Islamic Studies 41:3 (2002) pp. 391–444

Islamic Thought in Bosnia-Herzegovina in the 20th Century: Debates on Revival and Reform

ENES KARIĆ

The Bosnian writer A. Hifzi Bjelevac (d. 1972) published an article in the periodical *Gajret*[1] (1 March, 1924 issue) entitled "Evolution and Progress". It was an editorial introduction in which he appealed to his contributors not to go "beyond evolution and progress" in the articles they submitted to the journal in connection with the debate on the subject. In other words, *Gajret* was categorically in favour of progress and evolution of Muslim society in Bosnia. It was, therefore, not only desirable but obligatory for articles sent to the periodical to deal with 'evolution and progress', and not to go beyond these limits.

True, *Gajret* was not the only periodical of the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina oriented to progress in the 20th century. Every Bosniak paper, without exception, was in favour of progress, including the conservative Tuzla publication, *Hikjmet*, although it believed that advancement would be attained by upholding the traditional Islamic ideas, by defending the institutions of the caliph and the caliphate, by banning translations of the Qur'ān, and so on.

The question is not, therefore, whether the Bosnian Islamic thinkers of the 20th century were for 'progress' or not. The problem was that they defined reform and progress in various ways, and there was no consensus on the issue. Bjelevac was right in saying that many of *Gajret's* contributors, when they send him articles for *Gajret*, "they . . . restrict themselves ... to criticism, and have not even found subjects for debate, let alone entered into genuine debate".[2]

During the period between the two world wars (1918–1939), every Islamic and Muslim thinker[3] in Bosnia wanted change, all wanted progress, all

[1] *Gajret* was a magazine published by the Muslim Cultural Society, Gajret.

[2] *Gajret* (March 1, 1924), 1.

[3] Throughout the article the author has distinguished between 'Islamic' and 'Muslim'. In his understanding, the epithet 'Islamic' applies to those who are academically well-grounded in Islam and are consciously bound by Islamic teachings, holding them to be the basis of the right

wanted 'evolution', an 'evolution' by means of which they wanted to bring about a transformation of the contemptible state of their society into something better, more 'progressive'. But the *hodžas* (religious teachers, *'ulamā'*) wanted one kind of 'evolution' and the (secular) intelligentsia quite another. Furthermore, even among the *hodžas* there were opposing views, as there were among the intelligentsia. It may also be noted that at the very start of the debate for and against reforms in Bosnia, various allegations were levelled. For instance, *Gajret's* editor Bjelevac, in the article to which we have referred to, says: "Many throw the blame on the intelligentsia, on the schools, on the Waqf administration, on the *'Ulamā' Majlis*, on the *hodžas*, and so on, but no one anywhere says what needs to be done".[4]

Every Bosnian reformist, like reformists elsewhere in the world, inevitably faced the tantalising question: What is to be done? There is no reformist slogan that is not ultimately brought to a halt by this question. During the 19th and 20th centuries dozens of treatises, articles, brochures and books were written in Bosnia on the question of what ought to be done in order to change a situation with which, as once Muhammad Iqbal said, neither God nor man is satisfied.

The Questions Engaging the Muslim Mind

What kind of schools should one have? What kind of clothes should one wear? What kind of headcovering one should use ? May a Muslim wear a hat? May a Muslim woman go about with her face uncovered, shedding the veil and the cloak? Should there be modern schools? Should girls be sent to modern schools? May a Muslim woman be engaged in social activities? May Muslims emigrate to Turkey, and should that be regarded as *hijrah*? What about old Muslim graveyards in Bosnia — can they be used for building housing, parks, roads? How should the *waqf* system be organized? Is bank interest the same *ribā* to which the Qur'ān refers and which it prohibits? May Muslims engage in banking transactions? Has the caliphate been abolished for good, or should Muslims have a caliph?

These and numerous other similar questions primarily engaged the minds of Islamic and Muslim thinkers in Bosnia and Herzegovina from the end of

---

way of life for man. 'Muslim', on the other hand, signifies the fact of someone's being a Muslim, regardless of whether he has studied Islam well or not, and whether he is strongly committed to Islamic teachings or not. The word Muslim is thus often understood as denoting, in the Bosnian context, the nationality of Bosnian Muslims or Bosniaks. Ed.

[4] *Gajret* (March 1, 1924), 1.

the 19th to the start of the second half of the 20th century, and to some extent even later. These questions arose because Bosnia, which had been part of Ottoman Empire for nearly four centuries, suddenly found itself under the umbrella of Austrio-Hungarian Monarchy which was essentially western and Catholic in nature. This happened as a result of Bosnia's occupation by the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy after the Berlin Congress of 1878.

As far as we know, all the Muslim peoples of the Balkans (Bosniaks, Albanians, Turks, Pomaks, and the Slav Torbesh of Macedonia), or rather a great majority of their prominent intellectuals, dealt primarily with the questions mentioned above. On the other hand, intellectuals from the Christian peoples of the Balkans (Croats, Serbs, Slovenes, Macedonians, Montenegrins) were primarily interested in issues of state, political parties, language, nation, national institutions, and so on.

This is explained by the fact that after the fall of the Ottoman Empire, the European powers did not allow the Muslims of the Balkans to have a state of their own. Muslims survived simply as religious entities.

The Muslims of the Balkans themselves seemed to accept, at least tacitly, the widespread notion imposed on them: that they were not, and could not become, a state-building or nation-building community. They had to survive in the changed circumstances only as a religious entity, bearing the burden of the 'Turkish guilt'. The Muslim peoples of the region had to live an absurd life at a time and place where the newly-arisen Christian states of the Balkans (Montenegro, Serbia, Bulgaria, Greece, and so on) were in a position to "guarantee" freedom of religion to Islam, while at the same time, regarding Muslims as an event of the past, as relics of the Turkish yoke. These states tried to erase every trace of the Ottoman presence in the Balkans.

Certainly, the question of dress, was important for Muslims. However, as numerous treatises and debates by Muslim intellectuals during the first half of the 20th century show, all that remained for them was to discuss the issue of dress and old graveyards, *waqfs* and the decline of the caliphate. Those Muslim intellectuals who did discuss questions relating to state and nation were few and far between, and their voices too were not too loud. The debate about dress was, no doubt, in a sense a debate about the community's security and survival. At least as far as the most recent experience of the Muslims of the Balkans was concerned, the state should have been their principal security, and there should have been debates about the state as an institution of security. This, however, did not happen, since the Muslims of the Balkans had no state of theirs during this period, and they were no more than second-class citizens in the states in which they lived. The history of the Balkans in the 20th

century, and in particular towards the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century, provides ample evidence of this.

In this study we have attempted an integrated presentation of the principal trends of Islamic thought in Bosnia and Herzegovina by identifying the areas in which the Muslims felt that they were faced with challenges of the time and indicating their responses to those challenges. As a result, what primarily concerns us here is the history of activities within or among (a) the principal Islamic educational institutions and schools, (b) the Islamic *'ulamā'* circles, (c) the Islamic periodicals and newspapers, and (d) the prominent Islamic scholars.

This paper is an attempt to highlight the responses of the 20th century Islamic thinkers in Bosnia and Herzegovina to the challenges faced by the Muslims of that region and to do so through the prism of reformist and revivalist themes. Our purpose is to present the principal representatives of 'progress and advancement' and the chief protagonists of 'adherence to the old ways', the spokesmen of the *status quo*.

These responses can hardly be expressed very concisely because the Islamic thinkers of Bosnia and Herzegovina held highly diverse views on the question. This paper will, therefore, be of a doxographical and bio-bibliographical nature. In this regard, it would be pertinent to note that the great majority of Bosniaks in the 20th century, when writing on Islamic subjects, instead of using Arabic, Persian or Turkish, began to use their own native Bosnian language, written in the Latin or Cyrillic scripts. This was the first time that important Islamic subjects were discussed in the Bosnian language in these scripts. This development, however, was accompanied by considerable spiritual and social upheaval. The transition from the use of the Arabic alphabet (used for more than five centuries in Bosnia for the Arabic, Persian and Turkish languages) to that of Bosnian written in Latin or Cyrillic scripts was indeed a painful one. Printing houses were no longer a rarity in Bosnia at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. The Bosniak authors of this period who were unfamiliar with the Latin or Cyrillic scripts could have made use of Čaušević's arebica, a specially adapted Arabic alphabet designed for written and printed works in Bosnian, and could also have used arebica as a means of learning the Latin alphabet. At the beginning of the 20th century, Mustafa Konjhodžić even published a kind of alphabet handbook, entitled *Uputa u čitanju i pisanju latinice za muslimane koji znadu arapsko pismo*[5] ("Instructions for Reading and Writing Latin Script for Muslims Who Know the Arabic Alphabet") for the use of such writers.

✿ ✿ ✿

[5] Sarajevo: Islamska dionička štamparija, 1908.

"Islam is Wonderful, but what about Muslims?"

A very large proportion of the literature that has come down to us from the Islamic thinkers of Bosnia and Herzegovina of the late 19th and the 20th centuries deals directly with Islamic ideals in general, and the actual situation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in particular. The methodological basis and underlying concept of these writings comprises a standpoint that can be succinctly expressed by the slogan: "Islam is wonderful, but what about Muslims?" This seems to mean that although Islam is wonderful, and that it is wonderful in Bosnia, too, yet the Muslims of Bosnia could have been better and should have greater concern for their advancement.

The basic idea underlying a great majority of these writings is that the "concern for progress" is equivalent to "concern for Islam". This is the ideological, and one could even say the theological, matrix of a very large number of texts written in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the 20th century.

In this regard it is pertinent to mention that the reformist-oriented Islamic thinkers in Bosnia and Herzegovina kept themselves informed about the Islamic writings the world over, in particular those in Arabic and Turkish languages, which dealt thematically with a critique of Muslim backwardness and of the decadence of the Muslim peoples at the end of the 19th and in the first half of the 20th century. These writings, which gave vent to reformist ideas with regard to 'Islamic' and 'Muslim' institutions, were well received in Bosnia. In such writings Islam is described as a faith not opposed to reform, one that is congenial to rejuvenation, one that is open to the new, the modern and the contemporary. It should hardly be necessary to point out that 'modern' was considered, *a priori*, to mean that which is 'better'.

This is the principal reason for the enthusiastic welcome given by Islamic authors of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the work *Limādhā Ta'akhkhar al-Muslimūn wa limādhā Taqaddam Ghayruhum* by Amīr Shakīb Arslān (d. 1946).[6] During the first half of the 20th century, the work was read in Bosnia as an invigorating piece of literature, awakening its readers to new horizons and progress, but also as a work of liberation from decline and

[6] The work was translated from the Arabic by Šaćir Sikirić and Muhamed Pašić, and published in 1934 in Sarajevo (State Press). It was reprinted by Dr Rešid Hafizović and myself in 1992 and published by *Muslimanski glas* "Muslim Voice". It should not be necessary to make special mention of the fact that we re-read this work by Amīr Shakīb Arslān at the height of the war of 1992-1995 not only as an 'Islamic liberation theology' but also as an 'Islamic salvation theology'. (For a recent edition of Arslān's work, which has been published many a time, see Cairo: al-Markaz al-Salafī li al-Kitāb, 1981. For its English translation see *Our Decline and Its Causes: A Diagnosis of the Symptoms of the Downfall of Muslims*, tr. M. A. Shakoor Lahore: Ashraf, 1944. Ed.).

retrogression. Amīr Shakīb Arslān's work offered the Bosniaks a kind of Islamic liberation theology.

There were, certainly, other reasons for the Islamic thinkers of Bosnia and Herzegovina to read Amīr Shakīb Arslān and similar authors with great admiration, and for finding in them a methodology that could serve as a basis for their reformist works. It is notworthy that those Islamic thinkers who viewed their country and its social situation through the prism of progress had an upper hand in the intellectual life of the nation. As for the 'conservatives', they too were there, but they were considerably less influential. However, since the reformists outnumbered the conservatives in Bosnia, and since they were supported both by the Austro-Hungarian regime and by its successor states — the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and Socialist Yugoslavia — one may conclude that reformist writings in Bosnia are more extensive and more diverse.

It must also be mentioned that although Bosnia is a small country, it had many types of Muslim reformists during the 20th century. As a result, there are a number of diverse Muslim and Islamic reformisms, if one may call them so. During the Austro-Hungarian period, the authorities sponsored the type of reform that supported a form of Europeanization of the Bosnian Muslims, and thereby a Europeanization of their Islam. It was an attempt, one might say, to create a 'Euro-Islam'[7] in Bosnia to suit Vienna. In the work *Budućnost ili napredak Muhamedovaca u Bosni i Hercegovini* ("The Future or the Advancement of the Mohammedans in Bosnia and Herzegovina") from the pen of Mehmedbeg Kapetanović Ljubušak (d. 1902).[8]

Understandably, Islam was characterised in numerous articles, pamphlets, brochures and books by the Bosnian reformists as progressive and advanced. On the one hand, the fact that those reformists lived on the European soil was the principal reason for the acceptance, by the majority of Bosniak Islamic thinkers of the 20th century, of a progressive reading of history and thereby a progressive reading of Islam and its place in history. But the Bosnian Islamic reformist writings interpreted and presented 'progressive Islam' usually as a preliminary European historical phase only, as something that enabled Europe to be progressive, powerful, civilized, cosmopolitan. After the fall of the Ottoman Empire, ideas of progress were popular in Bosnia among many of the nascent Bosniak 'progressive intelligentsia', but still more popular was the assertion that Islam itself would bring progress not only to Bosniaks, but to

[7] There are other examples of 'Euro-Islam', even though, of course, the term 'Euro-Islam' is not mentioned at all in the book, since this expression was not yet in use at that time.

[8] Sarajevo: Spindler i Loschnera, 1893. The endpage of the book further states that it is "the second brochure of the Mohammedans published in the Bosnian language in Sarajevo".

other Europeans as well. There are indeed many works by Bosniaks explicitly claiming that Europe was able to bring about economic progress because of the Renaissance, and that the Renaissance was, unquestionably, in the opinion of the Bosniak reformists, the gift of Islam to Europe. This idea was the starting point of many a Bosniak thinker who, with great enthusiasm and gusto, sought to establish these claims by marshalling a great deal of evidence and argument.

Salih Hadžialić

This was the very idea which Salih Hadžialić (d. 1997), a graduate of al-Azhar, highlighted his article "Islam i stvarnost" ("Islam and Reality") in the 1930s.[9] Hadžialić's article is one among dozens of similar writings that appeared during the first half of the 20th century, at a time, that is, of widespread Bosniak debate on reform, progress and the way out of the predicament in which the Bosniaks *found* themselves. For its illustration we turn to Hadžialić. Here is an example of this genre of writing.

Hadžialić's starting point are two theses which were then widely held in Bosnia:

> (1) There are few peoples in the history of humanity who have created such an advanced culture and in such a short time as Muslims. When the Islamic faith emerged thirteen and a half centuries ago, it provided guidance leading to a new, more elevated way of life. With its social, cultural and ethical principles, Islam infused a new spirit among the peoples who embraced it, and prepared them for the struggle of life. Islam alone was the driving force that enabled the Muslims to play such an honourable and important role in the cultural development of humanity.[10]

By way of support for this first thesis of his, Salih Hadžialić, following the pattern of Muslim reformists elsewhere in the Islamic world at that time, cites several Western authorities who have praised the historical role of Islam. Thus Hadžialić quotes the "great contemporary English historian Christoph Dawson, rightly regarded as the heir to Spengler's authority". In his work *Die Gestaltung des Abendlandes*, Christoph Dawson writes: "The Qur'ān has had a greater impact on world history than any other book in the world. Western culture developed solely in the shadow of the progressive culture of Islam".[11]

Shortly after setting out his first thesis, Salih Hadžialić presents another:

---

[9] See *Novi Behar*, vol. 13, nos. 13–18 (1939–40).
[10] Ibid., 210.
[11] Ibid.

(2) Equally, there are few peoples who, after such a high culture and brilliant past, have sunk into such a desperate state as the Islamic peoples. Almost nothing remains to us of that former glory and power, about which history speaks to us as if it were a utopia. The Islamic peoples, after centuries of rule, have lost their freedom, and are now groaning under the yoke of the western powers.[12]

The whole of Hadžialić's treatise later develops with a view to corroborating and establishing these two theses. The Muslims are backward these days "and have begun to set their hopes on some Mahdi", he claims. At the same time, the Muslims are ever more aware of their predicament, and "have begun to seriously consider their position. The question has begun to be asked: is it possible for the Islamic peoples, and if so how, to emerge from this impasse, to go through a renaissance, and to regain their place in the comity of civilized nations?"[13]

Hadžialić then deals with the then current views on Islam held by the West. He refutes the Western thesis that Islam is incapable of reform: "The incapacity of Islam to undertake radical reform, its inadequacy for any kind of progress, was a widely accepted dogma not only among missionaries but also in certain academic and political circles in Europe".[14]

Therefore Hadžialić cites the French philosopher and historian, Ernest Renan (d. 1892), and the English politician and diplomat, Lord Cromer (d. 1917), who contended that Islam lacks the capacity to bring about any reform. Lord Cromer said so on the grounds that if Islam were to be reformed, it would lead Muslims to unbelief. Hadžialić referred to Cromer's "ideas of the impossibility of Islam to be reformed because cultural progress would, allegedly, lead Muslim to atheism".[15]

Hadžialić refutes the views of both Renan and Cromer, asserting that Islam has demonstrated great dynamism all through its history till the present time. Asserting that certain Christian circles had claimed "from the very start of the mediaeval period" that Islam should long since have disappeared, Hadžialić states vigorously:

> But quite to the contrary, Islam is spreading ever more widely, ever more striking roots in the world. "No single religion", says Oswald Spengler in his *Untergang des Abendlandes* . . . "has been so much suppressed as Islam, and no single religion has spread so easily and so rapidly as Islam. Although tolerant in

[12] Ibid.
[13] Ibid.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Ibid.

> the extreme of all religions" — continues Spengler — "Judaism, Mazdaism and Christianity rapidly and almost wholly disappeared before its advance".[16]

Hadžialić then cites a whole array of Western writers — some well-known, others not so well-known — in the fields of culture, history, philosophy and religion: Hadrian Reland, Hermann Keiser, etc., who, to a greater or lesser extent, claim that Islam still has much to offer to the world. Hadžialić states that Voltaire, Leibnitz, Lessing, Reimaras "and several others regarded . . . with great sympathy the natural teachings of Islam".[17]

One wonders why Hadžialić cites all these names of the people who, at one time or another, had something laudatory to say about Islam, and why the people he refers to are invariably Europeans? In our opinion, the underlying consideration with Hadžialić and other Bosniak advocates of the reform of Muslims was the same as with Muhammad Iqbal who, in his *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam* refers to Bergson, Nietzsche, Goethe, Spengler and others. This seems to represent the desire to reinforce the position of Islam as a religion which was capable of remaining a guiding force in the modern world a position that even respectable non-Muslim scholars acknowledged.

There are numerous texts in which the Bosniak Muslim reformists speak of the power of Islam to absorb useful elements from outside its own civilizational orbit. Islam had encountered in the past Greek philosophy and the intellectual and cultural legacy of Persia and India. It emerged from these encounters even more powerful and vigorous, and even more enriched culturaly and civilizationally. The question that inescapably faced the Bosniak reformists in the 20th century was: why was Islam in our time unable to encounter Europe and the West in the manner Islam had done in the past? Why did Islam emerge in the past as a more powerful entity after its encounters with other entities, whereas that is not happening to-day?

On this point, Hadžialić cites a work by Dr Josef Lippl entitled *Der Islam nach Eutstehung, Entwicklung und Lehre*, as follows:

> Islam means a great advance on the part of humanity. Its power and vigour lie in the harmony it has created between religion and life. Islam as a religion is not responsible for the moral disarray and spiritual languidity in the Islamic world.
>
> For the sake of their present and future position, Muslims must come into close contact with the European spiritual and cultural life. Islam permits this. It accepts alien ideas into its conceptual world. This is evidenced by the syncretic, and thus receptive, character of Islam throughout its history. It is not at all

[16] Ibid., 211.
[17] Ibid.

> necessary that that contact (between Islam and Europe) will lead to atheism. Islam in India shows that it can receive even the most modern cultural ideals. Positive Islam is wholly reconcilable with modern ideas. [On the other hand,] the Christianization of Islam is unthinkable.[18]

In the works of religious reformists in Bosnia such as Salih Hadžialić and Husein Đozo (d. 1982), as in the works of secular reformists such as A. Hifzi Bjelevac (d. 1972), Edhem Bulbulović (d. 1953) and others, no effort was made to explain what was meant by the expression "the modern ideas" of Europe, nor to elucidate what was meant by "progress" and similar terms. The authors assumed that their readers knew the core meanings of those terms and expressions.

Hadžialić is, of course, aware that an Islamic renaissance will not come from Europe itself. He says:

> The Islamic world, despite its humanity and tolerance towards Europe, is still the subject of European hatred and persecution. . .
> If [the Muslims] expect Europe to uplift them and make them more cultured, they will never live to see that day. The Islamic peoples must take care of their own life and survival. They must seek a solution to their existential problems in Islam itself. They have the right to demand of Islam, as a universal and absolutely true religion, to give them all the norms and principles with which they will be able to meet the demands of life and culture.[19]

With these words, Hadžialić calls upon the majority of Bosnian Muslim reformists of the 20th century to attempt to make a new, fresh, constructive interpretation of Islam. He cites Jamāl al-Dīn Afghānī (d. 1897), Muḥammad 'Abduh (d. 1905), 'Abd al-Azīz Jāwīsh, 'Aṭā' Bey al-Ḥusnī, Muhammad Iqbal (d. 1938), Syed Ameer Ali (d. 1928), Chirāgh 'Ali (d. 1895), Orhan Midhat and other world-renowned thinkers who had embarked upon a new interpretation of Islam. All these thinkers were more or less known in Bosnia, and the reformists modelled their thinking on their ideas.

Hadžialić particularly singles out Ameer Ali who, in his opinion, had set for himself the task of "defending Islam against the erroneous Christian allegations and presenting the philosophical and ethical spirit of Islam, in the hope that Muslims would bring about their own cultural and moral renaissance".[20] Muslims must embark upon the task of "freeing reason from its shackles" says Hadžialić, adding: "We must not restrict ourselves to certain

---

[18] Ibid., 212.
[19] Ibid.
[20] Ibid., 213.

formalities that serve no purpose; instead we must operate rationally, in the [true] spirit of Islam".[21]

Concluding this review of Hadžialić's work, it may be added that there are few reformist texts of this period that go into a more detailed account of which formalities the Muslims of Bosnia should in fact reject. There are, in particular, very few texts that, following Syed Ameer Ali's expression, explain what it means to operate according to the spirit of Islam.

For the most part, the meaning of the phrases employed by Afghānī such as "formalism is our enemy", "let us turn to the spirit of Islam", "let us free reason from its shackles", "let us operate rationally", and so on, are reminiscent of the Englightenment ideas. It would not be difficult for intelligent readers to guess what these phrases actually meant.

Mehmed Beg Kapetanović Ljubušak

Even before the appearance of the earlier-mentioned work by Amīr Shakīb Arslān, the Bosniaks themselves had written many works and brochures in which the subject of 'progress' in general and of the 'advancement' of the Muslims of Bosnia and Hercegovina in particular, had been discussed. One such work, as already mentioned, was by Mehmed Beg Kapetanović Ljubušak, and was titled *Budućnost ili napredak Muhamedovaca u Bosni i Hercegovini*, a work to which we have referred earlier. It probably need not be emphasized that the Bosniak writings of this type express approval of modernization, alongside insisting that they must necessarily preserve the 'spirit of Islam' among the Bosniak people.

Ljubušak published his work in 1893 during the fifteen-year period of Austro-Hungarian rule in Bosnia. This author is all prasises for the 'new order' in Bosnia and encourages the fellow Bosniaks to open up to the Austro-Hungarian authorities. Instead of the term 'Muslim', the author uses 'Muhammadan', which was quite popular at that time, and was considered an acceptable usage in the inner circles of the Austro-Hungarian authorities.[22] Ljubušak characterises the Austro-Hungarian regime as a "cultured and powerful government" and thinks that the empire is leading Bosnia to "well-

[21] Ibid.

[22] In the periodical *Behar*, vol. I (1900), the writer and reformist Osman Nuri Hadžić (d. 1937) published an article entitled 'Muslimani, a ne muhamedanci! — Poslanik, a ne prorok i propheta! ("Jedan Predlog) ("Muslims, not Mohammedans! The Messenger, not seer and prophet! A proposition"). Osman Nuri Hadžić sets out arguments for the rejection of the use of the word Mohammedan and other terms of the kind in the Bosnian language, since these were neither in accordance with the Bosniak tradition nor with the *Sharī'ah* (p. 1).

being". Ljubušak later says that despite the well-being brought by the Austro-Hungarian regime, there were in Bosnia those Bosniaks who "have doubts about our destiny and our future". He notes that there are many Mohammedans, as he calls them, in Bosnia, who have become resigned to their fate and "leave things to others: doing nothing, conducting no business, but merely vainly bemoaning their fate, losing time and missing favourable opportunities that they will never easily be able to attain". Such Mohammedans "remain backward" when they should be enjoying progress. Ljubušak then says that he understands some of the doubts entertained by his fellow countrymen, because they find themselves under the Christian rule and do not know what will become of them: " . . . for there has never before been a single case anywhere of more than half a million Mohammedans living in full liberty under the protection of a Christian ruler, as is the case with us now in our beloved homeland where we are living in such comfort".[23]

It can be clearly seen from these words of Ljubušak that the Bosniak 'bey' class of his day was taking note, closely and anxiously, of the final stage of the colonization of Muslim countries by the European powers. In Bosnia, as elsewhere in the Islamic world, an effort was being made by Muslim scholars to make their compatriots fully understand the phenomenon of the complete submission of Muslims to colonial powers. Many saw in the arrival of the Austro-Hungarian authorities the culmination of a global colonization plan and a colonial conspiracy against the Islamic world. Thus, when Ljubušak refers to the "protection of a Christian ruler" enjoyed by "half a million Mohammedans" in Bosnia, he is not merely conveying the fears and discomfiture of his fellow Bosnian "Mohammedans", but also his own.[24]

Despite these fears, Ljubušak wants to be realistic and warns his fellow countrymen that the Ottoman Empire will never return. He directs his warning at those Bosniaks. ". . . who have doubts about our good fortune and progress . . . who recall a time when the Mohammedan element ruled and had settled in Hungary, Slavonia, Lika and Krbava, and in parts of Poland as well".[25]

But new times have come, says Ljubušak, adding that: ". . . all the Mohammedans have been driven out and have crossed the Sava and Danube rivers in naked bodies, so that in the eastern regions they barely escaped with their lives".[26]

---

[23] *Budućnost ili napredak Muhamedovaca u Bosni i Hercegovini*, 4.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid., 5.

There were, then, fears among the Bosniaks, but Ljubušak claims that there was no need to fear Austro-Hungary, for "everyone knows that they have long since given up their religious wars and Crusades".[27] Ljubušak means to say that although Austro-Hungary is a Christian power, it is not necessarily driven by the crusading spirit. Ljubušak is childishly enthusiastic in his loyalty to the Austro-Hungarian authorities, saying:

> As soon as the Austro-Hungarian units had crossed the wave-tossed Sava river, as soon as they had stepped on the soil of our homeland, they could easily have forced us all to flee before them, banishing us from our own country in our naked bodies as happened at the same time to our brothers in Nikšić, Montenegro, and many other places in the Serbian kingdom.[28]

Ljubušak is grateful to Austro-Hungary, in other words, for not having behaved like Serbia and Montenegro. It follows, *eo ipso,* from this that in Ljubušak's opinion, it is better "for us" in Bosnia to be under Austro-Hungarian rather than Serbian rule, since the Austro-Hungarian empire is a "cultured and powerful state" . . . which has "guaranteed equality before the law for all, and given us complete religious and civil freedom, which the adherents of every religion now enjoy to the fullest extent".[29]

Ljubušak then lauds the Austro-Hungarian Emperor Franz Josef II, and extols in his treatise the saying of "unto Caesar that which is Caesar's and unto God that which is God's". In this case the 'Caesar' is the Austro-Hungarian Emperor, rather than the Ottoman Sultan. If the principle of "unto Caesar that which is Caesar's and unto God that which is God's" is honoured, Bosnia would be "peaceful", says Ljubušak. The impression one gets is that Ljubušak would like to convince his fellow countrymen that the principle of "unto Caesar that which is Caesar's and unto God that which is God's" is in fact an Islamic principle of which the Bosniaks alone had thus far not been aware.

Ljubušak later describes the religious freedom enjoyed by the Muslims of Bosnia:

> In the mosques our *ḥāfizes* recite the *muqābalah,* our *hodžas* constantly deliver their *wa'ẓ* (sermon), the *mudarrisīn* hold regular *dars* in the *madrasahs,* lesser *hodžas* teach small children in the *maktabs,* our *ḥājjīs* go each year with their leader, the *Ra'īs* [*al-'ulamā'*] to the Ka'bah, . . . there is not a living soul that

[27] Ibid.
[28] Ibid.
[29] Ibid., 5–6.

> would dare to touch our sacred objects, and we do enjoy full equality in every respect. . . .[30]

Throughout this work, Ljubušak describes in these and similar words the order that the Austro-Hungarians had introduced with their coming to power in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the fact that the authorities of the state did not subject the Muslims to expulsions and genocide.

Ljubušak is grateful to Austria for its absence of ill-will towards Muslims, or at least that it is less malevolent than other colonial powers. Indeed, there are too many uncomfortable passages in the writings of the 20th century Bosniak 'Islamic' and 'Muslim' authors which express gratitude for not subjecting Muslims to greater harm. In other words, it was the norm to justify the "lesser evil" and to accept it as a "good".[31]

In this context, Ljubušak notes that Austro-Hungary is better than Russia, because:

> Russia behaves appallingly towards our Muslim brethren, as is well known to all of us. It gives the unfortunate Yahūdīs [Jews] no peace, but . . . mercilessly persecutes them every day . . . .[32]

Ljubušak mentions the Jews in order to suggest that if Russia behaves in this way towards the Jews, what then can we expect her to do with the Muslims? With this passage he indirectly suggests to the Bosniaks that they were fortunate to have been under the Austro-Hungarian rule, because all other colonial powers had behaved with Muslims with great harshness and severity. In Ljubušak's words:

> Let us look at the situation in some Muslim countries and see how our brothers are treated, and then assess our own situation and position. In Algeria under the French, in India under the British, in short, nowhere in the world do Mohammedans under Christian rule live more freely and more at ease than we

---

[30] Ibid., 7.

[31] I recall *Ra'īs al-'ulamā'* Naim-efendi Hadžiabdić (d. 1987) once saying at a session of the Educational and Academic Council of the Islamic Theological Faculty in 1983, while reflecting on the course of this "logic of justifying the lesser evil", that it was a good thing that Bosnia had been under Tito's Communist rule since 1945. For if by any chance the scales had tipped in 1945 in favour "of the Ustasha" — the military units that were trying to bring about the so-called 'Greater Croatia' — or "into the hands of the Chetniks" — the military units supporting the creation of the so-called 'Greater Serbia' — we Bosnian Muslims would have ceased to exist". During the war of aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina of 1992–1995, I frequently recalled this speech by *Ra'īs al-'Ulamā'* Hadžiabdić.

[32] *Budućnost ili napredak Muhamedovaca u Bosni i Hercegovini*, 8.

do in this homeland of ours under the famous and ancient chivalrous house of Habsburg.[33]

The conclusion, quite clearly, is that the "Mohammedans of Bosnia" will have a good and prosperous future. But, as Ljubušak says, in the true reformist spirit, the Bosnian Mohammedans must develop the habit of hard work. Ljubušak advocates progress in these words:

> No people remains at the level it was formerly at, but advances in accordance with its potential and with time. There is no need to remain eternally true to the old ways which were once of value; instead one should move in step with the times.[34]

After this appeal to "advance", and after listing all the advantages that, in his view, "marching in step with the times" brings with it, Ljubušak reminds the Bosniaks that they are no longer a part of the Ottoman Empire and in an era reckoned by the *hijrah* calendar; they are rather part of Europe and in the 19th century of the Gregorian calendar.[35]

Social reform cannot succeed without a thorough and effective reform of the educational system. Ljubušak also speaks of the good teaching methods that the Austro-Hungarian authorities introduced in Bosnia. "Formerly it took several years merely to learn to read and write, and now, with the new ways, it takes no more than three or four months", he writes.[36]

Ljubušak then assures his Muslim readers that Islam itself calls for progress, saying: "Our *dīn* does not impede us in progress and well-being".[37]

In a passage of his treatise Ljubušak, quite unusually and unexpectedly, calls Muḥammad the Messenger of Islam, "our saint". This appears in a short passage in which he says that the Austro-Hungarian regime is willing to erect "many schools for us in Bosnia", "and has already erected many". Then Ljubušak proceeds to say that there are already schools, and that there is no need therefore to go to faraway countries, to "go to [as far as] China" to acquire knowledge:

> Our saint [to wit, the Prophet Muḥammad] told us: . . . "Seek knowledge from the cradle to the grave". Every Muhammadan must know that knowledge is highly valued, and that the *Sharī'ah* directs us to it, and I repeat, we have no need

[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid., 12.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Ibid., 13.
[37] Ibid.

to go to China when we can learn here at home. All that we need is the desire and the will to do so.[38]

Ljubušak is aware that the new educational system is aimed, above all, at young people, and adds: "In my opinion, our future lies above all in our youth; if we endeavour to teach and educate our children as the times demand of us, then our future and our present alike will be even more stable and secure".[39]

Ljubušak, like many other 20th century Muslim writers of Bosnia and Herzegovina, compares Bosnia with Muslim Spain. We may discern at least two reasons in his drawing this comparison.

(a) The first is evident: Bosnia was, and can once again be, a place of the flowering of many arts and sciences, just as was Islamic Spain.

(b) The second purpose in comparing Bosnia with Islamic Spain is not openly stated. Bosnia, too, God forbid, could suffer the fate of Islamic Spain, from which the Muslims and the Jews were expelled following the fall of Granada in 1492, a process which finally ended in 1610.[40]

If the Muslims of Spain thus ceased to be, although they were educated, prosperous and 'progressive', what could that mean for the Bosniaks of the 20th century, who are poor, backward and 'retrogressive'? This is the main point in these comparisons between Bosnia and Islamic Spain.

Ljubušak writes that "even today there are libraries in Europe that are full of Arabic books of varioius kinds".[41] He immediately adds — and this is something that is articulated by almost every Islamic reformist in Bosnia — that the learning of Islamic Spain "forms the foundation of all learning and science today. The Arabs were not doubting and hesitant, but incessantly worked and studied".[42] The conclusion is clear: the Bosniaks, too, must "incessantly work and study", and not have doubts and hesitations about their future in Bosnia.

Ljubušak is a fierce critic, however, of the behaviour of the Bosniaks and of their fear of the schools opened by the Austro-Hungarian regime. Thus, he avers: "Is it not a shame and a sad thing to see that there are only two or three of our Mohammedan children in the commercial school in Mostar, while the children of other faiths pack the schools? This can never be forgiven . . ".[43]

Ljubušak goes on to say:

---

[38] Ibid.
[39] Ibid., 15.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid.
[43] Ibid., 15–16.

> Our young people are capable of every kind of study, and this is fitting to them; they are well able to serve the state in any capacity; let us only consider the great vezir Sokolović Mehmed Pasha, or Sinan Pasha, or the military leader Hercegli Ahmet Pasha, or the Shaikh al-Islam Refik Effendi, together with many other pashas and effendis; all these are the sons of our beloved homeland, as history will testify as long as this world endures.[44]

Ljubušak encourages "Mohammedans" to take up the Bosnian language and begin to use it to write on religious subjects. It is no sin to do so. "It is very easy for us Bosniaks to learn, especially in our mother tongue. Our language is both succinct and very rich, and our forebears . . . already wrote to some extent [in Bosnian] in those days [to wit, the Ottoman period], for example Ilhamija from Travnik, Gaibija from Zvornik, Kaimija . . .".[45] Ljubušak at times demands quite acerbically of the Bosniaks that they attend the Austro-Hungarian schools or gymnasia. He cites a reformist rhyming slogan that sounds, in Bosnian, like a verse: "It's better to learn in the gymnasia than to go to Asia".[46]

Ljubušak calls upon his people to learn German. He states that Sultan Mehmed II al-Fātiḥ (who conquered Bosnia in 1463) himself "knew very well how to read and write Greek and Latin".[47] One should be able to read books in German, for there is no harm as such in reading works in German — or any other language for that matter — unless, of course, one reads something that will have damaging effects. Ljubušak says that religious scholars must tell the people that studying European subjects is not contrary to Islam:

> Our leading figures and dignitaries, our *hodžas* and *hājjīs*, if they wish for the well-being and advancement of their clan and lineage, should say openly and explicitly, and demonstrate from day to day, that it does no harm to our religion to accept and learn all this nicely, and to move with the time and to have business dealings and that all this will not lead to any bad effects.[48]

Ljubušak sees progress everywhere in Bosnia. He speaks of how "animal husbandry, the rural economy, and so on are improving". He even adds that "we see around our country that we now have a fine breed of horse, so that in this line too we have made significant advances". Nor does Ljubušak forget to

---

[44] Ibid., 16.

[45] Ibid.

[46] Ibid., 17. Asia, in this slogan, does not mean the continent of Asia, but the Ottoman Empire, which Ljubušak, in 1893 when this work of his was published, definitively dismisses as a place where one can not go to acquire knowledge.

[47] Ibid., 18.

say that tobacco production has also progressed, for "a single village now obtains more money" from the sale of tobacco leaf "than did the whole of Hercegovina previously".[49]

In his treatise (published in 1893), Ljubušak states that the "Germans . . . are a cultured and educated people, who act out of philanthropy, wishing to make each of us happy and to set us on the right path".[50] He also cites some verses in praise of the ruling House of Hapsburg. He quotes the following lines (which he probably wrote himself):

> Under the famous Habsburg House
> The peoples are developing,
> Without distinction, in liberty,
> Enjoying all their rights.[51]

Ljubušak dedicates the final part of his treatise to the problem of the emigration of Bosnian Muslims to Turkey. He is opposed to such emigration, which certain *hodžas* had encouraged and dignified by equating it with *hijrah*. In Ljubušak's view, this is not *hijrah* at all, for in emigrating to Turkey, the Bosniaks "have done neither themselves nor the place to which they have emigrated any good".[52] Ljubušak goes on to say: "To leave one's homeland and go to another country for so little, and on account of no painful suffering, is a great sin, which no patriot would commit".[53]

Ljubušak rouses his fellow countrymen, saying: ". . . one must endure for a while, struggle, strive to banish those troubled feelings, rather than resolve at once to emigrate".[54]

Faik Zeki

Through his writing as well as deeds Ljubušak had an immense influence on Islamic reformists and their enlightened thinking in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the first half of the 20th century. This is particularly noticeable in the writings of Mehmed Džemaludin Čaušević (d. 1938), Dževadbeg Sulejmanpašić, H. Ajni Bušatlić (d. 1946), and others. After him, a great many

[49] Ibid., 23.
[50] Ibid., 24.
[51] Ibid.
[52] Ibid., 25.
[53] Ibid.
[54] Ibid.

treatises dealing with the question of the "advancement" or "backwardness" of the Bosniak and other Muslim peoples were published.

Behar, a periodical intended both to inform and to entertain, which first appeared in 1900, disseminated enlightened, revivalist and progressive ideas among the Muslims of Bosnia.[55] In the May 1, 1907 issue of *Behar*, a certain Faik Zeki (probably penname for Čaušević) wrote an article entitled: "Why do Islamic Peoples not Progress"? In this essay Faik Zeki, in consonance with hundreds of other Bosniak progressive and reformist writers, identifies two groups as responsible for the backwardness of Muslims. The first group is that of *'ulamā'*, and the second, of despotic governments under which the Muslims are living. Faik Zeki writes:

> Islam does not recognize a priestly caste (*lā rahbāniyyata fi 'l-Islām*). Islam does not recognise the inspiration of the holy spirit . . . but permits every educated Muslim to study and interpret religious books, and if he interprets them correctly and well, he will be rewarded; and if he errs in so doing, he will still not be punished for the human mind is not capable of understanding everything.
>
> But to the misfortune of the Islamic world there arose, with the passage of time, a priestly caste, despite the fact that Islam recognises no such thing nor can it do so. *Hodža*s, or the so called *'ulamā'*, differ in their outward appearance from the rest of the Muslim world, so that when one sees them on the street, or at home with their venerable white beard, their great white *aḥmadiyyah* turban and long black or green *jubbah*, the impression they make upon one is that of a truly scholarly people, until one begins to converse with them, when as soon as they open their mouths one is simply saddened to have the illusion in which one was living so rapidly destroyed.[56]

Faik Zeki says about the *hodža*s that "as a result of their lack of education and understanding, they expose religion according to their own views, and instead of benefiting the people, they harm them at every step . . .".[57] He regards it as a matter of great shame that the Muslims do not study the West, adding that "today's *hodža*s still regard it as superfluous, and even sinful, to take account of the West and to have a closer acquaintance with its spiritual progress".[58]

---

[55] The editors of *Behar* were Safvet Beg Bašagić (d. 1934), Edhem Mulabdić (d. 1954), Džemaludin Čaušević (d. 1938), and Šemsibeg Salihbegović.

[56] Faik Zeki, "Why do Islamic Peoples not Progress?" in *Behar* (May 1, 1907), 378.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid.

Concluding his characterization of the first group responsible for the backwardness of Islamic peoples, namely the *'ulamā'*, Faik Zeki succinctly observes: "Thus, one of the chief causes of the decline of the Muslim world is that Islam has fallen into the hands of obscurantist ignoramuses, the so-called pseudo-*'ulamā'*, who do not know their faith, and what they do know they do not understand".[59]

The second group of people responsible for the backwardness of Muslim peoples, according to Faik Zeki, are tyrannical rulers of the Muslim countries: "The unparallelled tyranny and appalling absolutism of Muslim rulers is primarily to blame for the Islamic world's having begun to decline abruptly as early as the times when the Christian forces in the West were scheming against Islam . . .".[60] Faik Zeki adds that Muslim rulers do not like either to have a constitution or to govern according to one. "From this perspective, [a constitution] appears to oriental rulers to be some kind of a monster . . .".[61]

Faik Zeki expresses his other opinions in a similar vein. His articles in *Behar* were a radical critique of the Muslim situation at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries.

Osman Nuri Hadžić

In 1894 Osman Nuri Hadžić (d. 1937), a Bosniak writer who wrote extensively on Islam and its history, and on the Qur'ān and the Prophet Muḥammad (peace be on him), during the Austro-Hungarian period as well as under the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, published a book in Zagreb entitled *Islam i kultura* ("Islam and Culture"). He also published a work in Sarajevo in the *Gajret* collection entitled *Islam i prosvjeta* ("Islam and Education") (published *circa* 1903). Osman Nuri Hadžić's works embody reflections on how to overcome the contemptible situation of the Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina. His works are also written from the perspective of a revivalist, enlightenment and reformist ideology. We shall return to him later, after speaking of thinkers who, in one way or another, contributed to the debate on the issues given prominence by Čaušević in his well-known statements (in the lecture he gave on 6 December 1927 in his capacity as President of the Muslim Intelligentsia).

A Bosniak by the name of Alija Hotić dealt with the issue of the backwardness of Islamic peoples in a brochure entitled *Uzroci propadanja islamskih naroda*[62] ("Causes of the Decline of the Islamic Peoples"). There are

---

[59] Ibid.

[60] Ibid., 379.

[61] Ibid.

[62] (N.p.: Bosanski Novi, 1913).

several passages in this work which betray the influence of Mehmed Beg Kapetanović Ljubušak.

Ahmet Đumišić

Ahmet Đumišić, another scholar who followed the reformist line, published a work entitled *Ko smeta napretku i prosvjećivanju muslimana, a osobito muslimanki*[63] ("Who is Obstructing the Advancement and Education of the Muslims, especially Muslim Women?"). Ahmet Đumišić's book expresses the views of the Muslim educational and charitable society called 'Spas', which was active in Banja Luka. Taken as a whole, this work of Đumišić's addresses the plight of Muslim women during the First World War and the period immediately following it. Poverty, the numerous widows left behind by the Bosniaks who had been killed, the vogue of prostitution, beggary and exploitation of women: these are the subjects on which Đumišić speaks. His booklet offers a somewhat sombre picture of Bosnia after the First World War.

Đumišić begins by stating that the *hodža*s and the Muslim intellectuals are to blame for "our Muslim situation" and for "the decline of our womenfolk". "It is not the women who are to blame, but we ourselves, our Muslim intelligentsia is to blame, our *hodža*s are to blame (with a few honourable exceptions), and our older, wealthier Muslim men".[64]

For Đumišić, the *hodža*s are to blame because they say in their *wa'ẓ* (sermon) that women will go "to hell if they learn to read"'. The *hodža*s are thereby "condemning women to backwardness" and thus "gravely sinning against Islam . . .".[65]

Đumišić then refers to a poem by Shaykh Muḥammad 'Abduh in which he accuses the "white turbans" (that is, the ignorant and conservative *hodža*s) of being the chief threat to Islam:

I care not that the world wonders:
'Has Muḥammad recovered yet,
Or is the veil of mourning and death
Wound around his icy forehead?'

But I fear for my beloved faith,
In whose bliss I am ever renewed,
Lest in this century of ours

---

[63] (Banja Luka: Tiskara Fon i Grgić, 1919).
[64] Ibid., 3.
[65] Ibid., 4.

The white turbans bring black disaster upon it.[66]

At the same time, Đumišić is also of the view that secular Muslim intellectuals failed to work for the cultural upliftment of their people. "The entire activity of the majority of our intelligentsia . . . is to go from office to home, from home to office, or to go a while to *akšamluk* (evening entertainment parties)", says Đumišić. There are passages in Đumišić's treatise where he expresses his frank opinion about the secular Bosniak Muslim intellectuals of his time, whom he addresses directly, at times quite openly and without mincing words:

> You somewhat more intelligent people sneer, considering yourselves to be superior, because you attended high schools, but you thereby show yourselves to be much inferior . . . since many of you originated from poor families and you know . . . what our people need, but you do nothing for them, for the people with whose money you obtained your education . . .[67]

Ahmet Đumišić is of the view that the post-war period had affected the Muslim women most seriously of all. Men who did not go to battle-field in the First World War have "exploited the wretched situation of Muslim women, seeking to win them over to their bestial lusts".[68] He says further:

> Imagine the needs of a woman, the unhappy mother of children! Her husband is in the army, and she is without anyone to support her, she has sold everything she owns to feed her children, she has nothing left, the children are crying, wanting bread, the unhappy mother's heart is breaking, and she has nowhere to turn to for help. Those who could help will do so, but the condition is loss of honour and faithfulness to her husband . . .[69]

Thus Đumišić describes the moral decline of the Bosnian Muslim society during and after the First World War. He then criticizes the emergence of the petty bourgeoisie among a class of women "who know neither how to read nor to write", but "want a piano", for they want to be "modern". Such women

> . . . have become accustomed to idleness, to showing off their finery and strolling about; they want a piano but they scarcely know how to read and write, [and they] abandon their home and their children to servants [who are] without any education and most of whom are morally fallen. Others see them and desire the

[66] Ibid., 4–5.
[67] Ibid., 16.
[68] Ibid., 7.
[69] Ibid.

same, and they too become accustomed to idleness, to flaunting themselves, to thriftlessness, to laziness. . .[70]

Đumišić pleads for the "morally strong women" who will "read instructive works", who will take upon themselves the "social responsibility" to be educated and canny and, as such, "will not fall a prey to masculine lust". He pleads for women "to raise themselves from their subordinate status to an equal degree of humanity and dignity, where as wives they will be their husbands' comrade in life; their soul-mate, and not slave . . .".[71]

Đumišić powerfully urges the Muslim women to have social commitment. He finds a basis for this in the Muslim practice in the early days of Islam: "Read the Islamic history of the Arabs, and you will see how many Islamic poetesses and women writers there were. You will see that Zaynab, Ḥažrat 'Alī's daughter, astonished the people at the great encounter in Kūfah by her oratorical skills".[72]

Đumišić's intention is here perfectly clear: if Muslim women could give public lectures in the early days of Islam, and to an audience of men at that, why should not Bosniak women?

Like many other authors referred to in this book, Đumišić often describes the situation of the Bosniak Muslims. This description often comes down to lamentation, but what is lacking is a clear plan for the way out of the predicament.

✿ ✿ ✿

Reconciliation of Religion and Reason

A particular genre of 20th century Muslim Bosniak literature takes as its main theme is the reconciliation of faith (Islam) and reason. Hafiz Bekir ef. Fejzagić (a professor at the Banja Luka general gymnasium) and Munib ef. Cerić (*maktab* officer at the Waqf Directorate in Sarajevo) translated a treatise on this theme, on the relationship between faith (*dīn*) and sound reason (*al-'aql al-salīm*). The full Arabic title of this treatise is *al-Dīn fi Naẓar al-'Aql al-Salīm*, written by the Arab thinker Dr Muḥammad Tawfīq Ṣidqī.[73] Perhaps it need not be pointed out here that this treatise, like many others of its kind, demonstrates that reason is valued by Islam, that Islam is rational. He also

[70] Ibid., 8.
[71] Ibid., 9.
[72] Ibid., 15.
[73] A partial translation of this booklet in Bosnian under the title *Vjera i zdrav razum* ("Faith and Common Sense") was published in Sarajevo in 1914.

stresses that there is no conflict between Islam and reason, since both come to us from God. This is the thrust not only of this but also of many other treatises of this kind among the Bosniaks of the 20th century.

Nevertheless, treatises of this kind had another hidden message, at least among the Bosniak Muslims. If the word 'reason' implies 'Europe', then the message is that there is no contradiction between Islam and Europe, which means, *eo ipso*, that the Bosniaks of Europe can be good Muslims.

This is the underlying idea, the conceptual basis of a large number of treatises on Islam in the 20th century. Thus Adem Bise published a book entitled *Da li može musliman živjeti evropskim kulturnim životom i ostati dobar musliman (Kur'an u teoriji i praksi)*[74] ("Can a Muslim live a European Cultural Life and remain a good Muslim according to the Qur'ān in Theory and Practice?"). Treatises dealing with the issue of the youth were also written along the same lines. Šefkija Bubić, for example, wrote a treatise entitled *Kuda ćemo s našom omladinom?*[75] ("Where Shall We Go with Our Youth?"). The usual response to this question was that the salvation of the young people lies in education, and that the enlightened and educated will easily find the way not only to Islam, but also to all other good things.

Status of Muslim Women

During the first decades of the 20th century a number of acrimonious books and treatises were focused on "the advancement of the people", but in the context of all these treatises there was the question of Muslim women. Ever more frequent calls for Bosniak Muslim women to become involved in social life, to become educated and literate, were heard. In this connection there were also calls that the *zar* and *feredža*, the full veil, should be discarded. The reasoning was that Islam did not ordain that women shall veil their faces, as many said in Bosnia at that time.

A radical solution to the question of "revealing the faces of Muslim women" was offered by Dževad Beg Sulejmanpašić in his booklet *Muslimansko žensko pitanje, jedan prilog njegovu rješenju*[76] ("The Question of Muslim Women: A Proposal for its Solution).

Sulejmanpašić says that he wrote his booklet while Bosnia was still ruled by the Austro-Hungarian Empire; but "the censorship banned its publication because its contents were '*antoszig*' (inappropriate). . .". He claims that the

[74] (Tuzla: n.p., 1937).
[75] (Sarajevo: n.p., 1934).
[76] (Sarajevo: Author, 1918).

censorship took this step because "it did not suit the Austro-Hungarian authorities that the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina should ever become enlightened and civilized . . ."[77].

Sulejmanpašić then states that the issue of the social status of Muslim women was regarded as an untouchable subject, one "which no one other than the informed should touch upon".[78] The issue was not made public, but was held to be in some way sacrosanct, for the very reason that "this sacrosanct matter is our women". For all that, Sulejmanpašić had the courage to bring the subject onto the agenda. "I was the first to do so in such an open manner . . .".[79] And he did so because he saw the backwardness of Muslim women everywhere:

> The present-day condition of the Muslim women of Bosnia and Hercegovina, particularly urban women, tells us clearly and openly that with their poverty and backwardness they are leading all the Muslims of Bosnia and Hercegovina to poverty and backwardness, and in consequence of these, to their extinction, if rapid and fundamental changes are not undertaken.[80]

Sulejmanpašić then refers to *Reis ul ulama* [*Ra'īs al-'ulamā'*] Čaušević in order to reinforce his views on the subject. He points out that the Bosnian Muslims had spent forty years under the Austro-Hungarian rule, during which time they withdrew unto themselves, failing to take advantage of this opportunity for advancement, and that then "the wheel of history toppled" on the Bosniak Muslims. This is one of the causes of our backwardness, states Sulejmanpašić.

Another cause of Muslim backwardness, in Sulejmanpašić's view, is the belief that the *Sharī'ah* law cannot be changed:

> The Qur'ān, which goes to the heart of criminal, inheritance, family, civil and state law, leaves very little room for the legislators of the later centuries to adapt these laws to the historical imperatives of the later centuries. And since all the Qur'ānic precepts are Divine, are holy writ, it is clear that it is very difficult to alter anything, since state laws that are based upon Divine commandments had a completely different and inviolable authority from man-made laws.[81]

Sulejmanpašić says that the Austro-Hungarian authorities knew in 1878 that the Bosniaks had a deep respect for Islam, and that during their

---

[77] Ibid., 3.
[78] Ibid., 5.
[79] Ibid.
[80] Ibid., 6.
[81] Ibid., 10.

administration in Bosnia they did not wish to introduce reforms in such a way as "to deeply offend the ingrained Islamic sentiments of its new citizens".[82] As a radical modernist, Sulejmanpašić reproaches the Austro-Hungarian authorities on this account, saying that the Austrians should have forced us to "alter our way of life":

> They should have forced us to send our children to school and to be apprenticed to a craft, to reform in the spirit of the times the *maktab*s and *madrasah*s, they should have forced us to give our womenfolk a different position in the family and in society, as the 'new era' demanded.[83]

But the Austro-Hungarian Empire was no more in 1918, and as if nothing had occurred, we are still "backward", says Sulejmanpašić, with the life of Bosniak Muslims remaining for the most part just as it was prior to the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia in 1878.

Sulejmanpašić does not have much to say about the *hodža*s, nor about the pro-Western intelligentsia. He merely says, and that too briefly, is that the *hodža*s did not wish, and the intelligentsia did not know, how to change our situation.[84]

He further calls upon the intelligentsia to offer "our masses a modern interpretation of the Qur'ān and the *Sharī'ah*".[85] Sulejmanpašić does not say what a modern interpretation of the Qur'ān and the *Sharī'ah* consists of, all that he had in his mind was that the Qur'ān should be translated into the language of the people.[86]

Then, speaking of the "reform of our womenfolk", Sulejmanpašić says:

> Let us stop once and for all to point the finger to Turkey and turn our gaze upon the Russian, Egyptian and Indian Muslims. Let them be our models. The congress of Russian Muslim Women in 1917 in Kazan can be regarded as the most powerful historical document of the emancipation of Muslim women. At this congress it was concluded that women should be given all rights equally with men, that polygamy should be abolished, that education should be made compulsory for girls also, and so on.[87]

Referring to the "women's congress in Kazan", Sulejmanpašić stressed that what he was calling for in his booklet was not something isolated. It was

---

[82] Ibid., 11.
[83] Ibid.
[84] Ibid., 11–12.
[85] Ibid., 12.
[86] Ibid., 13.
[87] Ibid.

in fact a part of the process of the liberation of Muslim women that was taking place elsewhere in Muslim societies in the early 20th century.

Sulejmanpašić goes on to say that "veiling the faces of our women" is one of our "pernicious traditions". He also believes that veiling women's faces is not a religious matter, but is related to tradition which is "mingled with religiosity". In Sulejmanpašić's view, "veiling the faces of our women for a period of forty years" under Austro-Hungarian rule had brought disaster upon Boniak Muslims. Forty years is the length of time Bosnia was under Austro-Hungarian rule and, in Sulejmanpašić's opinion, "we failed to take advantage of that period, we failed to educate our womenfolk".[88] In this regard, he cites the following statistics:

> Here is the sorry picture of how backward our women are compared with the women of other faiths. The literacy levels of the women of Bosnia and Herzegovina, according to religious affinity in 1910, were the following: Muslims 673 literate, Orthodox 13,167, and Catholic 26,375; that is, although we are far more numerous than the Catholics in Bosnia and Herzegovina, our women do not have even one fortieth the literacy of Catholic women. The soul of our women is languishing in an unnatural darkness of vulgarity and ignorance.[89]

After citing these statistics pertaining to the year 1910, Sulejmanpašić issues this call:

> If we unveil their faces, they will have the same access to earnings as women of other faiths. We have no institutions to take care of orphaned and homeless girls, and if we had, they would never be able to provide for that immense number of our poor, homeless girls and women.[90]

It is interesting to note that like many of other Bosnian reformists, Sulejmanpašić often goes no further than ventilating his demands and merely describing the situation of the Muslim society in Bosnia of his time. The reformists do not make any serious attempt to determine why the Islamic community had failed to establish schools under its management which were both modern and Islamic. Neither did the reformists of Bosnia and Herzegovina say why they themselves had not joined hands to establish schools in which the education of girls would be carried by the Bosniaks in a manner that would be beyond every suspicion and provide no reason to entertain any fears.

---

[88] Ibid., 20.
[89] Ibid., 30.
[90] Ibid., 31.

Instead of offering a plan to build Bosnian schools and to create an Islamically acceptable environment for the education of Bosnian women, Sulejmanpašić simply cries out, in a dozen passages of his booklet. "Let us unveil the faces of our women", or "Let us unveil women". It is, above all, for such slogans that his booklet is remembered.

✿ ✿ ✿

Čaušević's Lecture of 1927

And yet a real wave of polemic on the subject of what "our advancement and progress" really is (and thereby the advancement and progress of our women folk) followed after the lecture delivered by Mehmed Džemaludin Čaušević in Sarajevo in 1927.

Čaušević addressed many issues in his lecture, and was particularly emphatic on the question of wearing hats, on the veiling of women (meaning the covering of the face with the *feredža*), on the question of *waqf*, whether it was necessary in perpetuity to respect the wishes of the donor of a given *waqf* or was it permissible to depart from those wishes if it became clear with the passage of time that the *waqf* was not functioning properly. *Reis ul ulama* Čaušević also spoke on the question of using the old graveyards — was it or was it not permissible to use old burial grounds for other purposes: housing, public utilities, and so on?

Let us recall, once again, that this lecture of Čaušević's aroused considerable uproar on the grounds that he had treated these issues from a liberal perspective.[91] To take an example, it could be assumed from what he said that a Muslim may wear a hat if he wore it as a kind of cap and not with the intent to appear like Christians or to identify himself with them. He also explicitly said that from the Islamic viewpoint women were not required to veil their faces. Further, as regards the conditions laid down by a *waqf* donor which, after the passage of a considerable period of time, is an obstacle to his *waqf*, Čaušević said that this condition *(sharṭ al-wāqif)* need not be respected and may be modified. He gave a liberal opinion, too, as regards the use of old burial grounds.

Reactions to Čaušević

It was not long before the Sarajevo *Jama'at Majlis* embarked upon a bitter polemic with Čaušević, and then issued a special brochure entitled *Sarajevski*

[91] For example, Čaušević who was in favour of the founding of the Gajret bank, gave permission to Muslim railway workers to wear the peaked cap, and so on. These statements of his seemed shocking at the time to the traditional Muslim circles in Bosnia.

džematski medžlis i Reisove izjave[92] ("The Sarajevo *Jama'at Majlis* and the Reis's Statements"). At about the same time Ibrahim Hakki ef. Čokić (one of the editors of the Tuzla-based *Hikjmet*) wrote a treatise entitled *O tesetturu* ("On the Veiling of Muslim Women") in which he fiercely attacked Čaušević. In his booklet *Rasprava o hidžabu* ("A Treatise on the *Ḥijāb*") Ali Riza Karabeg also shared, albeit in milder tones, these attitudes of disapproval of Čaušević's thinking and rejection of his views.[93]

It is interesting that this declaration of Čaušević's led to the convening of the Curia (the body composed of senior religious authorities, which at that time had its headquarters in Sarajevo). A particular role was played in this by the Sarajevo *Jama'at Majlis*, which issued an appeal to the Curia members "to stand resolutely in the way of the violations of the *Sharī'ah* regulations on the part of one who has been appointed to preserve them".[94]

The most vigorous contribution to the debate on the issue of Muslim advancement in Bosnia and Herzegovina on the occasion of Čaušević's statements, however, was made by Hafiz Ajni Bušatlić, a *Sharī'ah* judge. In 1928 he published a slender booklet entitled *Pitanje muslimanskog napretka u Bosni i Hercegovini (Iskrena i otvorena riječ)*[95] ("The Issue of Muslim Advancement in Bosnia and Herzegovina: A Sincere and Open Comment"). The work was published by Islamska dionička štamparija (Islamic Joint Press) and the front page reads: "On the occasion of the well-known statements by the Reis ul Ulama and others".

"We are groping in the dark without advancing, frozen to the spot, immobile, ill-adapted to the times and retrograde", wrote Bušatlić on the first page. He then cited the well-known verse from the Qur'ān which states that people have eyes but do not see, have ears but do not hear; they are like animals, "indeed, they are even worse than they" (Qur'ān 7: 179).

One may read in this appeal by Bušatlić to the message of this Qur'ānic verse his desire to urge his Bosniak compatriots, from an Islamic perspective, to commit themselves to progress and advancement. This gesture of his also constitutes a kind of encouragement to the Bosniaks to examine their position, and engage in a self-evaluative exercise.

---

[92] (Sarajevo: Jama'at Majlis, 1928).

[93] 'Jugoslovenski list' addressed the issue of unveiling Muslim women in 1928. In this regard, the writings of Omer H. Sefić are of great interest, for example his article "*Aktuelni muslimanski problemi — vakufi, feredža i fes*" ("Topical Muslim Problems — *Waqfs*, the Veil and the Fez") in *Hikjmet*, no. 15 (18 January 1928).

[94] Sarajevo, *Jama 'at Majlis*, 1928, 1.

[95] Sarajevo: Islamska dionička štamparija, 1928).

Immediately following this foreword, which is full of religious apologetics, Bušatlić speaks of "the opportunities we have missed":[96]

> We even saw the occupation of our country by the Austro-Hungarians as an evil from the point of view of culture, just as in the part we unbecomingly received Sultan Mahmut's reforms too, and instead of taking advantage of these events for our own ends, of grasping with both hands this culture and this advancement, and progressively moving forward with the rest of the cultured world, we took it all quite wrongly, stigmatizing our Caliph without justification as a *giaour* [unbeliever] and looking upon the [Austro-Hungarian] occupation, among other things, as dangerous to our faith, none of which was true, and we continued to remain backward. . . .[97]

Bušatlić also resolutely said:

> The *hojja*s blame our western-educated intelligentsia for all these reverses of our fortune, and the intelligentsia attack the *hodža*s, although both of them are in a large measure to blame for these misfortunes of ours.[98]

Criticism of the *'Ulamā'*

Bušatlić's booklet includes, after this, two sections, one entitled "*Hojja*s — the *'Ulamā'*", and the other "The Intelligentsia". In this he alludes to the principal ideological and theoretical dichotomy of Bosnia during the first decades of the 20th century. Bušatlić directs his fierce critique at both the *hojja*s and the intelligentsia. As regards the *hodža*s, he says that "they are primarily to blame for our backwardness, for throughout our entire past they have not been able to understand their difficult task of providing their people with a contemporary upbringing".[99] The *hodža*s, writes Bušatlić, have retained a monopoly over the interpretation of Islam, reminding us, in fact — as would Mohammed Arkoun, many years later — that throughout the Islamic world and in all Muslim societies the *'ulamā'* have long retained a monopoly over the symbolic wealth of Islam. Bušatlić contends that the *hodža*s have not permitted the people

> . . . even to consult religious precepts in their mother tongue, but have made our young people suffer torments for years in order to learn even the most elementary precepts of their faith in the difficult Arabic and Turkish languages

[96] Ibid., 7.
[97] Ibid.
[98] Ibid.
[99] Ibid., 8.

> instead of letting them do so in their mother tongues. This is why *jahālat* and the darkest kind of ignorance were bound to rule among the masses and bring evil consequences with them.[100]

The term "mother tongue" has been used several times in this book. In his writings Ljubu also speaks of our "beloved mother tongue". The point that Bušaltić is making here is that the *'ulamā'*s excessive dependence on a languages other than the mother tongue of the Bosniaks had had an intellectually impoverishing effect.

Furthermore, according to Bušatlić, the *'ulamā'* "have little concern to be well-read and to round out their education comprehensively, so they were bound to remain superficial in their thinking, and thus unproductive. . .".[101] In the same passage he laments: "We have had almost no *'ulamā'* who have had a higher, modern and comprehensive education, let alone any who are able to present to us the true essence of Islam . . .".[102]

After giving vent to some further criticisms of the retrograde *'ulamā'*, Bušatlić turns to a critique of the intelligentsia, a critique which is reminiscent of Dumišić. He says:

> We have said that a heavy responsibility for this condition in which we find ourselves is also borne by our Western-educated intelligentsia, so they too may permit us to point out to them some errors that have contributed to impeding our progress, for which impediment they are perhaps involuntarily to blame . . . .[103]

Bušatlić then rightly speaks of the dissolute behaviour of the Bosniak "Western-educated intelligentsia", which knew that "our people were afraid, without justification, of schools and of western learning . . ." By their inappropriate behaviour, says Bušatlić, the Western-educated Bosniak intellectuals alienated our youth from the Western teachings. Bušatlić goes on to say:

> Instead of being a model of conduct and behaviour, they have behaved defiantly, and produced an image, in the eyes of the masses, of western learning as something that spoils rather than ennobles, and from their very earliest beginnings either did not know how or did not wish to give an impetus to higher levels of school attendance and to the comprehensive education of our people,

---

[100] Ibid.
[101] Ibid.
[102] Ibid.
[103] Ibid., 9–10.

but indulged in eccentricity and were the cause of lack of sympathy to [modern] schools.[104]

Failings of the Intellectuals

Bušatlić's view is that the "Western-educated Bosniak intelligentsia" should have made the Austro-Hungarian schools popular with the people. Such Bosniak intellectuals, however, "on completing their higher studies, as widely and highly educated, mature people, made very little attempt to frequent the people, to raise their awareness and attract them to culture and progress. Instead of doing so, they acted in quite the contrary way, and do so till today . . .".[105]

Here Bušatlić is alluding to the fact that the "Western-educated intelligentsia" indulged in alcoholic drinks and a life of immorality, and rarely frequented the mosques, thereby in fact avoiding what was appropriate to the Bosnian Muslim people. Indeed, Bušatlić goes on to say about the intellectuals during the Austro-Hungarian regime and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia that:

> . . . the majority of them are alcoholics, and poor exemplars for their people . . . Many are fumbling in the dark, just like the *hodžas*. They frequent the people but little, doing little to help them to uplift themselves from their lethargy. And, what is very striking, they wholly neglect religious rites and do not provide enough overt evidence regarding themselves being staunch followers of their religion.[106]

Bušatlić also observes that many Muslim intellectuals married non-Muslim women.

> Yet another thing shows them to be poor patriots, and that is that many of them marry women of other faiths, thereby inflicting great damage on their Islamic community. With honourable exceptions, they continue to tipple and to criticize, instead of working and acting, instructing and teaching . . . .[107]

It should not be understood from these extracts that Bušatlić was opposed to Europe, or that he was against the "Western-educated intelligentsia" as such. That, however, was not the point of his critique. On the contrary, he reproved that the intelligentsia for failing to acquaint the Bosniaks with Europe in an appropriate manner. In this regard he says:

---

[104] Ibid., 10.
[105] Ibid.
[106] Ibid., 10–11.
[107] Ibid., 11.

> When did one of them mount the *ćurs* [the podium from which sermons are delivered in the mosque] or the cathedra, to speak to us of European culture and progress, and how to achieve it, what we should do and how we should act to advance along with the rest of the West, to tell us and to instruct us in a fine and appropriate manner about everything they had learned that was beneficial and progressive in the West, and to try to graft it on to us.
>
> Learning should not be acquired solely in order to earn one's bread, but also to transmit to others, particularly one's nearest and dearest, for their ennoblement with all the trends of civilization and culture.[108]

Approximately half way through his text, Bušatlić concludes that pro-Western Bosniak intellectuals do not act for the good of their people, and that they are almost equally as damaging as the inert *hodža*s and *'ulamā'*.

He then sets out his own seven-point plan for "our advancement" (quoted below verbatim):

1. The education and upbringing of the young generation of boys and girls in the spirit of the times, giving them the kind of reading that will enable them to refine themselves and their souls. (Bušatlić here mentions the education of 'female youth' since even in his day Bosniaks were reluctant to send their girls to modern schools.)
2. Paying the greatest attention to the upbringing of our youth in the proper and authentic Islamic spirit, facilitating their religious training with pleasant books and textbooks drawn up rationally and in tune with the spirit of the time.
3. Striving to eradicate the damaging consequences of prejudice, evil habits and customs that impede progress.
4. Striving to eliminate idling, inactivity and neglect in the upbringing of our youth and ensuring that all — boys and girls alike — address themselves to serious, hard work.
5. Striving with all the means available to us to eliminate luxurious and ill-mannered living, the enjoyment of alcohol, debauchery and similar ugly and damaging things from our society.
6. Advocating savings and a modest, well-mannered way of life, and using our savings to make this plan a reality.
7. Nor should we forget acting to nationalize our people as an indigenous element in these countries in the sense of bringing them into the fold of the civilized world, dedicated to their well-being and advancement in their national homeland.[109]

---

[108] Ibid.

[109] Ibid., 12-13.

Promoting National Awareness

Bosnian authors of the first half of the 20th century often refer to "acting to nationalize" the Muslim element. Whenever they mention "acting to nationalize the Muslim element" in this context, it usually means raising the national awareness of the Bosniaks as Bosniaks, and explaining to them that they are neither Serbs nor Croats, but a distinct "indigenous element" in Bosnia.

Shortly after this passage, Bušatlić moves on to the controversy provoked by the statements of Reis Čaušević, of whom he says that he is "our finest scholar, who is sincerely desirous of our well-being and advancement". He briefly recapitulates Čaušević's views, and does so approvingly. A Muslim woman is not required by Islam to cover her face with any kind of veil, says Bušatlić categorically, echoing Čaušević's statement. A Muslim woman should dress decently, which seems to underlie his statement that "there is no particular form of dress that is prescribed for Muslims".[110]

Feeling, however, that the issue of the veil is the most sensitive in the polemic against Čaušević, Bušatlić adds the following elucidation:

> From all this [that is, the fact that women are permitted to have their faces unveiled] it should not be concluded . . . that they are permitted to receive and to visit strangers, to visit dubious public places and dissolute entertainments, to mingle with people of other faiths, and so on, without a chaperon and without the consent of their husbands, other than in cases of need and necessity, and always on condition of preserving their honour and decency, which are sacred to all, but above all, to Muslims.[111]

Bušatlić's writing further implies that wearing a hat is not contrary to Islam, provided that in so doing it is not a manifestation of the desire to become a Christian. "Islam does not consider who is wearing a fez and who a hat", says Bušatlić.[112] As regards old burial grounds, Bušatlić says that Reis Čaušević is right in saying that such graveyards "may be used for the best of purposes". (Bušatlić does not explain what is meant by this, but Čaušević once adopted the stance, at a lecture in the Gajret Cultural Society in 1928, that schools and other humanitarian institutions, as well as residential accommodation, may be erected on the sites of old burial grounds.) Bušatlić also approves of the modification of *waqf* objectives, that is, departing from

[110] Ibid., 15.
[111] Ibid., 34–35.
[112] Ibid., 15.

the wishes of the founder, if a *waqf* has become impoverished and unproductive.

In brief, the message of Bušatlić's text is one of supporting Čaušević's stance that each individual should take responsibility for his faith and seek for his faith a place in the context of the times in which he lives. Each Muslim must promote Islam, and Čaušević "does not decree, nor could he, in his statements, what anyone should wear or hold to in his social life", says Bušatlić.[113]

Bušatlić goes on to say that it is Čaušević's duty to inform the Muslims of what is permissible in Islam and what is not, but that each individual is personally responsible to God. As he puts it:

> It is a characteristic of the Islamic faith that each one of us is responsible for himself in every regard. There is absolutely no intermediary between God and man in Islamic teachings, and our entire life must be founded upon normal work and conduct. Nor are the doors closed to common sense, which can be brought into play in the resolution of all unresolved issues . . . .[114]

Bušatlić does not approve of the attack by the Sarajevo *Jama'at Majlis* on Čaušević. He believes that such methods can be used only by those who are "spiritually impoverished"[115]. Nor does he approve of the declarations by H. M. Kurto, Mufti Mesihović, the Banja Luka Mufti Ibrahim Maglajlić (d. 1936), Ahmed Karabeg and others. Bušatlić also cites numerous intellectuals of the time who had come to the defence of Čaušević's views (for example, Osman Nuri Hadžić).

Bušatlić also addresses a very painful issue not only for the Muslims of Bosnia, but for the Muslims all over the world, and that is the proclamation by Muslims of other Muslims as unbelievers, a proclamation called *takfir*. Bušatlić is resolutely opposed to the practice of *takfir*, saying that it is well-known:

> . . . that Islamic teachings irrefutably affirm that no one may be declared a *kāfir* as long as there is [even] the shred of a sign that he is not, so why therefore is there the wish to ascribe unbelief to an individual, to call a Muslim a *kāfir*, simply because he is wearing a hat? Are not such opinions and conclusions both ridiculous and pathetic, completely contrary to Islamic teachings, and in appalling contrast to common sense, which Islam respects?[116]

---

[113] Ibid., 18.
[114] Ibid.
[115] Ibid., 19.
[116] Ibid., 34.

At the very end of this lively treatise, Bušatlić, like many other Bosniak reformists, appeals to the Muslims of Bosnia to turn to "intensive, sober and useful work" (p. 34).

Debate on Women's Issues

Many other religious and secular intellectuals took part in this reformist and enlightenment polemic with Čaušević's views. As we have seen, the Mostar religious scholar 'Alī Rizā Karabeg, who translated the Qur'ān into Bosnian (published in 1937), wrote a book entitled *Rasprava o hidžabu* ("The Veiling of Muslim Women"), which was published in Mostar in 1928 by Hrvatska tiskara.

Karabeg's book is written in archaic Bosnian, but it is not quite clear from it whether the author was categorically opposed to the unveiling of women. The author does not acknowledge the appropriateness of any kind of "progress", nor the need for adaptation to modern life. Karabeg explicitly says: "For religion is in order that human life and activity be adapted to it, and not the reverse".[117]

In his booklet Karabeg attacks all those Bosnian Muslim reformists who use Arabic literary works such as *The Thousand and One Nights* and conclude from them that Muslim women went about in Baghdad, Damascus, Cairo and so on with their faces unveiled. He says that reports in the literary works regarding Abū Nuwās, J'afar al-Barmakī, Hārūn al-Rashīd and so on cannot serve as a basis for Islamic discourse.[118]

It is only those who want to found a Kemalist school of thought in Bosnia who can appeal to such literature, asserts 'Alī Riza Karabeg. With the term 'Kemalist *madhhab*' (school of thought), he seeks to point a mocking finger at Reis Čaušević and his views on the unveiling of women. By using this expression he wanted to say that Reis Čaušević wants to carry out in Bosnia everything that Atatürk carried out in Turkey after the abolition of the Caliphate.

Karabeg stresses that the *Sharī'ah*'s precepts on the veiling of women are aimed at the covering of their bodies, and above all, their faces. He points out that the reformists are wrong in saying that the Qur'ān did not want that women's faces be covered it only wanted that the "other adornments" of women should be covered. Karabeg rejects the opinion of Bušatlić, and explicitly claims that the face is a woman's adornment *par excellence*:

---

[117] Ibid., 21.
[118] Ibid., 22.

> Is there anything in a woman more beautiful, more enchanting, more alluring, more attractive than the face? Can anything be more absurd than the assertion that any female may unconditionally walk about wherever and whenever she wants with her face unveiled?.[119]

Karabeg's writings attracted considerable attention in the Islamic newspapers and periodicals of the day, particularly the Tuzla-based *Hikjmet* which, as can be seen from the writings of A. Lutfi Čokić, adopted similar or identical views in this polemic.

Many Bosniak intellectuals of the time, however, supported Čaušević. Osman Nuri Hadžić, to whom we have already been referred, appeared at the height of the polemic in the Belgrade daily newspaper *Politika* (Politics), where he expressed his views on these issues in two articles (entitled "Feredža i fes" — "The Veil and the Fez"). In his opinion, women are equal to men in Islam, since in Islam all religious principles, and deriving from them all social and legislative principles, are equally applicable to women and to men. Women, like men, are required to believe in God, to pray, to fast, to distribute alms.

In these two articles, Osman Nuri Hadžić pleads for the commercial, judicial, administrative and religious freedom of Muslim women. He explicitly states that according to Islam, Muslim women may, on attaining the age of majority, undertake "all permissible legal activities". On other questions, too, Osman Nuri Hadžić is close to Čaušević's outlook. It should be said that with his books, and in particular his work *Muhamed a.s. i Kur'an* ("Muḥammad and the Qur'ān"),[120] Osman Nuri Hadžić exercised considerable influence on later Bosniak Muslim reformists. In this work Hadžić, has recourse to both Islamic and Western sources, and he forcefully sets out for his time the cultural mission of Islam in the context of the continuity of the monotheistic faiths and the continuity of the Mediterranean historical and cultural region. This book has not lost its topicality even today, and the way in which Hadžić treats Islam is still illuminating and pedagogically valid.

Ahmed Lutfi Čokić, referred to a moment ago, was one of the editors of the Tuzla-based periodical *Hikjmet* and a great Islamic *'ālim*. He published in the pages of this periodical a fierce critique of the book by Dr Mehmed Begović, *O položaju i dužnostima muslimanke prema islamskoj nauci i duhu današnjeg vremena* ("On the Position and Duties of the Muslim Woman in regard to Islamic Teachings and the Spirit of Our Times"), written from the perspective of Islamic modernism of the secular type. Čokić's own book is entitled *Prikaz i ocjena rada g. Dr. Mehmeda Begovića o njegovu naziranju na*

---

[119] Ibid., 28.

[120] Belgrade: 1931.

islamsku ženu i njen položaj po islamskoj nauci izloženog u njegovoj knjizi ("Review and Evaluation of the work of Dr Mehmed Begović on his Perspective on Islamic Women and their Position according to Islamic Teachings as set out in His Book"). Both works — of Begović and Čokić — are nothing more than a continuation of the polemical debate initiated by Reis ul Ulama Čaušević in his declarations of 1928.

It may be mentioned that the Tuzla periodical *Hikjmet*, from its very first issue in 1929, closely follows the polemic on the veiling of women, the wearing of hats, the re-organization of the *waqf* system, and so on. The editors of *Hikjmet* took the side of the Sarajevo Jama'at Majlis, and received with delight the so-called "*Takrir*" or statement of the Electoral Curia (the *hojjas*' electoral body, which also had within its jurisdiction the election of the Reis ul Ulama). Reis Čaušević was warned in the '*Takrir*' that he had exceeded his authority and that he should not issue such statements any more. According to the first issue of *Hikjmet* bearing the date 7 April 1929, the statement of the electoral Curia was signed by Maglajlić, Munib Cerić, Mustafa Nurkić, Muhamed Alihodžić, hfz. Salih Djozić, A. Moranjak, Hilmija Muhamedagić, Smail Mujakić, Mustafa Hadžić, Šakir Mesihović, Omer Durić, Hamza Puzić, Rustem Rustempašić, Muhamed Mušić, Salim Muftić, Mustafa Kapetanović, Muhamed H. Ahmetović, Agan Imamović-Gromiljak, hfz. Omer Hadžić, Sakib Korkut, Ahmed Burek, Salih Bašić, Abdulah Hadžić, hfz. Džemal Kršlak, Muhamed Ševket Kurt, Salih Sivčević, Ahmed Hilmi Muftić, Smail Mašić and Zekerija Ibrišimović.

In the same issue of *Hikjmet* there also appeared a statement by Reis ul Ulama Čaušević who, "after reading the *takrir* of the Curia", issued a public statement which included the following:

> After reading the *takrir* of the Curia I adopt it, since I understand from it that it does not reject my principal opinion that a Muslim woman who is conversant with the study of science, the acquisition of a craft and other commercial skills, may have her face unveiled and her hands bare . . . .[121]

A small news item in the same issue of *Hikjmet*, from which it can be gathered that public opinion in Egypt was also following the polemic provoked by the views of Reis Čaušević. In its spring 1929 issue the publication *al-Fatḥ*, the organ of the Egyptian 'Young Muslims', an organization very close to the Muslim Brethren, published the entire *takrīr* of the Electoral Curia in an article entitled "The Defeat of Kemal in Bosnia and Herzegovina". Here Kemal is, of course, Kemal Atatürk, in other words, Reis

[121] Ibid., 25.

Čaušević, of whom the Cairo-based *al-Fatḥ* indirectly claims that he disseminated Kemalist ideas and secularism. *Al-Fatḥ* openly rejoices at Čaušević's receiving such bitter criticism, and equates him with the Young Turks, whom the publication sought to discredit.

The polemic continued, however, even into the early years of the fourth decade of the 20th century. As already mentioned, Dr Mehmed Begović (a former professor at the Faculty of Law of Belgrade University) wrote his book on women's issues from the perspective of Islamic modernism of the kind we encounter among the Muslim modernists in India such as Seyyed Ameer Ali, Chirāgh 'Alī (d. 1885), Mumtaz Ali, and others, and of Muslim modernists in Egypt such as Qāsim Amīn (all of whom in turn had written on the "emancipation of women"). Begović's book is in fact a collection of several lectures that he delivered to the girls' boarding school of the Belgrade Gajret (Muslim Cultural Association) in the month of November 1930, as the subtitle of the 94-page work (written in Cyrillic script in the ekavian or eastern dialect). (The Gajret Cultural Association was founded in 1903, and for the greater part of its existence was, in the national sense, of pro-Serb leanings, although it did a considerable amount for the educational uplift of the Muslim youth). In brief, Begović defends the following:

(i) Veiling women's faces is a foreign (pre-Islamic Persian) custom, not an Islamic one. "It cannot be claimed that the Qur'ān prescribed [for women] the kind of veiling as is now practised among us and in certain other Muslim countries", says Begović.[122]

(ii) *Harems*, and keeping women enclosed in *harems*, are also a non-Islamic custom, since the *harem* has no basis in the fundamental sources of Islam. The *harem* is essentially in opposition to the mosque. In the early days of Islam women used to go to the mosque, which shows that Islam does not confine the life of Muslim women solely to the home. In Begović's view, *harems* have absolutely no basis in Islam. They are an invention that belongs to the time of decadence, and not to the early days of Islam, since "there were Islamic jurists who were even of the opinion that women can be imams, that is, [they too may] lead the prayers in which men too are taking part".[123] With such an understanding of the position of women, the *harem* is in direct opposition to the mosque and the active participation of women in social life.

(iii) There are numerous harmful effects of keeping women enclosed in *harems*, not only on the family, but also on the society at large, believes Begović.

[122] Ibid., 21.
[123] Ibid., 28.

(iv) Mystics and mysticism had negative effects on the position of women in the later Muslim societies. Begović takes a negative view of mysticism, believing that mysticism in Islam was "a kind of spiritually intoxicating drink".[124]

(v) Foreign, non-Islamic customs had also exercised an unwholesome influence on the position of women in later Muslim societies. Begović says that Persian, Jewish and Christian customs and opinions, together with the works of the Greek philosophers, had a damaging influence on the position of women in the later Islamic societies.

(vi) Certain Muslim customs that arose later also restricted the rights of women, and particularly those of slaves, and

(vii) Islamic peoples adopted certain customs and legal provisions that are in conflict with the primary sources of the *Sharī'ah*.

When the various aspects of this book are considered, it can be said that Dr Mehmed Begović was concerned, in an academic language, with the same theme with which a large number of Islamic reformists were concerned — the so-called *fesād-i zamān* or corruption of the times. The type of Islamic modernist thinking that is based on the so-called *fesād-i zamān* starts from the premise that everything was right and proper in the early days of Islam, and that the "corruption of the times" came later. But what were the causes of this corruption? There are many responses to this question, depending on the respondent. Traditionalists, generally speaking, believe that things began to go wrong because Muslims ceased to uphold the accepted early authorities of Islam and their judgements. Modernists and reformists, on the contrary, believe that the reason was Muslims' abandonment of *ijtihād* and their blindly following the early authorities of Islam.

What is the remedy for this "corruption of the times", Muslim reformists ask themselves. They respond by saying that the remedy is *ijtihād*, or the perpetual and committed reflection on ways out of the impasse, and the involvement of intelligent and mentally capable people in the identification of new possibilities of bearing witness to Islam and Islamic institutions in the fields of faith, culture, education and life in general.

Formalism and Fatalism

There is no doubt that Begović belongs to the reformist and modernist trend of thought in Bosnia. For this reason another important topic for Begović in this brochure was the so-called formalism and fatalism. He speaks of the very damaging effects of religious formalism and of fatalism, and states that

[124] Ibid., 59.

religious formalism in particular has contributed to a worsening of the position of Muslim women during the main stages of Islamic history.

He briefly addresses the "condition of our Muslims" during the Turkish and Austro-Hungarian periods, and gives a brief overview of later political history. Of particular interest is the fact that Begović speaks of the phenomenon of "Islamic feminism and its influence on our Muslims". (In regard to the subject of formalism and fatalism, it is worth noting that the 20th century Islamic and Muslim reformists in Bosnia spent much ink on trying to show that there was no such thing as fatalism in Islam, and that fatalism was something that Western Orientalists had foisted on Islam. The so-called Islamic fatalism was a very common topic in the first half of the 20th century, almost as common as the so-called Islamic fundamentalism that has swamped the pages of late 20th century newspapers.)

It is interesting, too, that Dr Begović, the descendant of a Bosnian bey's family, believes that "Turkey was not concerned to educate the masses, who embraced Islam, to acquaint them with their faith and religious principles . . .."[125] Begović considers that as far as Turkey was concerned, it was "sufficient to give these new Muslims the external appearance of believers".[126] He adds that "our Islam had to be reduced, at least at the beginning, to religious forms. . .".[127] Begović makes this observation in order to prove his thesis on the formalism of "our Bosnian *'ulamā'* and *hojjas*'. However, it is difficult to agree here with Dr Begović, the more so when one knows that for more than five centuries Bosnia, and the Balkans as a whole, have had highly esteemed institutions of learning (*madrasahs*), attended by local pupils and students. Similarly, the excellent theological, philosophical, mystical, legal and other treatises written by Bosniaks in Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian show that Islam in this region was by no means merely 'formal', and still less 'formalist'.

Ahmed Lutfi Čokić rejects, one after the other, all the premises set out by Dr Mehmed Begović in his work. It is particularly noticeable that Ahmed Lutfi Čokić writes, at the very beginning of his rebuttal of Begović's views, about the "propaganda of the Roman church against Islam". The informed reader may draw only one conclusion: that Dr Mehmed Begović himself is, though perhaps unwittingly, a tool in the hands of the conspirators against Islam whose origins can be traced back to Rome.

Taken as a whole, the books by Begović and Čokić are two examples of how Islamic conservatism and Islamic reformism-modernism in Bosnia

[125] Ibid., 58.
[126] Ibid.
[127] Ibid.

regarded the issue of the so-called emancipation of women. It is interesting that neither Begović nor Čokić speaks of the reasons for writing about the veil, the education of girls, the involvement of women in society, and so on. Their books and treatises do not have even the remotest reference to the fact that this is a problem of the state, which means a problem of the economic and political uncertainty of the Muslims of the Balkans, the principal problem of Muslims of the region. Of course, one cannot overlook the fact that in discussing the veil they are in fact discussing one of the forms of the protection of the religious, cultural and national identity of the Bosnian Muslims. And yet, it is a debate only about the effects, and not about the causes of the situation of the Muslims.

Husein Đozo, then a young al-Azhar student, also became involved in this polemic, writing an article entitled *Da li je problem otkrivanja žene vjerskog ili socijalnog karaktera?* ("Is the Problem of Unveiling Women of a Religious or a Social Character?") (*Novi Behar*, nos. 6–9, 1936–1937, 78–80). Husein Đozo claims that the issue should be debated in the social, not the religious sphere. Đozo praises Reis ul Ulama Čaušević and his resolute stance on the unveiling of women. He asserts that Čaušević "will not become any kind of intermediary between himself and the Qur'ān and the true *ḥadīth*", which means that Čaušević is a *mujtahid* who advocates that nothing should be done to impede

> . . . women from leaving the house unveiled and participating together with others, as their assistants, in building a better future, if this should be in the public interest. But this right may be curtailed or wholly denied if it were to lead to damaging consequences to society and public morals.[128]

Husein Đozo then cites a *fatwā* from al-Azhar issued by the university to a group of Hindus "preparing to convert to Islam, except that they did not like the veiling of women in Islam and the circumcision of men, and that was an obstacle to their conversion". Đozo asserts that al-Azhar issued a *fatwā* that Muslim women are not required to veil their faces. At the end of his text Đozo states that "the issue of unveiling women is not of a religious character, but is a matter of custom, and should be resolved as the public interest demands, with the proviso that the interests of the women themselves should not be subverted either".[129]

---

[128] *Novi Behar*, nos. 6–9 (1936–1937), 79.

[129] Ibid., 80.

Abolition of the *Zar* and *Feredža*

From 1945 onwards, with the coming of Communists to power in Bosnia and Hercegovina, the debate on Muslim women's dress gradually subsided. The Islamic community supported the general revolutionary trend to "shedding the *zar* and *feredža*", and the then Reis ul Ulama, Ibrahim ef. Fejić, (who held the post from 1947 to 1957), came out in favour of unveiling. In the official organ of the Islamic community, *Glasnik Vrhovnog islamskog starješinstva* (Herald of the Supreme Islamic Council), issues no. 4–7, 1950, Ibrahim Fejić (d. 1962) published an article entitled 'Pokrivanje žene u islamu' ("The Veiling of Women in Islam"), in which he explicitly states that veiling the female face is not a religious prescription. His article is permeated with the call for the "emancipation of women".

Finally, during 1950, the National Assembly of Bosnia and Hercegovina passed a law on the abolition of the *zar* and *feredža*. The then Islamic community supported the adoption of this law. Dr Fikret Karčić writes of this law:

> This law prohibits the wearing, or the compelling or inducing women to wear the *zar* or *feredža* or to cover their faces in some other way. Merely for wearing the *zar* and *feredža* a prison sentence of 3 months or a fine of up to 20,000 dinars is imposed, as is the case for any demand that such clothing should be worn. A custodial sentence of up to two years with hard labour or a fine of up to 50,000 dinars is prescribed for compelling women to wear such clothing or for propaganda to that end. The law enters into force 30 days after publication.[130]

It can be said that this law not only abolished the *zar* and the *feredža*, but also every form of theoretical debate on the subject, and in particular those that might advocate the wearing of such clothing.

Indifference to Religion

In Bosnia between the two world wars there gradually began to appear writings marked by indifference to religion, and even by atheism. As an example of this kind of booklet, in Sarajevo in 1931 a certain Abdulatif Dizdarević published a booklet of his entitled *Reforma odgojnog sistema* ("Reform of the Educational System"). As far as can be gathered from this treatise of Dizdarević's, he was not under the influence of the then Bosnian

[130] Fikret Karčić, *Društveno pravni aspekt islamskog reformizma* ("Social and Legal Aspects of Islamic Reformism") (Sarajevo: Islamski teološki fakultet, 1990), 240.

Islamic reformist models. From his own perspective of what upbringing should be "in the immense cauldron of world events", as he calls it, he proffers a series of responses. Dizdarević notes that humanity today needs salvation, but that it is a little late to ask who shall be saved.[131]

And just when one thinks that Abdulatif Dizdarević is going to follow the model of Ljubušak's or Čaušević's thinking, one comes up in his treatise against a very obscurely presented theory of Yugoslavianism that wholly absolutizes the Southern Slavs and their future role in history.

Dizdarević also believes that the turn has come for the Southern Slavs to take up the salvific torch of humanity. Of the Yugoslavs (meaning the inhabitants of the Yugoslavia between the two world wars), he says:

> The Yugoslavs, a mentally and physically healthy people, with their [significant] geographical position, their colourful history full of heroic battles and victories, their large-hearted Slav soul full of noble sentiments and inclinations, seem to have been ordained by a higher power, along with their other Slav brothers, to give the world a salvific idea.[132]

Dizdarević himself, however, sees that it is in fact an unrealistic wish. He, therefore, says a little later:

> In truth, when considering our local circumstances, in particular with regard to the culture of upbringing, the reform of which forms the topic of this work, we must acknowledge that the Southern Slavs are not exactly in such a position as to be the best example to the world.[133]

Dizdarević, inspired then (somewhat belatedly) by pan-Slavism, says that the Slavs are a people who have not yet become worn out, and that their strength is "inexhaustible". The Slavs, in Dizdarević's view, will find the strength to awaken morality in humanity, but not morality "as a literally implanted dogma in the soul of the unenlightened individual". The Slavs will not avail themselves of such a "dogmatic morality". "The obscurantist elements of centuries past availed themselves of such means", asserts Dizdarević. He then turns to reason, saying: "Reason is the trump card in the hands of the man of today".[134] He wishes humanity to reach a kind of reason "that will be a light under the influence of which a new man will develop, as

---

[131] Abdulatif Dizdarević, *Reforma odgojnog sistema* (Sarajevo: Author, 1931), 1.
[132] Ibid., 3.
[133] Ibid.
[134] Ibid., 7.

the noblest of creatures in the immensities of the universe".[135] He does not say when this will come about, nor does he refer to the First World War which, with all its horrors, was far from promising the birth of man as "the noblest of creatures in the immensities of the universe".[136]

The more one reads Dizdarević's treatise, the more one comes to the distinct impression that it is his desire to offer an atheistic concept of upbringing, since he speaks of morality but one cannot see that this morality is based on any of the world religions. He also speaks of upbringing, but one does not see that he regards Islam, or even Christianity, as an inspiration for this upbringing. And yet, Dizdarević has not yet made a clean break from religion, for in the very next pages he emerges as a critic of "modernized" man. "Modernized man cares little for religion's magnificent discoveries of knowledge or its cultural advance, to the extent that he despises faith and turns his back on it".[137]

If one were to venture to interpret Dizdarević, one might say that he does not reject religion; he rejects dogmatism in religion. In fact, he respects religion, because religion underpins morality: "It must be recognized that the content of religion is good, since it presupposes morality as the linchpin of life. But religious dogmatists have brought ruin upon every cultural form of religion".[138]

Dizdarević then equates the crusaders and the Ottoman Turks, saying: "The crusader armies drenched the lands of two continents with blood, and the invasions of the savage Turks degraded the genius of the great Muhammad. . .".[139]

Dizdarević is in search of a refined religion, one devoid of prejudices and fanaticism. He says that "shocking deeds occur equally in Islam, Orthodox Christianity and in all religions, as too in Catholicism", and that such deeds have been the cause of "hatred equally in Christianity and Islam" (p. 13). He does not say what deeds these are nor does he identify those who perpetrated them.

Dizdarević's treatise is anti-clerical; it is directed against both priests and *'ulamā'*. "At the very moment when a man, free of religious prejudices, enters into a life of freedom, it occurs to him to assess both his own deeds and those of the priests. . .".[140] Dizdarević goes on to say that this "free man" perceives

---

[135] Ibid.
[136] Ibid., 13.
[137] Ibid.
[138] Ibid., 12.
[139] Ibid., 12–13.
[140] Ibid., 13.

"repugnant imposture" on the part of priests, who have maintained people in that deception for "decades and centuries". However, he immediately asks himself what this "man free of religious prejudices" has gained, noting pessimistically that the very same "free man . . . has given free rein to his instincts, exceeding in unbridled fashion the bounds of unreasonable deeds [sic], and committing many errors".[141]

Dizdarević's philosophical stances are not quite clear; on several pages of his booklet he appears to be equally opposed to materialism and to dry-as-dust idealism.

He speaks of modern man as "unbridled", as "choking in vices of all possible kinds". He is opposed to the phenomena that arise as a consequence of capitalism; he is opposed to bars, cafés, brothels . . . He describes the inroads being made by these bars, cafés and brothels in Bosnia, saying that the well-to-do revel in them while "the poor are crying out" in front of the doors of these public places:

> Outside the doors of these same premises are crying out the poor, the ragged, the barefoot, the hungry and the thirsty, in the depths of winter uttering countless curses before God against those who do not even give them a crust of bread while they themselves are revelling, watching loose women swimming in lakes of champagne, naked as the day they were born, perfumed and powdered, but full of the filth of many sexual diseases. . . .[142]

Dizdarević goes on to speak of the "materialized man" that "profane materialism" and "filthy capitalism" have produced on the one hand, and "millions of hungry" on the other, saying:

> These are the paradoxes of our time: a maximum of culture, a minimum of reason. While you travel by air and hallucinate about the conquest of the universe, you do not see the blades of the guillotine being sharpened and the hangman's noose being raised to behead the innocent. . . .[143]

Dizdarević then turns to the "unbridled instincts that were suppressed for centuries", speaking of the consequences of the voracity of the modern era that has led to "man being transformed into a beast".[144]

It could be thought from some passages of this treatise that Abdulatif Dizdarević is against capitalism and that he is promoting the cause of socialism

---

[141] Ibid.
[142] Ibid., 14.
[143] Ibid., 15.
[144] Ibid.

and communism. He is, however, neither for capitalism nor for socialism, but looks upon both these isms with equal abhorrence:

> Capitalists and noisy social revolutionaries can all be lumped together. The former endeavour to sacrifice at the altar of the modern god, money, with the blood of a million innocents, blood that flows through sweat created by undescribable sufferings. The latter seek to use demagoguery to conceal their materialistic background, while they are incapable of having a healthy idea in their minds, for in their extremism they are as much a product of the times as the former.[145]

Dizdarević does not refer to Islam, however, but is rather a disillusioned intellectual among many in Bosnia and Europe of the period between the two world wars. He was unable to separate the *'ulamā'* of the day from Islam, nor did he even endeavour to find sources of inspiration for social reform in Islam. He is reform-oriented, but it is very difficult to detect, on the basis of this booklet of his, as to which reformist school he actually belongs to.

At the end of his treatise he proposes world literature as the remedy for the "social diseases" of his time. He proposes reading Shakespeare, Goethe, Dostovsky, Krleža and others. World literature teaches us, he avers, that morality is in us, and that not even God is a guarantee of morality. "Do not kill, do not steal, for God will not permit it. If you kill or steal, you will go to hell! That is the morality of centuries past . . ." says Dizdarević, rejecting the possibility of basing morality on belief in God, that is, on the fear of God. But he offers nothing in its place, for he also condemns the so-called "profane morality". Dizdarević advocates what he calls the "future morality":

> The future morality will be a new morality, since it will consist neither in the literalism of the past nor the hypocrisy of present-day morality. Its germ will be in the soul, that, gravitating towards its own perfection, will pass through the sensitivity of the heart and find its ultimate formation in the brain, so as to burst forth into the world as a new salvific institution. Such a morality will demand of man not to kill and not to steal for this reason, since to behave so requires visibly easy to understand and actual laws of life — real to the point of specificity.[146]

Thus Dizdarević seems inclined towards atheism, disposed to rejecting religious morality as "a morality deriving from the fear of God".

Almost at the very end of this slender brochure of his, Dizdarević proffers a proposal for a humanistically-oriented gymnasium. Every subject, such as gymnastics, literature, medicine, physics, history, chemistry, etc.,

---

[145] Ibid., 16.

[146] Ibid., 26–27.

would be compulsory. The only subject he advocates should be optional is religious instruction, or as he puts it, "religious instruction is non-obligatory". But for this reason Dizdarević advocates the maximum study of literature, saying: "Literature as the dominant subject is to serve as the principal upbringing of the future man: it will build his soul, while the other subjects will collaborate in this".[147]

Finally, Dizdarević concludes his study with the words: "The healthy Yugoslav people has a great future".[148]

The Question of Caliphate

The abolition of the Caliphate in 1924 came to the Muslims of Bosnia and the Balkans as a great shock. It was only then that some in Bosnia became aware that the Ottoman Empire had truly become a thing of the past, and that it would never return, since it had been abolished for good with the abolition of the Caliphate.

Following its abolition by Kemal Atatürk, or rather his Assembly in Ankara, in 1924, at least a dozen treatises and brochures of merit on the topic of the Caliphate and its abolition appeared in Bosnia.

The most significant premises of these studies will be cited here and some of them will be analyzed. It is very important, however, to point out that the topic "for or against the Caliphate" was set in a wider context, which is "for or against progress", "for or against reform". The impression one gets is that in many texts that were written the abolition of the Caliphate was seen an opportunity for the "reform" of that institution too.

Among the first to express his views on the Caliphate was E. N. Bulbulović. He wrote a booklet entitled *Sveislamski kongres i pitanje hilafeta* ("The Pan-Islamic Congress and the Caliphate Issue"). Dr Fikret Karčić is right in placing Bulbulović in the category of "secular reformists".[149] Since the Pan-Islamic Congress (held in Cairo in May 1926), dedicated to the issue of re-establishing the Caliphate was highly topical in Bulbulović's time, he informed his readership that in fact "the chief task of the Congress" was to "resolve the issue of the Caliphate raised by the Kemalist revolution of the Turks".[150]

---

[147] Ibid., 30.

[148] Ibid., 32.

[149] See Fikret Karčić, *Društveno pravni aspekt islamskog reformizma*, 227.

[150] E. N. Bulbulović, *Sveislamski kongres i pitanje hilafeta* (Sarajevo: Islamska dionička Štamparija, 1926), 3.

Bulbulović immediately indicates two possible issues that the Pan-Islamic Congress could have dealt with. The first was the possibility of "filling the vacant seat of the deposed Caliph" and the second "of perhaps complementing it with auxiliary bodies". In Bulbulović's view, the Congress should "prepare the ground for the spiritual unity of the Muslims".[151]

By the phrase "the spiritual unity of the Muslims", Bulbulović quite clearly indicates what he personally advocates. He is for the revival of the Caliphate, but only as a "religious institution". He does not advocate the Caliphate as a "political institution". He says quite openly: "The notion of a perpetual and constant faith should not be confused with changeable daily life and the whims of politics, which depend on race, time and place".[152]

From these words of Bulbulović it should be understood that even the Caliphate does not belong to the domain of "perpetual and constant faith", but is in fact a "changeable matter of daily life". He goes on to say:

> Among the common people there is an ingrained supposition that the Qur'an is the source of all knowledge. It therefore follows that they reduce all issues to agreement with the precepts of the faith and seek divine sanction for every tiny detail. We cite an antithesis to this synthesis, that religion is exclusively the relationship between God and man, and nothing else.[153]

This philosophical stance leads Bulbulović to espouse several other ideas as well. He thus writes of Islam:

> Islam in itself is very liberal. It is the enemy of dictatorship and absolutism. Violence and autocratic tyranny are the most reprehensible things in Islam. In everything, and above all in public social affairs, Islam prescribes consulting the will of the people, as the only sovereign authorites, and does so in a categorical and imperative tone. The Qur'ān explicitly states that Islam is a religion of reason, and continually appeals to awareness and reflection.[154]

"The will of the people", then, is the source of sovereignty in Bulbulović's view. Government is a public matter, he asserts, and does not lie in the hands of a single supreme individual. Nor did the Messenger of Islam, Muḥammad (peace be on him), appoint a Caliph, "but left it to the choice of the people", avers Bulbulović.[155]

---

[151] Ibid., 4.
[152] Ibid., 5.
[153] Ibid., 5–6.
[154] Ibid., 6.
[155] Ibid.

All these views of Bulbulović must be understood as bidding farewell to the Ottoman Caliph, and as indirectly suggesting to the Bosniaks that they too should finally bid farewell to the institution of the Caliphate. This institution, in Bulbulović's view, had inflicted a good deal of harm and misery on Islam, for it was over ". . . the question of the Caliphate that the harmony and unity of Muslims was first shaken. It was because of this that Muslims split into diverse parties: the Khārijīs, Yazīdīs, Rāfiḍīs, 'Alawīs, Imāmīs, Idrīsīs, Ismā'īlīs and so on . . .".[156] In addition, Bulbulović claims that "many of these Caliphs not only failed to act in the service of the reputation and self-esteem of the Muslims, but were a disgrace and embarrassment to Islam".[157]

Bulbulović says quite brusquely that the Turks, in abolishing such a Caliphate, had done "a great and praiseworthy deed". The passage as a whole reads:

> The task of a pan-Islamic congress should be to eliminate anything that sows confusion and dissension in the simplification of Islam, and to create the conditions for the advancement and civilization of the Muslims. Many obstacles of a religious character have been strewn so far on that path, and should be removed. Among them is the Caliphate, which mixed politics with religion, or religion with politics, stifling the life and advancement of the Muslims.
>
> The destruction of such a Caliphate and the banishment of its protagonists is not a sin, but a great and praiseworthy deed. The question of the Caliphate, raised by the Turks, surrendering that right for the benefit of Islam as a whole, is one that I consider as a boon, that may initiate a happier era in the history of the Muslims . . . .[158]

Bulbulović's arguments are aimed at the thesis that "the Caliphate must be transformed and replaced by new, modern conditions of an appropriate nature".[159] He also says that "the Caliphate should exist as a spiritual centre around which all the Muslims would focus. The Caliphate should become the living connection of the spiritual unity of the Muslims".[160]

In order to make his meaning fully clear, Bulbulović says: " What the Pope and the Vatican are for the Catholic faith, the Caliph and the Caliphate should become for the Islamic faith".[161] Thus E. N. Bulbulović wrote in 1926,

---

[156] Ibid., 9.
[157] Ibid., 13.
[158] Ibid., 14–15.
[159] Ibid., 15.
[160] Ibid., 15–16.
[161] Ibid., 17.

without asking himself whether the comparison between the Pope and the Caliph was a valid one.

In an article on the Caliphate issue: (*Hilafet, vjersko jedinstvo muslimana* ("The Caliphate, the Religious Unity of the Muslims"), in *El-Hidaje* (28 January 1942), Dr Hamdija Ćemerlić (d. 1990) contests the validity of the comparison between the Pope and the Caliph, for "the Caliph was both the religious and the political head of almost all the Muslims".[162] Dr Ćemerlić does not agree with many Western authorities who have made the same comparison, saying:

> . . . the Caliphate is a state-religious community and cannot function solely as a religious community, for Islamic law recognizes no separation between religion and state. Many Western writers, however, studying the historical development of the Caliphate, claim that in Islam too religion is separate from the state, and that the Caliphs were entrusted solely with religious affairs, while rulers dealt with political affairs. On the basis of this assertion they compared the Caliphate with the Catholic Church. But this is a flawed comparison, for Islam does not allow of this difference, so that the position of the Caliph does not correspond to that of the Pope. The Pope is the sovereign of the Catholic Church and, as such, is the supreme interpreter of the Divine will on earth, while the Caliph is the leader of the Muslim state . . . .[163]

In his article Ćemerlić did not call into question the view that the need for the Caliph is dictated by the need to testify to and provide a symbol of the "religious unity of the Muslims". But Ćemerlić was aware of the fact that the concept of the Caliph and the Caliphate had evolved during the course of history. He says that in the early days of Islam the Muslim community was "purely a religious community, later [becoming] a religious and political community, and finally once again a religious community".[164] Given that the third stage of Muslim existence is a religious stage, this, in Ćemerlić's view, means that the Caliph too is needed only to testify to "the religious unity of the Muslims".[165]

Ćemerlić expresses doubt whether it is possible to revive the Caliphate in its original form, and has little confidence in the so-called Khilāfat movements that were emerging throughout the Islamic world at that time, and still less in the Pan-Islamic Congress (one of which was held in Makkah in 1925 and another in Cairo in 1926). Ćemerlić believes that "at the present time it is

---

[162] *Elhidaje* (28 January, 1942), 83.
[163] Ibid.
[164] Ibid., 82.
[165] Ibid., 89.

impossible to revive the Caliphate in the way in which it was construed, through *ijmā'*." Ćemerlić concludes by saying:

> . . . we believe that it would be possible to establish a purely religious Caliphate. The present times and the needs of the Muslims imperatively demand the establishment of a general Muslim institution that would watch over the destiny of the Muslim world. That institution would be a new Caliphate understood as the purely religious community of all the Muslims.[166]

With this stance Ćemerlić is very close to Bulbulović's view of the Caliphate, although he excludes any resemblance between the Pope and the Caliph.

Hafiz Ajni Bušatlić, too, in one of his articles entitled *Pitanje hilafeta i izbor halife* ("The Caliphate Issue and the Election of a Caliph"), addresses this issue. In this article Bušatlić asserts that the duty has arisen ". . . for all Muslims, without any consideration of nationality, to re-elect a Caliph, and along with that election to establish power for the elected Caliph".[167] It is significant that Bušatlić repeats several times in this treatise that "the Caliph must have power" (*quwwah* and *shawkah*). In this Bušatlić is without doubt expressing the proper stance, which indicates that he regards the matter of the "election of Caliph" from a realistic perspective, for in his view the Caliph is a Caliph only if he is powerful.

Bušatlić advocates sending a Bosniak delegation to the Islamic congress dealing with the issue of the Caliph, and points to the fortunate circumstances that "we have a recognized religious leader" appointed by the Caliph, and that Čaušević is a Reis "with a *manshūrah* (document issued by the Caliph to his appointees) from a recognized and respected Caliph in his time".[168] The Kingdom of Yugoslavia should also establish relations with a new potential Caliph "for the sake of its Muslims". Bušatlić calls for a treaty between the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and the new Caliph to be "something similar to a concordat", a concordat that would cover "the most essential religious, religious-educational and *Sharī'ah*-judicial institutions".[169]

Bušatlić sets out in this text a wide spectrum of issues in which he discussed how to reestablish a Caliph, but the general impression of the text is that "the position of Caliph is currently vacant".[170]

---

[166] Ibid.
[167] *Gajret* (December, 1924), 21.
[168] Ibid.
[169] Ibid.
[170] Ibid., 294.

Another article that deals with the issue of the Caliphate, is by Hafiz Muhamed Pandža (d. 1962) entitled *Institucija Hilafeta i razvitak državnog i političkog života kod muslimanskih naroda* ("The Institution of the Caliphate and the Development of State and Political Life among Muslim Peoples") (published in *Islamski svijet,* Sarajevo: 1933–1934). Pandža applauds as commendable the fact that "the first four Caliphs were not succeeded by their progeny". In Pandža's view the institution of the Caliphate was later corrupted by the introduction of the system of primogeniture or inheritance. His article gives a brief overview of the later history of the Caliphate and underlines the fact that as early as the Abbasid dynasty, which ruled until 1258, the Caliphate "had become a factor without any value".[171]

Hafiz Muhamed Pandža also sets out his own brief proposal of how a Caliph should be elected at the time he was writing his article:

> Envoys of all the Muslim peoples should come together in a pan-Islamic congress and elect the Caliph by mutual agreement, without any external pressure, by wholly free election.[172]

Pandža, like Bušatlić before him, strongly urges the Caliph to be powerful, saying:

> Under no circumstances could any political or state representative of any Islamic people be elected [as Caliph] who is under any influence from a foreign state, for this could only inflict damage on the Muslims.[173]

In time the debate on the Caliph died down in Bosnia, and in turn there came the upheavals and misfortunes of the Second World War, followed by the long socialist period (1945–1992), which had the effect of removing this issue from the Muslims' agenda of discussion in Bosnia.

The majority of the other questions discussed or referred to in this article also disappeared from the Muslims' agenda during the socialist period. The issue of *waqf* too ceased to be a matter for discussion as soon as *waqf* property was nationalized and expropriated, following the Second World War. The *feredža* and the *zar* were abolished, as we have seen, by a law passed in 1946, but it should also be borne in mind that with their abolition the right of citizens to

---

[171] *Islamski Svijet* (Sarajevo: 1933–1934), 56.
[172] Ibid., 57.
[173] Ibid.

discussion on a number of Islamic topics such as that pertaining to the s
of Muslim women in society was also abolished.

After 1945, Bosnian Islamic thought turned to debates on progress an
"Islam as a progressive faith", albeit from the perspective of socialism. A
1960s and 1970s approached there were ever more debates that focused ch
on the topic of "reconciling socialism and Islam".

Among a number of other thinkers, such as Husein Đozo, one
clearly perceive an 'Islamo-socialist tend' in their writings and an 'Isl
socialist' stage in their thinking.