japanese Women, Selected Works, trans. Eiichi Kiyooka, University of Tokyo Press 1988.

Fukuzawa Yukichi; The National Diet, Circumstances behind its Birth (Nippon Kokkai Engi), trans. Eiichi Kiyooka, Fukuzawa Yukichi Nenkan, vol.l4, Fukuzawa Yukichi Kyokai, Keiō University, Tokyo 1987.

Fukuzawa Yukichi; On Departure From Asia (Datsuaron), trans. Sinh Vinh, Fukuzawa Yukichi Nenkan, vol.11, Fukuzawa Yukichi Kyokai, Keiō University, Tokyo 1984.

Gibb, H.A.R. & Bowen, H.; Islamic Society and the West, vol. 1, 2 Parts, London 1950-1957.

Al-Giratly, ‘Alī; *al-Ṣinā‘ah al—Miṣriyyah fī al-Niṣf al-Awwal min al-Qarn al-Tāsi‘ ‘Ashar* (The Egyptian Industry in the first half Nineteenth Century), Cairo 1955.

Hamed, Raouf Abbas; *Al-Nizām al-Ijtimā‘ī fī Miṣr fī Ẓill al- Milkiyyat al-Zirā‘iyyah al-Kabīrah* (Social Structure in Egypt in Relation to Big Landownership) 1836-1914, Cairo 1973.

Ḥamzah, 'Abdul-Laṭīf; *Adab al-Maqālah al-Ṣaḥafiyyah fī Miṣr* (The literature of Press Article in Egypt), 2nd edition, Cairo 1958.

Hanotaux, G.; Histoire de la Nation Egyptienne, vol 6, Paris 1938

Heyworth-Dunne, J.; Introduction to the History of Education in Modern Egypt, London 1939.

Ḥijāzī, Maḥmûd Fahmī; *Uṣûl al-Fikr al-‘Arabī al-Ḥadīth ‘inda al-Ṭahṭāwī* (The Origins of Modern Arab Thought of Tahtawi), Cairo 1974.

Hirschmeier, Johannes; The Origins of Entrepreneurship in Meiji Japan, Harvard University Press 1964.

Al-Ḥittah, Aḥmad; *Al-Zirā'ah al-Miṣriyyah fī ‘Aṣr Muḥammad ‘Alī* (Egyptian Agriculture of the Muhammad ‘Alī’s Era), Cairo 1954.

Hourani, Albert; Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age 1798-1939, Oxford University Press 1962.

Ike, Nobutaka; The Beginning of Political Democracy in Japan, Boltimore, Johns Hopkins Press 1950.

Irokawa Daikichi; The Culture of Meiji Period, trans. ed., Marius B. Jansen, Princeton University Press 1985.

lssawi, Charles; Egypt at Mid-Century, London 1954.

Lockwood, W.W.; The Economic Development of Japan, Growth and Structural Change 1868-1938, Princeton University Press 1969.

Majdī, Ṣāliḥ; *Ḥilyat al-Zamān bi-Manāqib Khādim al—Waṭan, Rifā'ah Bey Rafī' al-Ṭahṭāwī* (The Time Ornament on the Credits of the Nation's Servant, Rifā'ah Raf'ī al- Ṭahṭāwī), Cairo 1958.

Marshall, B.K.; Capitalism and Nationalism in Pre-war Japan, The Ideology of Business Elite 1868-1941, Stanford University Press 1967.

Maruyama Masao; Thought and Behavior in Modern Japanese Politics, ed. Ivan Morris, New York 1963.

Kosaka Masaaki ed.; Japanese Thought in the Meiji Era, trans, David Abosch, The Toyo Bunko, Tokyo 1969.

Nakamura, H.; Ways of Thinking of Eastern People, Hawaii 1964.

Nishikawa Shunsaku; The Historical Legacy in Modern Japan, Competition, Paper Currency, and Benevolence, The Japan Foundation Newsletter, vol.X vi , No,1, July 1988.

Nishikawa Shunsaku; Profiles of Educators: Fukuzawa Yukichi (1835-1901), unpublished article written for UNESCO Magazine, 1990.

Oxford, Wayne H.; The Speeches of Fukuzawa Yukichi, A Translation and Critical Study, The Kokuseido Press, Tokyo 1973.

Al-Rāfi'ī. 'Abdul-Raḥmān; *'Aṣr Muḥammad 'Alī* (The Era of Muhammad 'Alī), Cairo 1937.

Al-Rāfi'ī. 'Abdul-Raḥmān; *'Aṣr Ismā'īl* (The Era of lsmā'īl), Cairo 1937.

Reischauer, E.O.; Japan Past and Present, 3rd ed., New York 1967.

Rivlin, H.A,B.; The Agricultural Policy of Muhammad 'Ali, Cambridge Mass. 1961.

Safran, Nadav; Egypt in Search of Political Community, Cambridge Mass. 1961.

Sālim, Laṭīfah; *Al-Mar'ah wa al-Taghayyur al-Ijtimā'ī fī Miṣr* (Women and Social Change in Egypt), Cairo 1986.

Al-Shayyāl, Jamāl al—Dīn; *al-Tārīkh wa al-Mu'arrikhûn fī al- Qarn al—Tāsi' 'Ashar* (History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century), Cairo 1958.

Al-Shayyāl, Jamāl al—Dīn; *Tārīkh al-Tarjamah wa al-Ḥarakah al-Thaqāfiyyah fī 'Aṣr Muḥammed 'Alī* (A History of Translation and Intellectual Movement in the Era of Muhammad 'Ali), Cairo 1951.

Al-Shayyāl, Jamāl al—Dīn; *Rifā'ah al—Ṭahṭāwī Za'īm al-Nahḍah al- Fikriyyah fī 'Aṣr Muammad 'Alī* (Rifā'ah al—Ṭahṭāwī The Leader of Thought in the Era of Muhammad 'Alī). Cairo 1946.

Shively, Donald H. ed.; Tradition and Modernization in Japanese Culture, Princeton University Press 1971.

Al-Ṭahṭāwī, Rifā'ah; *Takhlīṣ al-Ibrīz fi Talkhīs Birīz* (The Extraction of Gold on the Summary of Paris), Cairo 1834.

Al-Ṭahṭāwī, Rifā'ah; *Manāhij al-Albāb al-Miṣriyyah fī Mabāhij al-Ādāb al-'Aṣriyyah* (Courses for the Egyptian Minds in the Delights of Modern Literature). Cairo 1870,

Al-Ṭahṭāwī, Rifā'ah; *al-Murshid al-Amīn lil-Banāt wa al-Banīn* (The Honest Guide of Girls and Boys), Cairo 1872.

Al-Ṭahṭāwī, Rifā'ah; *Anwār Tawfīq al-Jalīl fī Akhbār Miṣr wa Tawthīq Banī Ismā'īl* (liluminations of Tawfīq the Great on the History of Egypt and the Origins of the Sons of Ismā'īl), Cairo 1868.

Al-Ṭahṭāwī, Rifā'ah; *Nihāyat al-ījāz fī Sīrat Sākin al-Ḥijāz* (The Last Summary on the Biography of the Resident of Ḥijaz), Cairo 1873.

Tucker, Judith E.; Women in the Nineteenth Century Egypt, Cambridge University Press 1985.

Wendell, Charles; The Evolution of the Egyptian National Image, from Its Origins to Aḥmad Lûṭfī al-Sayyid, University of California Press 1972.