

public investment in their economies, but with governmental guarantee that such funds will be spent primarily for development rather than for the enrichment of the foreign investor. What better hope than nationalization is there for the assurance of advancement and continued political independence, *particularly from Soviet domination*? Does Professor Allen deny the democratic successes of the British and Swedish models, or does he really believe that all forms of nationalization represent an inevitable step toward a totalitarian Soviet form? Surely he knows that the Soviets themselves regard the democratic socialists as a major obstacle to their goal of world Communization. Indeed, as the author himself records, "Perhaps as influential and effective in combatting Communism has been the democratic left, which exercises real political influence in most countries." Unlike Professor Allen, however, the "democratic left" is persuaded that under democratic controls increased centralization of economic activity can be a step away from totalitarianism.

In spite of this serious shortcoming in Professor Allen's work, which after all represents debatable differences in outlook, his work is a valuable summary of the University of Virginia's Woodrow Wilson Department of Foreign Economic Affairs' Soviet Foreign Economic Relations Project, brought up to date by the author's own additions. Unfortunately, other than a bibliography of his colleagues' publications arising out of the Project, this book is almost totally lacking in documentation and thus will be of little direct aid for further research.

The tables presented in an Appendix are a useful summation of bloc trade activities. The author's analysis convinces this reviewer that many of us have credited the Soviets with too great a success in the realm of economic warfare. The beginning student, or the old Soviet hand, desiring a careful review of recent Soviet international economic activity, will find what he is after in this book. Moreover, convincing argument is presented to indicate that although the bloc will "retain its self-sufficiency policy . . . economic motivation is playing an increasing role in Soviet bloc foreign economic activities with underdeveloped countries. . . ."

Unfortunately, Professor Allen's closing observation revives previous criticism of his work: "One thing is certain; the West *will* find that combination of public and private activity and those methods which will promote and expand an equitable economic system and a value system which attaches the highest priority to man." This reviewer emphatically

agrees that we must work to "promote and expand . . . a value system which attaches the highest priority to man." However, those whom Allen would classify as belonging to the "democratic left" will submit that a blind commitment to policies based upon a *laissez faire* outlook (*i.e.*, in particular, that freedom from governmental regulation of economic activities is the mainstay of human freedom) can lead only to a disaster for political democracy in the complex modern world.

ROY D. LAIRD

The University of Kansas

The Intellectual Origins of Egyptian Nationalism. BY J. M. AHMED. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1960. Pp. xi, 135. \$5.00.)

This is without doubt one of the outstanding contributions to the study of modern Egyptian nationalism. While brief, Mr. Ahmed's book is a thorough survey of the writing and thought of some of the most influential men of letters in Egypt during the British occupation, 1882-1922. The survey is refreshingly straightforward and meaningful, and its central thesis—the relevance of nationalist thought during the period under survey to the present Egyptian search for some national formula—is modestly but subtly put forward without arrogant overemphasis. The presentation is fortunately unencumbered by theoretical or other clichés.

In a well-written introduction the author discusses the impact of the Napoleonic expedition to Egypt in 1798 characterized by the uncertainty, stirrings, and gradual though reluctant political awakening of an incipient Egyptian national leadership. Adib Ishaq, Abdullah al-Nadim, Rifa'a Rafi al-Tahtawi were the trumpeters of Egyptian national awakening in the 1850's and 1870's. The chapter on Islamic Liberalism is largely devoted to the influence of Afghani and Sheikh Muhammad Abduh on the generation of nationalist leaders active during the British occupation. In this chapter, Mr. Ahmed emphasizes the "positive aspect" of Egyptian nationalism in its formative stages and the commitment of its leaders to the principles of imported European liberalism as the fundamental premise for the establishment of a modern Egyptian nation-state. At the same time, the author discusses, with the help of appropriate quotations, the major pre-occupation of Muhammad Abduh and his disciples with the reform of Islamic religious practices and institutions—a process of evolutionary change which would eventually accommodate traditional Islamic society to the necessities of modern existence.

Mr. Ahmed is careful to point out that early

nationalist effort in nineteenth century Egypt was primarily directed at educational reform (especially the Azhar University), "to transmit European knowledge, and relieve the language from the many impediments it had been gathering in the three centuries of stagnation," and that this activity reflected the introduction of the "country's elite" to the principles of European liberalism. It was thus in his role of reformer and teacher that Sheikh Muhammad Abduh bequeathed to his disciples the earnest desire gradually to change society and equip it "for the responsibilities of freedom."

The subsequent confrontation between Abduh's followers and secularists on the one hand, and fundamentalists on the other is brought out in a delightful chapter entitled "The Girondists of Egypt." Mr. Ahmed skillfully observes the influence of British administration upon the writings of such men as Ahmad Fathi Zaghloul, Qasim Amin, and Ahmad Lutfi al-Sayyid, especially in the preoccupation of these men with social reform and the achievement of civic virtues.

In contrast to Muhammad Abduh's lukewarm attitude toward political activity, those influenced by his reform ideas and educational philosophy formed the nucleus of political party formations at the turn of the century. It should be noted here that one might take exception with Mr. Ahmed's remark that "After his [Abduh's] experiences in the period of Arabi and his term of exile in Paris and Beirut, he seems to have decided to abandon political activity because something else was more urgent." Sheikh Abduh's activities as Grand Mufti and Azhar scholar involved him in politics directly, even though not in any organized manner. That he abandoned the pan-Islamic ideas of his earlier colleague Afghani there is no doubt. Indeed, the development of political parties after 1907, discussed by Mr. Ahmed in Chapter IV, was a reflection of this deviation on the one hand, and a rejection of the extremist politics of Mustafa Kamil or the Islamicism of Sheikh Ali Yusuf on the other.

The last chapter in the book is devoted to a discussion of the work of Ahmad Lutfi al-Sayyid, the sole survivor of this early group of political writers and leaders at the turn of the century. The "philosopher of the generation," as Lutfi is still called by educated Egyptians, continued in the tradition of the early struggle "to arouse the national consciousness of the country." Here again Mr. Ahmed successfully points to the "inner-directed" type of nationalism: the internal reform of Egyptian life and society leading to a state based on political

liberty and constitutionalism. "Our nationalism must rest on our interests, not our beliefs," was a formula Lutfi advocated partly to temper the immoderate and wild agitation of extremists.

Throughout the survey, Mr. Ahmed appears to underline the contention of these reforming nationalists that "no political revolution could take the place of a gradual transformation of the mind and heart of Egypt." At the same time he maintains (in his Postscript) that "Contemporary Egypt takes many of her symbols from the pre-First World War years of preparation; and many heroes of that period . . . are now being resuscitated . . . Modern intellectual life in Egypt is in many ways extending or resuming that of the preparatory period which is the subject of this book." It is apparent nevertheless that the military ruling class in Egypt since 1952 has reversed the premise of these early nationalists, preferring a political revolution to direct the transformation of Egyptian thinking. With this attitude, the junta that came to power in July 1952 rejected the constitutional liberalism of their nationalist predecessors. Arabi's spirit may have been evoked by the junta soon after their coup, but Mr. Ahmed argues earlier in his book that the "Girondists," followers of Muhammad Abduh and European liberalism, were not too fond of Arabi's methods.

Mr. Ahmed's suggestion that Lutfi al-Sayyid and his contemporaries were "laying the foundations of the later political and social resurgence of Egypt" may be well-taken theoretically. As to their literary legacy, many Egyptians might take exception to the author's thesis. The new generation of young writers—not Naguib Mahfouz, for whom Mr. Ahmed has a very high regard, but Yusuf Idris, Numan Ashur, Ihsan Abdel Quddus, and Yusuf Sibai—are not trained men of letters as their predecessors were. Indeed, they rebelled against not only their predecessors' thought, but their style as well (compare for example Idris' *The Critical Moment*, al-lahza al-hariga). Moreover, the symbols today are national rather than personal political freedom, efficiency and performance rather than debate and public control of policy. The arch-symbol is the Leader, not any institutionalized process of political decision-making. Finally, the new generation of younger writers seems to have a genuine mass following (among those who can read) to an extent never enjoyed by the educated leaders of the first three decades of the present century.

On the whole this is an unusually competent work on a subject most American political

scientists would unfortunately relegate to the historian. Its importance, however, cannot be overlooked by students of Egyptian and Middle Eastern politics, or by students of the politics of the so-called new states. Now that Egypt is becoming increasingly influential in wider Arab national affairs, the appearance of Mr. Ahmed's book should receive the welcome and commendation it deserves.

P. J. VATIKIOTIS

Indiana University

Freedom in the Balance; Opinions of Judge Henry W. Edgerton Relating to Civil Liberties. EDITED BY ELEANOR BONTECOU. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1960. Pp. 278. \$5.75.)

Legacy of Suppression; Freedom of Speech and Press in Early American History. BY LEONARD W. LEVY. (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 1960. Pp. 353. \$6.50.)

"You are one of the truest voices of our constitutional tradition." With these words, Yale University conferred the LL.D. upon Judge Henry White Edgerton of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. In the field of civil liberties Judge Edgerton speaks with special vigor, and political scientists will welcome the addition to the Cornell Studies in Civil Liberty of this volume of his civil liberties opinions.

It is true that Edgerton's voice has often been in a minority, but he has an impressive record of support by the Supreme Court. A persistent pushing forward along the liberal path is evident in his severe scrutiny of the government loyalty program and the Un-American Activities Committee; in his denunciation of restrictive covenants and segregated public education; and in his defense of the rights of the despised, the feared, and the unorthodox. In the words of Eleanor Bontecou, the editor, "his own passion is for the preservation of a free society with all that that implies." What it implies, in Edgerton's view, is freedom, with no "ifs," "ands," or "buts."

Yet the reader is left with a faint dissatisfaction. Partly this is due to an inherent deficiency of any such collection of opinions; it is a play in which no one but the hero is allowed on the stage—and Edgerton's chief antagonist, Judge Prettyman, is a formidable one. More important, Edgerton's passion for freedom sometimes seems to warp his judgment. It is not necessary, for example, to deny the fact that the loyalty program caused some innocent

suffering to wonder whether the dismissal of Miss Bailey from her position in the United States Employment Service really constituted "forced idleness" and thus "a cruel as well as unusual punishment," or whether the law of free speech is well served by defining punishment as simply "infliction of harm," including such harm as ostracism by private individuals. In this area where free speech and national security collide, Judge Edgerton's views have, understandably, found less support in the Supreme Court, although it cannot be said that the high court has provided an adequate guide of its own. Indeed, wherever else students of American government disagree, most of them would probably agree about the unsatisfactory condition of the law in this area.

One way of beginning to investigate the reasons for this unsatisfactory condition is to explore our constitutional tradition with regard to the relation between free speech and the preservation of a free society. In his *Legacy of Suppression*, Leonard W. Levy, Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at Brandeis University, examines the origins and original understanding of the First Amendment protection of free speech. He raises the question whether it was the intention of the Framers to reject common law notions of free speech and press, which acknowledged "the power of government to punish words that do not directly incite to acts in violation of law." While touching on some of the broader aspects of the problem of free speech, his main concern is with the bed-rock question whether the Framers intended to wipe out the doctrine of seditious libel, as Professor Chafee, Justice Holmes, and many others have asserted. Levy's answer, based on thorough research among masses of original materials, is an emphatic no. Neither in the Anglo-American liberal tradition nor in American thought and action after the Revolution does Levy find any substantial denial of "the notion that the state might be criminally assaulted merely by words, even by words which had no consequence other than producing disesteem or contempt in the minds of the people." As for the First Amendment itself, no one can say for sure what the Framers meant—perhaps they did not know themselves—but the evidence tends to support the proposition that the freedom of speech-and-press clause "substantially embodied the Blackstonian definition [of free speech as freedom from prior restraint] and left the law of seditious libel in force. . . ."

At last, under the pressure of the Sedition Act of 1798, American libertarians began to formulate "a broad definition of the meaning