Temple, of course, took the idea of "tribal cohesion" to its fullest extent. "Since the occupation of these territories we have in the Northern Provinces of Nigeria," he wrote, "in a great measure supported the Emirs and Chiefs and to a limited extent in the Southern Provinces also. In my opinion we should continue to do so and to an ever increasing extent" (emphasis added). Cameron, of course, set his face against the "feudal autocracies", and carried through the change from indirect rule to indirect administration. But it was left to Creech-Jones and the Colonial Office in 1947 to give the coup de grace to the original idea by speaking of providing "the people with their political education" (and not just the "tribal rulers"); by advocating "development schemes", and not just the development of "the native politically on lines suitable to the state of society in which he lives"; and in the famous (original!) phrase by stating that "the key to success lies in the development of an efficient, democratic system of local government".

A host of questions arise, of course—and not only the old ones about who was the first person to think of indirect rule, or what was the extent to which at the outset a virtue was made of necessity. One point may perhaps suffice here. What was the ideological background to the formulation of the doctrine? What is most striking, for readers of this Journal, is the contrast Indirect Rule presents with some doctrines which the British advanced in India in the early part of the nineteenth century. The attack upon the idea of destroying "all the institutions, all the traditions, all the habits of the people, super-imposing upon them what we consider to be better administrative methods and better principles" (which Cameron gave vent to) would have been anathema to such men as Cornwallis, James Mill, Bentinck, Macauley or Dalhousie. It has a good deal in common, however, with the doctrines of Munro, Canning, the Oudh School, and the Political Department of the Government of India. And there can be little doubt that a straight line of thought runs through the Deccan Agriculturists Relief Act of 1879, and the Punjab Land Alienation Act of 1900 into the thinking which dominated the formulations of Indirect Rule. Each represented an attempt to shore up the available buttresses against the destructive atomisation which all too easily could overtake colonial societies. Each represented, moreover, a thoroughly hostile attitude towards anything, or anyone, who had a "European veneer". Such thinking was fairly certainly linked to the thinking of late nineteenth century Liberal Unionists in Britain, and with that of those who would not have another African Bishop on the Niger after Samuel Crowther. The intellectual expression of such ideas came from such figures as Fitzjames Stephen and Mary Kingsley. Will someone sort out the tangle here for the rest of us?
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Three practising academicians, three men of the bench or the bar, and one educational administrator have contributed essays to this volume. Most contributors are from West Pakistan; apparently only the educational administrator (Mohiyud-Din) is from the East.
Professor Mohiyud-Din integrates many facts and quotations concerning education in Dacca and persuades us that the material and human resources allocated to education are grimly inadequate. His stress on “the wisdom of spending more money on education” will find ready echo in many lands.

The longest essay (70 pp.) by Manzur Qadir, a former Minister for Foreign Affairs, expands a 1962 note advancing proposals for Pakistan’s new constitution, then under discussion. As background for understanding this document, the historians of tomorrow should find Quadir’s statement valuable.

H. N. Gardozi’s analysis of the characteristics of the Pakistani population will delight the professional demographer. West Pakistan is much more urban than East Pakistan (22.5:5.2%) and the gap appears to be slowly increasing (p. 92); also, the migration between Pakistan and India during 1947 would appear to have accelerated urbanization in both countries.

In describing his “conception of successful life”, A. K. Brohi says, “What ultimately shatters the prison walls of individuality that surround us and effectively enables us to expand our consciousness to a point where it begins to mirror the light universal is something which is the result of individual effort and which no external aid can import to us.” (212) This is interesting stuff, and one regrets that Brohi doesn’t describe real life crises for us so that we might see how his philosophical ideas relate to his actions.

A. H. Dani (Peshawar archeologist) and N. A. Baloch (Hyderabad educationist) offer vignettes on the history and sociology of Pakistan. The authors appear to be addressing primarily fellow-nationals, striving to create for them a collective self-image which would give them pride in their nationality. No doubt this is a worthy task, for the establishment of new national identities continues to be a persistently acute problem throughout Afro-Asia. It should be recognized, however, that the performance of this task leads one occasionally to subordinate the empirical facts to the ideology inherited from the founding fathers. Professor Baloch describes one of the “significant cultural traditions” of West Pakistan thus:

“Liberal and Democratic Outlook: Having been culturally aligned with the enlightened civilizations on the West (Sumerian, Babylonian, Greek, Iranian and the Arab) the people have imbibed the spirit of adjustment and accommodation, as compared to the rest of the Indian sub-continent steeped in mythology of gods, dominated by the super race of the Brahmans, and bound by the rigid laws of joint-family and caste-system.” (173)

The anti-Indian (and anti-Hindu) theme in this passage appears several times in these two essays (e.g. pp. 4–7); it reminds one of Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi’s basic historiographic dictum, namely, whatever helped the spread of Islam was good, whatever hindered it was bad. How the use of anti-Indian themes in Pakistani literature, and vice versa, as a device for strengthening national solidarity, is only a local version of a universal problem. However, to strengthen positive feelings towards group A by supporting negative feelings towards group B, a neighbour, is ultimately dysfunctional, for neighbours must continue to live next to each other. Justice M. R. Kayani’s Last Address, which concludes the volume under review, shows that affection for Pakistan is compatible with neutrality towards India. It is to be hoped that future publications in the Pakistan Studies Series will include authors who can entertain positive