

CONTEMPORARY DEBATES IN ISLAM

AN ANTHOLOGY OF MODERNIST
AND FUNDAMENTALIST THOUGHT

Edited by

MANSOOR MOADDEL

and

KAMRAN TALATTOF

2000

St. Martin's Press
New York



FALLACY OF RATIONALISM

Sayyid Abul A'la Maududi

Sayyid Abul A'la Maududi. "Fallacy of Rationalism I and II." In *West Versus Islam*, translated by S. Waqar Ahmad Gardezi and Abdul Waheed Khan. New Delhi, India: International Islamic Publishers, 1992, pp. 110-41.

FALLACY OF RATIONALISM I¹

INFLUENCE OF THE WESTERN EDUCATION AND CIVILIZATION on the religious views of our youth, raw in Islamic grooming, can be judged from their writings and utterances. A Muslim graduate from U.P. (India) wrote an article giving an account of a tour of China and Japan undertaken by him. He wrote:

Our Chinese co-travelers are extremely voracious eaters and liquor boozers. They die for pork. It is now that I have come to know the secret of Christianity's popularity. Modern education has made the Chinese ashamed of their age old religion. He could have embraced Islam without any hesitation had he understood it in letter and spirit. But, Islam deprives him of his favorite food. Therefore, willingly or unwillingly, he becomes Christian. No wonder if Christianity becomes China's official religion in the near future. I am a bit lenient toward the European and Chinese Muslim converts in the matter of pork. Moreover, I doubt the Quran has explicitly forbidden it. I feel pork was forbidden for the Arabs for some special reason. I see no harm in permitting it in the countries where it is but a physical need without any intention of flouting divine injunction. Any how I must admit this is the only Quranic injunction or general prohibition which is beyond my comprehension, as to me the motivation and incentive for good and evil has nothing to do with the stomach. If we concede such a relationship and let religion determine even our menu, then why should it not teach us the principles of the job of blacksmith, goldsmith and tailor. I feel the main reason Islam is making no headway, is that it snatches all discretion from human beings reducing them to a body deprived of all life and action or a child devoid of all senses and urges for

material betterment. Religion in my opinion should be as permissive and liberal as Christians consider their religion.

Talking of Shanghai he writes:

One refuses to believe that this multitude of happy and smiling prosperous people are all destined to be the fuel of hell after a given time as if the very purpose of their creation was just that. All of them except a few, are nonbelievers and idolaters; are they condemned to hell only because they committed the mistake of populating the earth? They neither waylay and kill the pilgrims to Mecca, nor are they sodomites, nor do they usurp others' belongings and then try to justify it. They are leading a calm and quiet life, yet they deserve hell as their final resort, why? No doubt pantheism is nonsense, but if one concedes to the fact that there is a Being who is the sole authority to kill and to revive him, then why do you become his enemy and consider him your enemy, simply because he fails to conceive the Being in the same way as you fail to comprehend Him exactly, or that he does not acknowledge Arabic as the Divine language. But no, all this does not matter the least to you. What you consider important is that one should wear trousers of a particular cut and shirt of a particular type, eat such and such food, keep a beard or a particular size and should never dare to go to school because religion and the religious language are not taught there.

About the Japanese port of Kobe, he says:

I went around Kobe for two hours and did not find any beggar or any destitute in tattered clothes. Such is the development of a people who neither know religion nor God.

Then he delivers a sermon and advises the people:

Mind it that fair dealing is the real religion, and doing good deeds, not art or language. The innate objective of religion is to convince us that we are and we shall be answerable for our deeds in this life or in the life hereafter. This is real Islam. Whatever is demanded beyond it in the name of religion is nothing but self-delusion or mental derangement. The day religion is confined to these two realities and the shackles of *Shari'ah* broken, you too will attain the heights or progress like other nations. You will awaken the world's conscience and those, who do not lose the world, shall not be losers in the kingdom of Heaven as well. In fact you are no nation, but a reformer of nations. For God's sake do not let others say that while other nations are at the zenith of progress the Muslims are only backward and the cause of their backwardness is their religion.

This article is a self-explanatory example of the mind and thinking of our new generation with modern education. They were born into a Muslim family and brought up in a Muslim society, with strong social and cultural ties with the Muslims. Love for Islam, sympathy for the Muslims, and the desire to remain Muslim has become their second nature and rooted deep in their hearts without any intention and without any contribution whatsoever of their heart and mind in it. Before

developing their involuntary and unconscious attachment with Islam into voluntary and conscious conviction through education and proper grooming to enable them to fully understand and follow Islamic teachings and experience the change Islamic teachings and experience the change Islamic injunctions bring to practical life and approach, they were admitted to English schools and colleges. Their intellectual and ideological upbringing was done there on a pattern quite alien to Islam. Western thought and western civilization influenced them so deeply that they started looking at everything from the western angle, and pondered on every issue with a western mind. It became impossible for them to think and to observe independently keeping their approach free of western domination. They learnt rationalism from the west, without any reasoning of their own but that acquired from the west. Thus it was no independent rationalism of their own but entirely a rationalism lent from the west. They learnt the art of critical appreciation from the west. Naturally it was not an objective and independent criticism. It was just a training and grooming to measure everything with a western yardstick and consider western standards as over and above all criticism. When our new generation completed their studies in western-oriented educational institutions they came out fully trained and groomed in the western way of thinking and with their minds totally changed. Their hearts were no doubt Muslim, but their minds had turned secular. They lived among the Muslims, had dealings with the Muslims, were tied to the Muslims in innumerable social and cultural bonds, had relations of love and sympathy with them and watched the cultural and religious activities of Muslims in their day to day life. But all their faculties of thinking, understanding and opinion-forming had turned Western, having nothing to do with Islamic values and Muslim mannerism. They started criticizing Islam and Muslims in every matter by western standards, declaring obsolete and amenable whatever they found incompatible with the western standards, be it some fundamental matter, or any detail of Islam, or just a practice in Muslim society. Some of them also tried to know Islam to some extent and to ascertain the truth, but the yardstick of their criticism and research was the same western approach. How could the plain truth of Islam adjust so as to fit into the crooked frame of their west-oriented mind?

Whenever these gentlemen speak on religious issues they are mostly irrelevant and do not even know what they are talking about. Neither are their premises correct, nor do they argue in any logical sequence or try to draw correct conclusions, so much so that they can not even determine their own standpoint while arguing. They take divergent stands in a single breath. Speaking from one pedestal they shift all of a sudden to a quite contradictory viewpoint. Loose-thinking is the glaring feature of their commentaries on religion. They are very alert and cautious while speaking on issues other than religion. They fully realize that any slip on their part might condemn them in the intellectual circles. Religion carries no weight or importance for them. Hence they do not care in the least to apply their mind to it. They take it very lightly, just as if they are gossiping after their meals in a very relaxing mood, talking just for the sake of fun and feeling no need to observe any limits.

Another thing that is very obvious in their writings is shallowness of mind and paucity of proper knowledge. They dare not speak on any issue other than religion

with such poor knowledge and without any serious thinking. They know they lose face and credibility if they pass any illogical or unreasonable remark or comment, but speaking on religion they see no need of any research, study, contemplation, and serious thinking. They form their opinion on off-hand information and give it out without any second thought. It is so because they have no fear of any check or criticism. Any confrontation or criticism, if it comes at all, would be from the orthodox religious leaders who are already labeled as a rigid, backward and narrow-minded class.

The article of the learned writer under discussion bears both these features. Firstly, the article does not indicate whether the writer is speaking as a Muslim or a non-Muslim. Speaking on Islam, one is either a Muslim or a non-Muslim. If he speaks as a Muslim, may he be orthodox, a liberal thinker, or a reformer, whatever be the case, he is expected to talk within the orbit of Islam with the Quran as the final authority and within the fundamentals of religion and the laws of Shari'ah as enunciated in the holy Quran. Whoever does not believe in the holy Quran as the final authority, and considers its injunctions as open to discussion, automatically goes out of the pale of Islam and thus loses every right to speak as a Muslim. If one speaks as a non-Muslim, he will have every right to criticize the principles and injunctions enunciated by the Quran in whatever manner he likes, because he does not believe in the holy Quran as the final word of Allah. But, speaking as a non-Muslim, he will have no right to pose himself as a Muslim and try to explain to the Muslims the meanings of Islam and the ways and means to promote Islam. Any sensible person talking about Islam with sense and reason will have to decide whether he is going to speak as a Muslim or a non-Muslim and, while giving his opinion, will fully observe the logical requirements of the position he has chosen.

But it is against all canons of justice and reason to call oneself a Muslim, and yet use the right to criticize the principles and laws given by the Quran, question the Quran's authority, and yet try to advise and guide Muslims. It is nothing but an attempt to use antonyms as synonyms. Paradoxically, it means that a person can be a Muslim as well as a non-Muslim at the same time and remain within the pale of Islam and outside its fold simultaneously.

We do not expect the learned writer, with all his wisdom and learning, to juxtapose two diametrically opposed positions for himself while speaking on any issue other than Islam. We can never expect him to criticize British laws sitting in the chair at a British Court of law. Nor do we expect him to be so daring as to profess adherence to any school of thought, and yet to criticize the fundamentals on which that school is based. Ironically he has taken up two diametrically opposed positions in relation to Islam without the least pricking of conscience that he is shifting his position time and again. On one hand, he claims to be a Muslim, carries a Muslim name, shows deep concern for the Muslim's miserable plight, wishes the progress of Islam, and delivers a sermon to the Muslims on *Ehsaan* (beautifying their deeds), which is to him the real Islam. On the other hand, he severely criticizes the fundamental tenets and teachings of Islam, which must be believed as final authority by a Muslim.

The Quran has specifically forbidden pork in four places,² but you like to grant relaxation in this matter, and that, too, ironically, in the name of and for the

cause of Islam. In other words, you pose to be more concerned than even the Quran itself for the welfare of Islam, or there is some other Islam, besides that presented by the Quran, for which you are so much worried. The Quran no doubt lays down the menu for human beings and sorts out the eatables as lawful and unlawful,³ foul and chaste, and unequivocally declares that you have no authority to declare any thing lawful or unlawful. You insist that it is your right, and you are not ready to concede this right to the Quran and allow the religion to have any say in what one should eat or drink. In fact, the Quran does not confine Islam within the limitation like that which the followers of Saint Paul (not the followers of Jesus Christ) had imposed on their religion.

Islam formulates laws for dress, eating and drinking, marriage and divorce, inheritance, trade, politics, justice and punishment for crimes etc., but you are against these divine injunctions and consider them a hurdle in the path of progress of Islam. You accuse Islam of turning human beings into lifeless bodies and helpless children and propose that religion should be accepted in the same sense and to the same extent as Christians (truly speaking, followers of Saint Paul) believe in Christianity.

The Quran has itself framed laws and ordained their compliance as the Divine limits. You consider these limits of the *Shari'ah* as fetters and want to break these fetters like Saint Paul did, and even see this move as imperative for the promotion and expansion of Islam. According to the Quran, belief is the first and foremost condition for salvation of man. It warns in clear words that those who do not believe in Allah shall be thrown into the hell,⁴ may they be countable or countless and prosperous or destitute. But to you it is unbelievable that such a vast multitude of bouncing and prosperous people could go down to hell as its fuel after a given period. You cannot understand their fault save that they have inhabited the earth. Now the question is, how can one remain a Muslim having such an obvious disagreement with the holy Quran?

A Muslim who believes in the Quran as the word of Allah cannot dare to differ with the Quran. If you do not see eye to eye with the Divine book, you are free to differ but only after denouncing faith in Islam. Whoever feels dissatisfied with the teachings and injunctions of a religion and doubts its veracity, fails to understand its logic and needs, and considers its views and concepts objectionable, has only two options. Either he may clearly denounce and disown it and then criticize its tenets and teachings as bitterly as he likes or, if he does not want to say good-bye to his religion in spite of his doubts and apprehensions, he must avoid projection of his disagreement. He should try to solve his differences and clear his doubts as a seeker of truth instead of trying to demolish the foundations and structure under the garb of renaissance.

Reason and wisdom show only two courses open in such a situation, and a sensible person shall take to any one of the courses when confronted with such a situation. But the difficulty with our learned writer and the like, brought up in west-oriented institutions, is that they do not have the courage to adopt the first course and feel ashamed of taking to the second course. They have, therefore, taken to a middle course, which is quite illogical. They insist on being accepted as Muslims, claim to be desirous of the name and fame of Islam, and express great

concern for Islam and the Muslims, yet they speak and work against Islam in the same way as a non-Muslim may say or do. Not to speak of the traditions (*hadith*) of the holy Prophet or Islamic jurisprudence (*fiqh*), they do not spare even the holy Quran from their criticism, and hit at the very foundations of Islam.

These gentlemen claim to be rationalists and boast of rejecting all that is irrational. Their most common charges against so called *Mullas*, a misnomer for the Ulema, is that they do not use their brain while they themselves are quite contradictory in their utterances and impressions about religion, and contradictory in their behavior. What they say in one breath, they contradict in the next breath. What sort of rationalism is invented by these so-called enlightened scholars?

Now let us have a look at the depth and extent of their knowledge. They consider it necessary to remove all the limitations imposed by *Shari'ah* and shrink it to just a mere dogma and faith like Christianity. The secret of the progress of Christianity, according to them, is that it does not impose any restrictions of lawful and unlawful and no moral regulations. It does not reduce man to a lifeless body or a helpless child usurping his human rights. On the contrary, it grants free license to anybody who claims belief in Jesus Christ to do what he likes. But little do they think that Islam is nothing but all that is mentioned in the holy Quran.

According to Quran, Islam is a composite whole of beliefs and good deeds along with its limitations, its rules and regulations, and a complete working system for all individual and social activities without which Islam cannot stay as a system of life and a civilization. No Muslim has any authority to revoke these limits, because to revoke these limits is to revoke the Quran and to revoke Quran is the revocation of Islam. When Islam itself is revoked, where does its progress lie? You can invent a new religion of your own and propagate it, but you have no right to dub anything against the teachings of the Quran as Islam and claim its propagation as the progress of Islam. You call this dogma as Islam that "we are and shall be answerable for our actions in the life hereafter or even in this world." You thus hope to make Islam more easy and acceptable by confining it to each individual as his private matter. But going a little deep in the meanings and implications of this belief, you would know that Islam cannot conform to your desires even if confined to private life.

The first requirement of faith in Islam is to believe in the life Hereafter. Then there are three requisites of the concept of answerability. Firstly, to determine to whom one is answerable and to accept him as supreme. Secondly, to determine the nature of answerability and that what sort of deeds in this life can lead to success and what actions could be condemned in the life hereafter. Thirdly, what difference would it make if certain actions and deeds are condemned, because if it makes no difference whether any action or deed is accepted or condemned, then the concept of answerability loses all its sense and meanings.

These are quite logical and rational requisites of the belief you call the real religion. Now if Islam is confined and reduced to what you consider the real concept of belief in Islam, even then the problem you want to avoid would still remain. You will have to believe in Allah, the converse of what you believe is the secret of Japan's phenomenal progress. You will have to abide by the limits of *Shari'ah* and Islamic ethics, which you wish to override and which, in your view, are the real

hurdle in the progress of Islam. The issue of punishment and recompense in the life hereafter shall also crop up, and you will again wonder how these countless people leading a happy and prosperous life without believing in Allah and accountability before Him could all be destined to go through the agony of Hell just after a few years of this mundane life.

Would it not be better if such people bring out a new edition of Islam of their own choice to relieve them of all restrictions and leave it to their sweet will to adhere or not to adhere to it without it being detrimental to their welfare in the life hereafter, and which may guarantee success in this world as well as in the life hereafter on the ground that they were kind enough to inhabit the earth, and you may rest assured that all the non-believers would be accommodated in paradise because they lived a very happy and prosperous life in this world.

You doubt there is a total and explicit prohibition of pork in the holy Quran. You interpret the prohibition of pork as meant only for the Arabs, for some reasons exclusive to them. This suspicion could be removed, had you just taken the trouble of going through the holy Quran before expressing this suspicion. It is vividly written in the holy Book that:

Say: I find not that which is revealed to me, ought prohibited to an eater what he eats thereof except it be carrion, or blood poured forth, or pork for that verily is foul, or the abomination which was immolated to the name of other than Allah. But whoso is compelled (there to) neither craving, nor transgressing, (for him) lo your Lord is Forgiving, Merciful (6:146).

This Quranic verse has forbidden pork for every one, without exception, on the ground that it is foul. Does the eater here means Arab eater alone? And whether any thing can be foul for the Arabs and fair for non-Arabs. Shall you, in the same way, allow some relaxation for the carrion eater too? If you want to allow relaxation in the case of pork, do it on your own, but you have no right to say that its explicit prohibition in the Quran is doubtful despite its clear verdict.

One of the principles that our modern casuists have framed for themselves is that any injunction of Islam they wish to violate, they declare it, without any hesitation, exclusive for Arabs even if there is not the slightest indication of such exclusiveness in the holy Quran and even if they may not be able to put forward any reason or quote any instance in support of their notion. Such practice, if allowed, may result in confining the Quran and its teachings exclusively to the Arabs.

And to argue on the basis of the Quranic injunction "*but whoso is compelled (thereto) without any intention of disobedience or transgression*" is so interesting that one cannot but stand confounded. He has perhaps translated this verse to the effect that "take pork when you feel irresistible desire to have it, but never take it in a garden, and do not make it a habit."⁵

Nobody, except one who is quite ignorant of the meanings of conditions beyond one's control or intention of disobedience, can dare interpret it in terms of relaxation for the people of China and Europe. Anybody who knows the meanings of the verse would never dare interpret the verse in that sense. This verse does not in any way refer to those who are habitual carrion eaters or blood suckers or have

a craze for pork and eat all that is slaughtered in any name other than Allah as a matter of routine. Such an interpretation would practically negate the Quranic injunction.

If the prohibition was meant for those who were used to all the prohibited things, then such exception would have granted them a free license. If they say the prohibition was meant for those who already avoided such things, then what was the need for such prohibition for them. In fact the condition of a situation beyond control with no intention of transgression is meant for one who is dying of hunger, and nothing except the prohibited is available to save his life: he is permitted to eat from the prohibited thing only that much that is inevitable to save his life without the least intention of transgressing the Divine limits. The same is repeated at another place prohibiting pork and the carrion as follows:

However one (lying or hunger, can eat of any of these forbidden things without any inclination to sin. (5:3).

There is a world of difference between this exemption and the contention that the pork be permitted for the Europeans and Chinese, because they have a craze for it, under the cover of exemption given in the verse:

(Whoso is left with no option, with no inclination and no intention of transgression)

and that too to lure them into the fold of Islam. If permissiveness and relaxation is made just to accommodate various nation's likings and desire, then liquor, gambling, adultery, usury and so many other things shall have to be permitted one after the other. The question is what is the fun in proselytizing to Islam the people who are not prepared to accept the injunctions, limits, and prohibitions ordained by Allah? Islam is in no need of such people, then why should Islam strike such a bargain with them?

To start with, you could not appreciate the logic of prohibition of pork. Pondering over it further you found that the stomach and moral incentives are poles apart, hence you arrived at the conclusion that religion has no right to impose any restrictions of lawful and unlawful in the matter of food and drinks. It unfolded the secret that your knowledge about physical science is no more than your knowledge about the holy Quran. It is no shame for an "enlightened and educated person" to be ignorant of Quran but so much ignorance of the science is no doubt very shameful. You are still ignorant of the relationship between your physical build and your inner self and between your physique and your diet.

It is by no means surprising that the diet restores the body's spent up constituents and builds its tissues and nerves, rejuvenating an entirely old body into a new physique within a few years. What is surprising is that diet has nothing to do with the inner self. The world of science was generally unaware of this fact before, but the recent scientific research on dietetics disclosed the fact that diet has an unmistakable effect on one's morals and intellectual faculties. Hence our scientists are busy exploring the effects of different foods on our hearts and minds. It appears

our graduate friend is not up to date in scientific information, otherwise he would not dare to assert that the stomach and the faculties of mind are, as a matter of principle, poles apart.

FALLACY OF RATIONALISM II

Rationalism and naturalism are being projected with great humdrum by the West for the last two centuries. And who can deny the power of publicity. One cannot shield his heart and mind from the influence of a thing being constantly and frequently brought before his eyes and drummed into his ears. Thanks to the force of propaganda, the world has at last conceded that western sciences and culture are based entirely on rationalism and naturalism. Although a critical study of western civilization shows, beyond doubt, that it is based on neither rationalism nor naturalism. On the contrary, its entire structure stands on feelings, lust, and urges. The western renaissance was nothing but a revolt against reason and nature. Discarding logic and reason, it turned toward whims and feelings and material urges. It relied on moods instead of reason, rejected rational guidance, logical reasoning, and innate intuition, and made perceptible material results its real criterion. Rejecting nature's guidance, it preferred to be guided by desires and urges, regarded everything as baseless that cannot be measured and weighed, condemned everything as negligible and worthless that did not produce any perceptible material gain.

In the beginning even the West was unaware of this fact. Hence despite going against reason and nature, they remained under the illusion that the new era of enlightenment, ushered in by them, was based on rationalism and naturalism. Later the truth dawned on them, but they had not the courage to confess it. Hypocrisy, materialism, and submission to the urges of body and instincts were given the cover of rationalism and naturalism. But now the cat is out of the bag. Irrationality and violation of nature is so obvious that it cannot be concealed under any cover now. Hence there is an open revolt against reason and nature. The banner of revolt has been raised. Everywhere, right from the sacred precincts of learning and thought to the social, economic, and political fields, this revolt can be noted. With the exception of a section of conservative hypocrites all the leading personalities of the modern world confess that urges and desires now rule their civilization.

However, the orientalists and the westernized of the East are still a few steps behind their leaders. The education, the intellectual atmosphere, and the factors of culture and civilization responsible for their intellectual evolution demand unconditional submission to physical desires and urges and devotion to materialism on their part, and they are submitting to it. But the stage when the cat comes out of the bag has yet to arrive. They are still insisting in their writings and speeches that they would accept nothing but reason and nature, hence they call for logical reasoning. They refuse to accept anything not proved by cogent arguments and the evidence of nature.

But all this bragging is motivated by the same mentality, which is neither rationalism nor naturalism. An analysis of their articles shall reveal to you that they are unable even to grasp the implications of logic and intuition. What they call

pragmatism comes out to be empiricism, when probed. Empiricism is something that is solid and weighty, and that can be measured and enumerated. Anything that cannot be assessed by measurement, counting, or weighing in the balance is of no use to them.

They consider it illogical to believe or to follow anything until and unless its utility is established in that particular sense. Even their claim of following nature's guidance cannot stand scrutiny. By nature they do not mean human nature but animal nature, which is devoid of intuition and conscience and has only passions and the animal appetites of sex and stomach. They consider worthy of acknowledgment only that which can be materially felt, which can satisfy desires and fulfill physical and sensual urges, and whose return is instantaneous and visible, and whose harm is either invisible or apparently less than its gain. But the requisites of human nature, which are important intuitively, whose harms or benefits are not material and sensuous but psychological and spiritual, are superstitions labeled by them as nonsense, worthless, and negligible. It is obscurantism, superstition, and conservatism in their view to acknowledge or to give any importance to such thinking. With such digression from reason and nature, they still claim to be rationalist and naturalist. Yet their intellectual bankruptcy does not let them realize this contradiction at all.

Education and refinement of thought should at least serve to remove confusion in the views, enabling a person to adopt a clear and straight thinking, draw correct conclusions by putting their propositions in proper order, and avoid contradictions and the confusing of issues. But barring a few exceptions we generally find our educated people deprived of even preliminary benefits of intellectual evolution. They cannot even determine their exact stand, understand its logical requirements and, keeping it in view, adopt a way of arguing that is relevant to their stand. Going through their writings or discussing with them any issue, the first impression one gets is that they are badly confused in their views. They start a discussion with a certain standpoint and then go on shifting it on each step. They can neither choose propositions intelligently enough to establish their point of view, nor arrange them in logical sequence. One cannot follow, from the beginning to the end, what is exactly the issue and what they want to prove and establish. It is so because modern civilization and the education under its influence are mostly inclined toward feelings and material realities. They stir desires, develop an awareness of demands and requirements, impress the importance of feelings and perception, but do not duly regulate the intellect and the mind. Modern civilization no doubt creates vanity as a lust, rather a vanity of criticism and reasoning and this vanity exhorts them to criticize each and everything in the name of rationalism and to reject anything that they are unable to grasp. But truly speaking, their minds are bereft of rationalism and the ability to solve any issue or to form a considered opinion in any matter.

This irrational rationalism is displayed in matters relating to religion mostly, as these are the matters that come in fundamental conflict on each and every point with the western concepts in spiritual, moral, social, and collective fields of life.

Talk to any modern educated person on any religious issue, but first get an affirmation from him of his being a Muslim to test his state of mind, and then put

before him an injunction of the Shariah along with its authority. He will just shrug his shoulder and comment, in a very philosophic style: "It is all mullaism. Bring me some rational argument. If you have only some sayings to quote and no logic and reason, I am not going to accept it." Just these cursory remarks are enough to dis-close the secret that such a person is poles apart from rationalism. Even after years of education and academic grooming he is still ignorant of the rational requisites of argumentation and the proper stand of the seeker of argument.

Rationally, there can be only two positions of a person with relevance to Islam. Either he is a Muslim or a non-Muslim. If he is a Muslim, it means that he has conceded that Allah is the Supreme Authority and the holy Prophet is the authentic Messenger of Allah. He has also committed that he will surrender unconditionally to all the injunctions conveyed to him by the authentic Messenger of Allah. He has thus surrendered his right to demand any rational proof of argument for each and every injunction.

Being a Muslim he is expected only to ascertain whether a particular injunction has been issued by the authentic Messenger of Allah or not. And, as soon as it is proved that any injunction is authoritative, he must obey it. He may ask for rational justification just for his own satisfaction and knowledge only after compliance with the injunction. But subjecting compliance to rational justification of any injunction and refusal to obey any injunction on the grounds of dissatisfaction after committing to obey prophetic injunctions unconditionally, amounts to denial of the authority and authenticity of the holy Prophet (S.A.W.).

Such a denial is nothing less than infidelity although he had started his discussion with an affirmation of Islam. Now if he prefers for himself the position of an infidel, his proper place is not inside but outside the pale of Islam. He must first show at least this much moral courage to disown faith in Islam, then only would he deserve to ask for and get rational justification for any Islamic injunction.

This is what common sense demands as a rule, and no system and no regulation can stay without it. No government can stay even for a moment if every person starts demanding rational justification for its orders and refuses to submit to any order without getting its satisfactory justification. No army can be called an army if every soldier starts seeking the reason for his commander's orders and demanding his satisfaction before compliance. No school, no college, no association, in short no system can work on the basis of satisfying each and every individual prior to the compliance of its order.

Anybody who joins a system or organization does so only when he accepts and believes in the authority of that system as supreme authority, and as long as he is a part of that system, he is duty bound to obey its supreme authority, may he be convinced and satisfied with any order or not. To violate any order is no doubt a crime but it is a different matter. One can remain a part and parcel of a system even if he commits any violation of any part of it.

But to subject obedience to personal satisfaction, even in the smallest issue, is to refuse to submit to its final and supreme authority, which is a clear revolt. If such is the attitude against a government established by law, the culprit shall be tried for rebellion. In the case of the army, such a person would face court martial. In the case of an educational institution, he would be expelled from the school or

college within no time, and in the case of religion he would be declared an apostate. This is all so, because no system can afford such a questioning of its justification within its rank and file. The proper place of such a seeker of justification is not within but outside a system. He may challenge any order in a system, but he must first denounce his faith and belief in that system.

Unconditional faith is the first and foremost requirement of Islam. It calls people to believe in Allah and His Prophet first, instead of issuing injunctions. All arguments and justifications have been exhausted to establish Allah and His prophet as the final and supreme authority. Every possible rational justification and evidence from Nature is meant to convince man that Allah is the only authority in the universe and Muhammad (peace be upon him) is His authentic messenger and prophet.

Scrutiny and rational justification should be sought on this fundamental issue as conclusively as necessary for satisfaction and conviction. If you are not satisfied, by any reason and logic, you will not at all be forced to embrace Islam, nor shall any Islamic injunction be imposed on you. But the moment you embrace Islam, you become a "Muslim," that is you have committed yourself to the unconditional obedience of Allah and His prophet. Now you are not expected to call for argument and justification for each and every order, and now compliance and obedience is not at all subject to your satisfaction. The first and foremost duty after embracing Islam is to submit to the orders given to you by Allah through His prophet without any ifs, ands, or buts.

The saying of all (true) believers when they appeal unto Allah and His Messenger to judge between them, is only that they say, "We hear, and we obey." (24:51)

It is not at all compatible with faith to argue and to seek justification as a condition for obedience and submission. This juxtaposition of opposites is clearly against common sense. A believer would never seek arguments and justification and whoever seeks arguments and justification cannot be a true believer.

And it becometh not of a believing man or believing woman when Allah and His Messenger have decided a matter for them that they should (after that) claim any say. (33:36)

The magnificent task of reform and organization performed by Islam is all due to this rule alone. Once the belief was instilled deep in hearts and minds, the believers halted where they were asked to stop. And whatever was enjoined millions and millions of people adopted it forthwith. Reform of human morals and regulation of social activities by the holy prophet, in a short span of 23 years, could never be possible, had submission to these imaginations depended on rational justification for each and every order and explaining the wisdom of all dos and don'ts.

But it does not at all mean that the Islamic injunctions are irrational, or any of its part is devoid of wisdom and prudence. Nor does it mean that Islam demands blind faith and puts any bar on its followers on their search of the logical and natural base or probe into the wisdom of its injunctions. In fact it is just the reverse. In-

sight and prudence is indispensable for the proper following of Islam. The more one understands the wisdom and prudence of Islamic injunctions, the more he will be able to follow it properly.

Islam is not against such comprehension and enlightenment, rather it encourages it. However, there is a world of difference between this intellectual probing and scrutiny, which is governed by an urge to obey, and that rational test, which instead of being governed by an urge to obey is in itself a requisite for submission. A Muslim is he who is fully convinced and offers unqualified submission first and then strives to probe into the wisdom of injunctions.

It is not necessary that he must succeed in finding out the prudence of each and every injunction. He is fully convinced that Allah Almighty is the supreme and ultimate authority and the Prophet is His authentic messenger and spokesman. What he needs is the attainment of complete enlightenment and getting as much evidence as possible to substantiate his belief. If he succeeds in getting what he is striving for he thanks God for it, but if he does not succeed he goes on obeying the injunctions without the slightest hesitation because of his conviction and faith in Allah.

This seeking of more and more evidence can by no means be compared with the attitude where submission and obedience is subjected to satisfaction in each and every matter.

Recently a statement issued by a Muslim organization has come to our notice. This organization is comprised of well educated persons who do not shun religion. This organization is doing, according to them, "meritorious" service to Islam. What they preach in the name of religious "reform" is that they are advising Muslims to refrain from ritual sacrifice on Eidul Azha and to donate that money to charitable institutions, help the widows and the orphans, and provide employment to the jobless. Somebody perhaps objected to this campaign, details of which we do not know. What has been said in rebuttal of the objection is as follows:

Nobody has so far cared to explain the wisdom and benefits of the ritual sacrifice on Eid-ul-Adha except blindly advocating and following an age-old practice. We shall be grateful to anybody who enlightens us about the wisdom of this ritual sacrifice.

This is just a sample of the intellectual approach of those who call themselves educated and enlightened. On one side is their loud claim of "rationalism" and on the other side is such a rigid show of "irrationalism." The two sentences quoted from them above are enough to show that they have not yet determined their position. If they are speaking as a Muslim then they are bound to concede to the commandments of the Quran and Sunnah first and then ask for any reason and justification, and that too for the sake of enlightenment and satisfaction and not as a condition for submission and obedience. But if you ask for reason and rational justification as a prerequisite for submission and obedience then you have no right at all to speak as a Muslim. Such a seeker of rationality and wisdom should first accept the position of a non-believer, and then and then only shall he be entitled to raise an objection on any Islamic teachings. But he will have no right to give a verdict on any Islamic issue as an authority on Islam.

Both of these are quite contradictory to each other and it is irrational to take both the positions at the same time and fail to fulfill requisites of even one position. On the one hand, they pose themselves not only as a "Muslim" but as a juristic authority on Islam as well, while on the other hand, they give no importance to traditions and commandments of the Quran and Sunnah and refuse to submit even if it is proved beyond a doubt that a certain commandment is from the ultimate Authority, and ask for the rational justification and pragmatic benefits of the divine injunction before compliance.

In other words, they are not ready to submit to any injunction proved to be a Divine and Prophetic injunction until and unless they are themselves duly convinced of its wisdom and pragmatic benefits. They will reject any injunction forthwith, if they are not convinced of its benefits, or feel such benefits are not substantial enough. They will propagate against it, prove it irrelevant, meaningless, and useless, rather a harmful and extravagant ritual and try their best to prevent Muslims from following it. Is there any wisdom that would allow mixing up of such conflicting attitudes and contradictory positions? No doubt, anybody can ask for justification and rationality but first his own attitude and approach should be rational.

Rational pragmatic benefit is nothing very specific, but relative and proportionate. One may consider a particular thing beneficial while the other may declare it damaging, yet another may admit some benefit, but consider it immaterial as compared to some other more beneficial thing. There is much to differ in pragmatic benefits. Every one has his own concept of benefit, and decides according to his concept as to which of his own experience or others is beneficial or not. One may be after immediate gain and avoid immediate loss. His choice shall definitely differ from the other one who has his eye on the ultimate end.

There are so many things that are beneficial in one way and harmful in some other way. One adopts them because he is ready to bear harms for the sake of benefit. The other one avoids it as he considers it more harmful than beneficial. There is also a difference in pragmatic and rational benefits. One thing is pragmatically harmful, but prudence advises to face harm for a bigger rational benefit. There is some other thing, which is pragmatically beneficial, but prudence gives its verdict against it to avoid its rational harm. It is not possible to elaborate the pragmatic and rational benefits of something in such a way as to convince everybody of its utility leaving no room for refusal.

Such an elaboration has never been possible of rational and pragmatic advantages of not only ritual sacrifice, but Salat, Fasting, Hajj, Zakat, and all the other commands and prohibitions of *Shariah* making its utility crystal clear to all and sundry and convincing them to submit and obey. Had it been so, not a single person in the world would have avoided Salat, Fasting, and refused to pay Zakat or go for Hajj pilgrimage. This is why the injunctions of Islam do not depend on everybody's understanding and experience but solely on faith and submission. A Muslim has faith in Allah and His Prophet and not in pragmatic or rational benefits. He does not call for any rational or practical proof of the utility and benefit of a certain thing to make it acceptable for him, or establishment of its harm to reject it. He concedes only that which is established as an injunction from Allah and His prophet, and refuses all that does not come from Allah and His prophet.

Hence the main question is whether one believes in wisdom and experience or in Allah and His prophet. In the first case, he has nothing to do with Islam and he has no right to speak as a Muslim and to advise Muslims to keep away from the "so called Sunnah" (i.e., ritual sacrifice of animals) of the unproductive land (Arabia). In the other case, the point of discussion should not be pragmatic and rational benefits but the question whether animal sacrifice is just a ritual innovated by the Muslims or whether it is a submission to Allah, who is pleased with it, and a sacred practice introduced to his *Ummah* by the holy Prophet (S.A.W.).

NOTES

1. Article published in the monthly *Tarjumanul Quran* in its issue of December 1934, Sha'aban 1353 A.H.
2. The Quran (2: 173, 5:3, 6:145, 16:115).
3. And do not say what your tongues falsely utter, "This is lawful, and that is prohibited" (16:116).
4. Surely you, and those whom you consider sharing the authority of Allah are fuel of Hell and you are destined to go down to it. (22: 98).
5. Here it is noted that the Arabic words *Idaarra*, *Baghin*, and *Aadin* mean conditions beyond control, garden, and habit in Urdu respectively, and the learned writer Sayyed Maududi has satirically referred to their Urdu meanings.

11. Ahl adh-dhimma: non-Muslim citizens of the Muslim state, whose rights and obligations are contractually determined.
12. Umma: the entire Islamic Community, without territorial or ethnic distinction.
13. Masjid al-Aqsa: the site in Jerusalem where the Prophet ascended to heaven in the eleventh year of his mission (Quran, 17: 1); also the complex of mosques and buildings erected on the site. The chief of these was extensively damaged by arson in 1969, two years after the Zionist usurpation of Jerusalem.
14. Umayyads: members of the dynasty that ruled at Damascus from 41/632 until 132/750 and transformed the caliphate into a hereditary institution. Mu'awiyah, frequently mentioned in these pages, was the first of the Umayyad line.
15. Abbasids: the dynasty that replaced the Umayyads and established a new caliphal capital in Baghdad. With the rise of various local rulers, generally of military origin, the power of the Abbasids began to decline from the fourth/tenth century and it was brought to an end by the Mongol conquest in 656 A.H./1258 C.E.
16. Kufr: the rejection of divine guidance; the antithesis of Islam.
17. Anyone who claims the prerogatives of divinity for himself, whether explicitly or implicitly. See also p. 92.
18. Shirk: the assignment of partners to God, either by believing in a multiplicity of gods, or by assigning divine attributes and prerogatives to other-than-God.
19. "Corruption on earth": a broad term including not only moral corruption, but also subversion of the public good, embezzlement and usurpation of public wealth, conspiring with the enemies of the community against its security, and working in general for the overthrow of the Islamic order. See the commentary on Quran, 5:33 in Tabataba'i, *al-Mizam*, V, pp. 330-2.
20. It may be apposite to quote here the following passage from a secret report drawn up in January 1916 by T.E. Lawrence, the British organizer of the so-called Arab revolt led by Sharif Husayn of Mecca: "Husayn's activity seems beneficial to us, because it marches with our immediate aims, the breakup of the Islamic bloc and the defeat and disruption of the Ottoman Empire. . . . The Arabs are even less stable than the Turks. If properly handled they would remain in a state of political mosaic, a tissue of small jealous principalities incapable of political cohesion." See Philip Knightley and Colin Simpson, *The Secret Lives of Lawrence of Arabia* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1970), p. 55.
21. Fatimat az-Zahra: Fatima, the daughter of the Prophet and wife of Imam 'Ali.
22. I.e., Hasan and Husayn.
23. See *Nahj al-Balaghah*, ed. Subhi as-Salih (Beirut, 1397 A.H./1967 C.E.).
24. Imam Riza: eighth of the Twelve Imams, born in 148 A.H./765 C.E. and died in 203 A.H./817 C.E. in Tus (Mashhad). According to Shi'i belief, he was poisoned by the Abbasid caliph Ma'mun, who had appointed him as his successor at first, but then grew fearful of the wide following he commanded (see p.148). His shrine in Mashhad is one of the principal centers of pilgrimage and religious learning in Iran.
25. The text of this tradition is to be found in Shaykh Sadduq, *'Ilal ash-Shara'i* (Qum, 1378/1958), Vol. 1, p. 183.
26. That is, in the absence of the Imam or an individual deputy named by him (as was the case during the Lesser Occultation), the task devolves upon the fuqaha as a class. See argument on pp. 62-125.
27. Here the allusion may be in particular to the so-called Family Protection Law of 1967, which Imam Khomeini denounced as contrary to n.p., n.d., pp. 462-3, par. 2836, and p. 441.

CHAPTER 24

THE POLITICAL
THEORY OF ISLAM

Sayyid Abul A'la Maududi

Sayyid [Sayed] Abul A'la Maududi. *Political Theory of Islam*. Lahore: Islamic Publications Limited, 1976, pp. 4-22.

FUNDAMENTALS OF ISLAM

IT SHOULD BE CLEARLY UNDERSTOOD IN THE VERY BEGINNING that Islam is not a jumble of unrelated ideas and incoherent modes of conduct. It is rather a well-ordered system, a consistent whole, resting on a definite set of clear-cut postulates. Its major tenets, as well as detailed rules of conduct, are all derived from a logical connection with its basic principles. All the rules and regulations that Islam has laid down for the different spheres of human life are in their essence and spirit a reflection, an extension and corollary of its first principles. The various phases of Islamic life and activity flow from these fundamental postulates exactly as the plant sprouts forth from its seed. And just as even though the tree may spread in all directions, all its leaves and branches remain firmly attached to the roots and derive sustenance from them and it is always the seed and the root that determine the nature and form of the tree, similar is the case with Islam. Its entire scheme of life also flows from its basic postulates. Therefore whatever aspect of the Islamic ideology one may like to study, he must first go to the roots and look to the fundamental principles. Then and then alone he can have a really correct and satisfactory understanding of the ideology and its specific injunctions and a real appreciation of its spirit and nature.

THE MISSION OF THE PROPHETS

The mission of a prophet is to propagate Islam, disseminate the teachings of Allah, and establish the Divine guidance in this world of flesh and bones. This was the

mission of all the divinely inspired prophets who appeared in succession ever since the man's habitation on earth up to the advent of Muhammad (peace be upon him). In fact, the mission of the prophets was one and the same—the preaching of Islam. And Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) was the last of their line. With him, prophethood came to an end and to him was revealed the final code of human guidance, in all its completeness. All the prophets conveyed to mankind the guidance that was revealed to them and asked it to acknowledge the absolute sovereignty of God and to render unalloyed obedience to Him. This was the mission, which each one of the prophets was assigned to perform.

At first sight, this mission appears to be very simple and innocuous. But if you probe a little deeper and examine the full significance and the logical and practical implications of Divine Sovereignty and the concept of *Tawheed* (the Unity of God-head), you will soon realize that the matter is not so simple as it appears on the surface, and that there must be something revolutionary in a doctrine that roused such bitter opposition and sustained hostility on the part of the non-believers. What strikes us most in the long history of the prophets is that whenever these servants of God proclaimed that "there is no ilah (object of worship) except Allah," all the forces of evil made common cause to challenge them. If it were merely a call to bow down in the places of worship before one God with perfect freedom outside these sacred precincts to owe allegiance to and carry out the will of the powers that be, it would have been the height of folly on the part of the ruling classes to suppress the religious liberties of its loyal subjects for a minor matter which had no bearing on their attitude toward the established government. Let us, therefore, try to explore the real point of dispute between the prophets and their opponents.

There are many verses of the Quran that make it absolutely clear that the non-believers and polytheists too, who opposed the prophets, did not deny the existence of God, nor that He was the sole Creator of heavens and earth and man, nor that the whole mechanism of nature operated in accordance with His commands, nor that it is He Who pours down the rain, drives the winds and controls the sun, the moon, the earth, and everything else. Says the Quran:

Say: unto whom (belongeth) the earth and whosoever is therein, if ye have knowledge? They will say, unto Allah. Say: Will ye not then remember? Say: Who is Lord of the seven heavens, and Lord of the Tremendous Throne? They will say, unto Allah (all that belongeth). Say Will ye not then keep duty (unto Him)? Say: In whose hands is the dominion over all things and He protecteth, while against Him there is no protection, if ye have knowledge? They will say: unto Allah (all that belongeth). Say: How then are ye bewitched?¹

And if you were to ask them: who created the heavens and the earth, and constrained the sun and the moon (to their appointed task)? they would say: Allah. How then are they turned away? . . . And if thou wert to ask them; who causeth water to come down from the sky, and therewith reviveth the earth after its death? they verily would say: Allah.² "And if thou asked them who created them, they will surely say: Allah. How then are they turned away."³

These verses make it abundantly clear that the dispute was not about the existence of God or His being the Creator and Lord of heavens and earth. All men ac-

knowledge these truths. Hence, there was no question of there being any dispute about what was already admitted on all hands. The question arises, then, what was it that gave rise to the tremendous opposition that every prophet without any exception had to face when he made this call! The Quran states that the whole dispute centered round the uncompromising demand of the prophets that the non-believers should recognize as their *rabb* (Lord) and *ilah* (Master and Lawgiver) also the very being whom they acknowledged as their Creator and that they should assign this position to none else. But the people were not prepared to accept this demand of the prophets.

Let us now try to find out the real cause of this refusal and what the terms *ilah* and *rabb* mean. Furthermore, why did the prophets insist Allah alone should be recognized and acknowledged as *ilah* and *rabb* and why did the whole world arrange itself against them upon this apparently simple demand?

The Arabic word *ilah* stands for *ma'bud* (i.e., the object of worship) which in itself is derived from the word *'abd*, meaning a servant or slave. The relationship that exists between man and God is that of "the worshipper" and "the worshipped." Man is to offer *'ibadat* to God and is to live like His *'abd*.

And *'ibadat* does not merely mean ritual or any specific form of prayer. It means a life of continuous service and unremitting obedience like the life of a slave in relation to his Lord. To wait upon a person in service, to fold one's hands in reverence to him, to bow down one's head in acknowledgment of his elevated position, to exert oneself in obedience to his commands, to carry out his orders and cheerfully submit to all the toil and discipline involved therein, to humble oneself in the presence of the master, to offer what he demands, to obey what he commands, to set one's face steadily against the causes of his displeasure, and to sacrifice even one's life when such is his pleasure—these are the real implications of the term *'ibadat* (worship or service) and a man's true *ma'bud* (object of worship) is he whom he worships in this manner.

And what is the meaning of the word *rabb*? In Arabic, it literally means "one who nourishes and sustains, and regulates and perfects." Since the moral consciousness of man requires that one who nourishes, sustains, and provides for us has a superior claim on our allegiance, the word *rabb* is also used in the sense of master or owner. For this reason, the Arabic equivalent for the owner of property is *rabb al-mal* and for the owner of a house, *rabb al-dar*. A person's *rabb* is one whom he looks upon as his nourished and patron; from whom he expects favors and obligations; to whom he looks for honor, advancement, and peace; whose displeasure he considers to be prejudicial to his life and happiness; whom he declares to be his lord and master; and, lastly, whom he follows and obeys.⁴

Keeping in view the real meaning of these two words, *ilah* and *rabb*, it can be easily found who is it that may rightfully claim to be man's *ilah* and *rabb* and who can, therefore, demand that he should be served, obeyed, and worshipped. Trees, stones, rivers, animals, the sun, the moon, and the stars, none of them can venture to lay claim to this position in relation to man. It is only man who can, and does, claim godhood in relation to his fellow-beings. The desire for godhood can take root only in man's mind. It is only man's excessive lust for power and desire for exploitation that prompts him to project himself on other people as a god and extract

their obedience; force them to bow down before him in reverential awe, and make them instruments of his self-aggrandizement. The pleasure of posing as a god is more enchanting and appealing than anything else that man has yet been able to discover. Whoever possesses power or wealth or cleverness or any other superior faculty, develops a strong inclination to outstep his natural and proper limits, to extend his area of influence and thrust his godhood upon such of his fellow-men as are comparatively feeble, poor, weak-minded, or deficient in any manner.

Such aspirants to godhood are of two kinds and accordingly they adopt two different lines of action. There is a type of people who are comparatively bold or who possess adequate means of forcing their claim on those over whom they wield power and consequently make a direct claim to godhood. For instance, there was, Pharaoh who was intoxicated with power and so proud of his empire that he proclaimed to the inhabitants of Egypt: "*Ana rabbokum al-a'la*" (I am your highest Lord) and "*Ma 'alimto lakum mim ilahim ghairi*" (I do not know of any other *ilah* for you but myself). When the Prophet Moses approached him with a demand for the liberation of his people and told him that he too should surrender himself to the Lord of the Universe, the Pharaoh replied that since he had the power to cast him into the prison-house, Moses should rather acknowledge him as *ilah*.⁶ Similarly, there was another king who had an argument with the Prophet Abraham. Ponder carefully over the words in which the Quran has narrated this episode. It says:

Bethink thee of him who had an argument with Abraham about his Lord because Allah had given him the kingdom; how, when Abraham said: My Lord is He Who giveth life and causes death, he answered: I give life and cause death. Abraham said: Lo! Allah causeth the sun to rise in the East, so do thou cause it to come up from the West. Thus was the disbeliever flabbergasted.⁶

Why was the unbelieving king flabbergasted? Not because he denied the existence of God. He did believe that God was the ruler of the universe and that He alone made the sun rise and set. The question at issue was not the dominion over the sun and the moon and the universe but that of *the allegiance of people*; not that who should be regarded as controlling the forces of nature, but that *who should have the right to claim the obedience of men*. He did not put forth the claim that he was *Allah*: what he actually demanded was that no objection should be cast over the absoluteness of his authority over his subjects.

His authority as the ruler should not be challenged. The claim was based on the fact that he held the reins of government: he could do whatever he liked with the property or the lives of his people; he had absolute power to punish his subjects with death or to spare them. He, therefore, demanded from Abraham that the latter should recognize him as his master, serve him, and do his bidding. But when Abraham declared that he would obey, serve, and accept no one but the Lord of the Universe, the king was bewildered and shocked and did not know how to bring such a person under his control.

This claim to godhood, which the Pharaoh and Nimrod had put forth, was by no means peculiar to them. Rulers all over the world in ages past and present have advanced such claims. In Iran the words *Khuda* (Master) and *Khudawand* (Lord)

were commonly employed in relation to the king, and all the ceremonies indicative of servility were performed before him, in spite of the fact that no Iranian looked upon the king as the lord of the universe, that is to say God, nor did the king resent himself as such. Similarly, the ruling dynasties in India claimed descent from the gods; the solar and lunar dynasties are well-known down to this day. The *raja* was called *an-data* (the provider of sustenance) and people prostrated themselves before him although he made no pretense of being God and his subjects never recognized him as such. Much the same was, and still is, the state of affairs in other countries.

Words synonymous with *ilah* and *rabb* are still used in direct reference to rulers of many places. Even where this is not customary, the attitude of the people toward their ruler is similar to what is implied by these two words. It is not necessary for a man who claims godhood that he should openly declare himself to be an *ilah* or *rabb*. All persons who exercise unqualified dominion over a group of men, who impose their will upon others, who make them their Instruments and seek to control their destinies in the same manner as Pharaoh and Nimrod did in the heyday of their power, are essentially claimants to godhood, though the claim may be tacit, veiled, and unexpressed. And those who serve and obey them, admit their godhood even if they do not say so by word of mouth.

In contrast to these people who directly seek recognition of their godhood there is another type of men who do not possess the necessary means or strength to get themselves accepted as *ilah* or *rabb*. But they are resourceful and cunning enough to cast a spell over the minds and hearts of common people. By the use of sinister methods, they invest some spirit, god, idol, tomb, plant, or tree with the character of *ilah* and dupe the common people successfully into believing that these objects are capable of doing them harm and bringing them good; that they can provide for their needs, answer their prayers, and afford them shelter and protection from evils which beset them all around. They tell them in effect: "If you do not seek their pleasure and approval, they will involve you in famines, epidemics, and afflictions. But if you approach them in the proper way and solicit their help they will come to your aid. We know the methods by which they can be propitiated and their pleasure can be secured. We alone can show you the means of access to these deities. Therefore, acknowledge our superiority, seek our pleasure and I entrust to our charge your life, wealth, and honor." Many stupid persons are caught in this trap and thus, under cover of false gods, is established the godhood and supremacy of priests and shrine-keepers.

There are some others belonging to the same category who employ the arts of soothsaying, astrology, fortune-telling, charms, incantations, etc. There are yet others who, while owing allegiance to God, also assert that one cannot gain direct access to God. They claim that they are the intermediaries through whom one should approach His threshold; that all ceremonials should be performed through their mediation; and that all religious rites from one's birth to death can be performed only at their hands. There are still others who proclaim themselves to be the bearers of the Book of God and yet they deliberately keep the common people ignorant of its meaning and contents. Constituting themselves into mouthpieces of God, they start dictating to others what is lawful (*halal*) and what is unlawful

(*haram*). In this way their word becomes law and they force people to obey their own commands instead of those of God. This is the source of Brahmanism and Papacy which has appeared under various names and in diverse forms in all parts of the world from times immemorial down to the present day, and in consequence of which certain families, races, and classes, have imposed their will and authority over large masses of men and women.

If you were to look at the matter from this angle, you will find that *the root-cause of all evil and mischief* in the world is *the domination of man over man*, be it direct or indirect. This was the origin of all the troubles of mankind and even to this day it remains the main cause of all the misfortunes and vices which have brought untold misery on the teeming humanity. God, of course, knows all the secrets of human nature. But the truth of this observation has also been confirmed and brought home to humanity by the experiences of thousands of years that man cannot help setting up someone or other as his god, *ilah*, and *rabb*, and looking up to him for help and guidance in the complex and baffling affairs of his life and obeying his commands. This fact has been established beyond question by the historical experience of mankind that if you do not believe in God, some artificial god will take His place in your thinking and behavior. It is even possible that instead of one real God, a number of false gods, *ilhas*, and *rabb*s may impose themselves upon you.

Even today man is enchained in the slavery of many a false god. May he be in Russia or America, Italy or Yugoslavia, England or China, he is generally under the spell of some party, some ruler, some leader or group, some money-magnate or the like in such a manner that man's surveillance of man continues unabated. Modern man has discarded nature-worship, but man-worship he still does. In fact, wherever you turn your eyes, you will find that one nation dominates another, one class holds another in subjection, or a political party having gained complete ascendancy, constitutes itself as the arbiter of men's destiny; or again in some places a dictator concentrates in his hands all power and influence setting himself up as the lord and master of the people. Nowhere has man been able to do without an *ilah*.

What are the consequences of this domination of man by man, of this attempt by man to play the role of divinity? The same that would follow from a mean and incompetent person being appointed a police commissioner or some ignorant and narrow-minded politician being exalted to the rank of a prime minister. For one thing, the effect of godhood is so intoxicating that one who tastes this powerful drink can never keep himself under control. Even assuming that such self-control is possible, the vast knowledge, the keen insight, the unquestioned impartiality and perfect disinterestedness, which are required for carrying out the duties of godhood, will always remain out of the reach of man. That is why tyranny, despotism, intemperance, unlawful exploitation, and inequality reign supreme, whenever man's overlordship and domination (*ulubriyat* and *rabubriyyat*) over man are established. The human soul is inevitably deprived of its natural freedom and man's mind and heart and his inborn faculties and aptitudes are subjected to such vexatious restrictions that the proper growth and development of his personality is arrested. How truly did the Holy Prophet observe:

God, the Almighty, says: "I created men with a pliable nature; then the devils came and contrived to lead them astray from their faith and prohibited for them what I had made lawful for them."⁷

As I have indicated above, this is the sole cause of all the miseries and conflicts from which man has suffered during the long course of human history. This is the real impediment to his progress. This is the canker, which has eaten into the vitals of his moral, intellectual, political, and economic life, destroying all the values that alone make him human and mark him off from animals. So it was in the remote past and so it is today. The only remedy for this dreadful malady lies in the repudiation and renunciation by man of all masters and in the explicit recognition by him God Almighty as his sole master and lord (*ilah* and *rabb*). There is no way to salvation except this; for even if he were to become an atheist and he would not be able to shake himself free of all these masters (*ilhas* and *rabb*s).

This was the radical reformation effected from time to time by the prophets in the life of humanity. They aimed at the demolition of man's supremacy over man. Their real mission was to deliver man from this injustice, this slavery of false gods, this tyranny of man over man, and this exploitation of the weak by the strong. Their object was to thrust back into their proper limits those who had overstepped them and to rise to the proper level those who had been forced down from it. They endeavored to evolve a social organization based on human equality in which man should be neither the slave nor the master of his fellow beings and in which all men should become the servants of one real Lord. The message of all the Prophets that came into the world was the same, namely, "O my people, worship Allah. There is no *ilah* whatever for you except He."⁸

This was precisely what Noah said; this is exactly what Hud declared; Salih affirmed the same truth; Shoaib gave the same message, and the same doctrine was repeated and confirmed by Moses, Christ, and by the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon them all). The last of the Prophets, Muhammad (God's blessings and peace be upon him), said:

I am only a warner, and there is no god save Allah, the One, the Absolute Lord of the heavens and the earth and all that is between them.⁹

Lo! Your Lord is Allah Who created the heavens and the earth in six days, then mounted He the Throne. He covereth the night with the day, which is in haste to follow and hath made the sun and the moon and the stars subservient by His command. His verily is all creation and (His verily is the) commandment.¹⁰

Such is Allah, your Lord. There is no god save Him, the Creator of all things, so worship Him. And He taketh alone care of all things.¹¹

And they are not enjoined anything except that they should serve Allah, keeping religion pure for Him, as men by nature upright.¹²

Come to a word common between us and between you, that we shall worship none but Allah, and that we shall ascribe no partner unto Him and that none of us shall take others for lords beside Allah.¹³

This was the proclamation that released the human soul from its fetters and set man's intellectual and material powers free from the bonds of slavery that held

them in subjection. It relieved them of the burden that weighed heavily upon them and was breaking their backs. It gave them a real charter of liberty and freedom. The Holy Quran refers to this marvelous achievement of the Prophet of Islam when it says, "And he (the Prophet) relieves them of their burden and the chains that were around them."¹⁴

CHAPTER THREE: PRINCIPLES OF ISLAMIC POLITICAL THEORY (EXCERPT)

The belief in the Unity and the Sovereignty of Allah is the foundation of the social and moral system propounded by the prophets. It is the very starting-point of the Islamic political philosophy. The basic principle of Islam is that human beings must, individually and collectively, surrender all rights of overlordship, legislation, and exercising of authority over others. No one should be allowed to pass orders or make commands *on his own right* and no one ought to accept the obligation to carry out such commands and obey such orders. None is entitled to make laws on his own authority and none is obliged to abide by them. This right vests in Allah alone:

The Authority rests with none but Allah. He commands you not to surrender to any one save Him. This is the right way (of life).¹⁵

They ask: "Have we also got some authority?" Say: "All authority belongs to God alone."¹⁶

Do not say wrongly with your tongues that this is lawful and that is unlawful.¹⁷

Whoso does not establish and decide by that which Allah hath revealed, such are disbelievers.¹⁸

According to this theory, sovereignty belongs to Allah. He alone is the law-giver. No man, even if he be a prophet, has the right to order others *in his own right* to do or not to do certain things. The Prophet himself is subject to God's commands: "I do not follow anything except what is revealed to me."¹⁹

Other people are required to obey the Prophet because he enunciates not his own but God's commands:

We sent no messenger save that he should be obeyed *by Allah's leave*.²⁰

They are the people unto whom We gave the Scripture and Command and Prophethood.²¹

It is not (possible) for any human being unto whom Allah has given the Scripture and the Wisdom and the Prophethood that he should have thereafter said unto mankind: Become slaves of *me instead of Allah*; but (what he said was) be ye faithful servants of the Lord!²²

Thus the main characteristics of an Islamic state that can be deduced from these express statements of the Holy Quran are as follows:

1. No person, class, or group, not even the entire population of the state as a whole, can lay claim to sovereignty. God alone is the real sovereign; all others are merely His subjects;
2. God is the real law-giver and the authority, of absolute legislation vests in Him. The believers cannot resort to totally independent legislation nor can they modify any law that God has laid down, even if the desire to effect such legislation or change in Divine laws is unanimous;²³ and
3. An Islamic state must in all respects, be founded upon the law laid down by God through His Prophet. The government that runs such a state will be entitled to obedience in its capacity as a political agency set up to enforce the laws of God and only insofar as it acts in that capacity. If it disregards the law revealed by God, its commands will not be binding on the believers.

NOTES

1. Al-Quran, 23: 84-89.

2. Ibid., 29: 61, 63.

3. Ibid., 43: 87.

4. For a detailed discussion over the meaning and concept of *ilab* and *rabb* see: Abul A'la Maududi, *Quran Ki Char Bunyadi Istilahen*. (Four Basic Terms of the Quran), Islamic Publications Ltd., Lahore.

5. Al-Quran, 26: 29, 28: 38, 79: 24.

6. Ibid., 2: 85.

7. Al-Madani, *At-Trehoofat al-Saryya fi al-Abad Qudsiyya*, Hadith No. 343, Daira't al-Ma'arif, (Deccan) 1323 A.H.

8. Al-Quran, 7: 59, 65, 73, 86; also 11: 50, 61, 84.

9. Ibid., 38: 65-66.

10. Ibid., 7: 54.

11. Ibid., 6: 102.

12. Ibid., 98: 5.

13. Ibid., 3: 64.

14. Ibid., 7: 157.

15. Ibid., 12: 40.

16. Ibid., 3: 154.

17. Ibid., 16: 116.

18. Ibid., 5: 44.

19. Ibid., 6: 50.

20. Ibid., 4: 64.

21. Ibid., 6: 90.

22. Ibid., 3: 79.

23. Here the absolute right of legislation is being discussed. In the Islamic political theory this right vests in Allah alone. As to the scope and extent of human legislation provided by the Shari'ah itself please see Maududi, *Islamic Law and Constitution*, chapter II: "Legislation and Ijtihad in Islam" and chapter VI: "First Principles of Islamic State," Islamic Publications Ltd., Lahore.

SELF-DESTRUCTIVENESS OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION

Sayyid Abul A'la Maududi

Sayyid Abul A'la Maududi. "Suicide of Western Civilization¹" in *West versus Islam*. Translated by S. Waqar Ahmad Gardezi and Abdul Waheed Khan. New Delhi, India: International Islamic Publishers, 1992, pp. 61-73.

THE STUPENDOUS PROGRESS OF THE WEST IN THE FIELDS of politics, trade and industry, and art and science is awe-inspiring. It looks as if the progress of these nations is everlasting and their domination over the world has been destined for all times to come. They have been conferred monopoly to rule the world and their domination and suzerainty appears to be too firm to be up-rooted.

In fact the superpowers of every age have always been considered unassailable. The Pharaohs of Egypt, the A'ad and Thamud of Arabia, the Caledonians of Iraq, the Chosroes of Iran, Conquerors of Greece, rulers of Rome, undaunted Mujaahids of Islam, and the scorching Tartars appeared with pomp and show on the world stage and each of them over-awed the world with the agility of their skill and grandeur in the same fashion. Any nation that rose to power, swept the world in a similar way. It reigned supreme over the civilized world and confounded the world to make it believe that its domination had come to stay. But as soon as the term of its domination was over and the real eternal ruler, that is Allah, decided to remove them from the world stage they fell and fell in such a way that most of them vanished altogether from the world scene. The rest who survived were subjugated by those whom they once ruled and were enslaved by those who had been their slaves.

Many systems have passed away before you, Go about the world, and see for yourselves the end of those who did deny the messengers of Allah. (3:137)

There has been many wicked habitations whom at first I gave respite. (22:48)

It was not a little respite. Some nations enjoyed respite for centuries.

A day with your Lord is equivalent to thousand years as You reckon. (22:47)

But every time respite proved a new ordeal to them. They took it as an outcome of their machinations against the will of Allah and thought that they rule supreme in the world. At last the Divine fury flared up. They were deprived of all the favors. Prosperity gave way to decline and destruction. It was a super stroke from Allah which these people could neither foresee nor forestall.

They plotted thus and we too devised a plot which they could not visualize. (27:50)

The Divine move comes not from outside but works inside the man by penetrating his mind and heart. It paralyzes his reason, his consciousness, his judgment, his thought, and his senses. It blinds not his eyes but his conscience.

It is not the eyes that grow blind, but it is the hearts which are within the bosoms that grow blind. (22:46)

And when one's conscience is dead every move for his betterment goes against him. Every step he takes toward success leads him to destruction. His faculties revolt against him and he slashes himself with his own hands.

Then see what was the result of their plotting; we destroyed all of these plotters and their people. (27:51)

A clear picture of this rise and fall is portrayed in the story of the Pharaohs and the Israelites. When the Egyptians reached the height of their progress and prosperity, they started oppression and tyranny. The Pharaoh proclaimed himself as their God and subjected the weak Israelites to untold torture and tyranny who had settled there during Prophet Joseph's period. At last when the Pharaoh and his people transgressed all limits in their perversity, Almighty Allah decided to humble them and raise the down-trodden Israelites to power, which had no entity before them. Divine decree was enforced. Prophet Moses was born in the weak nation, and he was destined to be brought up by Pharaoh himself in his own palace. Prophet Moses was deputed to liberate his nation from their slavery to Egyptians. Prophet Moses pleaded the case of his people with the Pharaoh very softly, but he would not listen. He and his people were admonished by God constantly in the form of famines and draught, storms and rain of blood, attack of locusts, lice, and frogs. But their haughtiness knew no abatement.

They became proud and they were really criminals. (Quran)

The system of this universe is not static and stationary. A constant move, change, and cycle does not allow anything to remain static. There is extinction for every existence, unmaking for every making, autumn for every spring, descent for every ascent, and vice versa. A tiny seed flying weightless today, when it gets rooted in the soil, sprouts into a big, shady tree tomorrow. Then again becomes dead and dry and is reduced to dust. The forces of nature, leaving that dead and dry seed, start nurturing some other seed. These are all the ups and downs of life. But when a certain state is prolonged, one thinks that it is eternal. If it is the state of decline he thinks it shall go on declining, and if it is a state of progress, he thinks it shall continue for ever. But in fact it is nothing but a matter of time alone. No state is permanent and lasting.

These are (only) the vicissitudes which we cause to follow one another for mankind. (3:140)

World events are constantly moving in a sort of cycle. Birth and death, youth and senility, strength and weakness, spring and autumn, cheerfulness and gloom, all are different aspects of this very cycle. In this cycle, everything grows and proliferates, displays force and power, exhibits beauty and bloom, and attains its climax. Then begins the anti-climax and it starts declining, withering, weakening, and at the end is eliminated by the same forces that had nurtured it.

This is the Divine way in the matter of His creation and human beings are no exception to it, be it an individual or a nation. Honor and disgrace, prosperity and poverty, ascent and descent, and other such developments occur turn by turn to individuals as well as nations in the same cyclic movement. None is exempt from this cycle of change and no state of affairs is to remain permanent, be it rising or falling.

It was the tradition of Allah for those who passed away before you, and you shall find no change in the tradition of Allah. (33:62)

The relics of the ancient nations are scattered all over the world. The traces of culture and civilization, art and craftsmanship, skill and dexterity left behind by them show that they were in no way less advanced than the most developed nations of today, rather they were comparatively much more advanced and powerful than their contemporaries.

They were stronger than these in might, they plowed the land and cultivated it and built on it more than these people have. (30:9)

But then what happened to them? They were puffed up by their constant rise and success, and the enormity of luxuries and favors made them proud. Prosperity proved a trial. Intoxicated by power and authority, they turned into brutes and tyrants and dug their own graves by their evil deeds. The wrongdoers followed that by which they were made sapless and were guilty (11:116). Allah gave them a long respite despite their defiance and disobedience.

When they ignored all warnings and admonitions, the Divine chastisement was enforced. Moses left Egypt along with his people and the Pharaoh and his army were drowned in the sea resulting in the total destruction of Egyptians who could not rise again for centuries.

Therefore We seized him and his hosts, and abandoned them unto the sea, behold the end of the evil-doers. (27:40)

Then came the Israelites' turn. The real Sovereign of the universe replaced the Egyptians with them who were, till then, a depressed and wretched people.

And we caused the people who were downtrodden to inherit, from East to West, the land we had blessed, and the most fair word of Allah was fulfilled upon the people of Israel, because of their endurance. (7:137)

And bestowed upon them superiority over all the existing nations of the world. (2:47)

But this superiority and vicegerency on earth was subject to good deeds. It had already been conveyed to them through Prophet Moses that vicegerency and authority on earth shall no doubt be bestowed upon you but it will be observed how you behave² and this condition was not laid for the Israelites only but for all the nations bestowed with authority on earth.

Then we made you their successor on the earth after them so that We might see how you behave. (10: 14)

When the Israelites disobeyed Allah, tampered with His word, changed the right into wrong, took to unlawful earning, falsehood, dishonesty, and breach of promises, turned greedy, cowardly and easygoing, killed their prophets, opposed everybody who called them to submit to the ultimate truth, they preferred the leadership of the wicked over the pious ones. Allah Almighty also withdrew His favors and deprived them of His vicegerency on earth. They were routed and crushed by the tyrant rulers of Iraq, Greece, and Rome, and rendered homeless. They wandered from country to country in utter humiliation. They were deprived of every authority. For the last 2,000 years, they have suffered such miserableness with the Divine curse that they find no place to live in peacefully and honorably all the world over.³

And abasement and wretchedness were imposed upon them, and they were visited with wrath from Allah. (2:61)

The tradition of Allah is being repeated today before our eyes. The torture inflicted on earlier nations as a result of their misdeeds haunts Western nations today. All possible admonitions and warnings have been administered to them. The miseries of the first world war, financial breakdowns, ever increasing unemployment, a spectacular rise in sexual diseases, disintegration of the family system,

all these are very clear indications for those who have insight to conclude the repercussions of tyranny, disobedience, lustfulness, and dishonesty. But they learn not any lesson from all these calamities. They remain adamant in their rebellion against Allah. They have not the eyes to penetrate into the real cause of this malady. They try their best to remove the symptoms and not the cause. Such an attitude enhances the malady instead of its remedy. This state of affairs shows that the time of admonitions and arguments is more or less over and the final verdict of the destiny is soon to come.

Allah has imposed two big evils on the Western nations, which are dragging them toward destruction and extinction. One of them is the curse of birth control and extinction of the human race, while the other one is the curse of nationalism.

The first one is imposed upon their individuals while the other one is imposed on their states. The curse of birth control has driven the men and women mad and is persuading them to destroy their generations by their own hands. It tells them the ways of blocking conception, exhorts them for abortion, and convinces them of the benefits of sterilization meant to destroy even the seed of procreation. They become so callous that they do not hesitate nipping in the bud their own infants. In short, this evil is leading them toward gradual national suicide.

The second evil has deprived their top-ranking statesmen and army generals of the instinct of sound thinking and fair judgment. This evil developed venomous feelings of selfishness, rivalry, hatred, bigotry, avarice, and greed. It is dividing them into hostile and warring factions, who have daggers drawn against each other. This too, no doubt, is a form of Divine punishment.

Or to confront you with dissension and make you taste the violence of one another. (6:65)

It is leading them toward wholesale suicide, which will not be gradual, but sudden. It has dumped its gunpowder all over the world, and has created danger spots here and there. It is just waiting for an opportune moment. As soon as the time comes, it may trigger fire in any of the gunpowder dumps, resulting in an instantaneous devastating blast and an unprecedented havoc all over the world, which will surpass all the catastrophes of the past history.

What I am saying is by no means an exaggeration. The war weaponry that is in process in America, Europe, and Japan is quite enough to send shivers down the spines of the people in knowledgeable circles. They feel terrified to visualize the consequences of such a war. Sergel Neuman, a member of American military staff, has written an article on the impending war. According to him, it will not be a fight between armies but a sort of general massacre which would not spare the innocent population, even children and women. The research in the field of science has shifted the fight from combatants to chemical compounds and senseless weapons, unable to distinguish between combatants and non-combatants.

Now the wars shall not be fought in fields and forts, but, in cities and habitations, because, according to the modern theory, an enemy's real strength lies not in armed forces but in its cities and towns, and commercial and industrial centers. Now the airplanes shall drop different types of bombs raining explosive material,

poisonous gases, germs of various diseases that would destroy millions of people—men, women, and children within no time. A single Lewisite bomb may shatter the biggest building complex of London to pieces.⁴

There is a poisonous gas called "Green Cross Gas," which, if sniffed, makes a person feel as if he has been drowned in the water. "Yellow Cross Gas" is poisonous like a snake and acts exactly like snake poison. There are 12 more such poisonous gases that are almost invisible. Their effects are not at all felt in the beginning, but by the time they are felt they become incurable. One of them is a sort of gas that spreads at a very high altitude and the pilot of any airplane crossing it loses eyesight. I believed that one ton of some such gases can destroy the whole of Paris within one hour with the help only 100 airplanes.

Recently, an electric incendiary bomb has been invented. Weighing only 100 kilograms, it is so powerful that it would generate heat to the tune of 3000 degrees Fahrenheit flaring a fire that cannot be put out by any means. The water works as petrol to such a fire and science has not yet discovered any method of extinguishing it. It is meant to be sprayed on big commercial centers to set them on fire from one end to the other. Later, to make complete annihilation sure, the airplanes would drop poisonous gas bombs on the fleeing mobs.

According to armament experts, these inventions can level the world's biggest and safest capital to the ground with the help of a few airplanes within only two hours. A population of millions of people can be poisoned in such a way that they may go to sleep unawares in the night but none of them, not a single person, may get up alive in the morning. The whole water reservoir of a country, its cattle wealth, crops, and orchards can be destroyed with poisonous matter. No effective device has been invented as yet to check these devastating attacks except to use similar devices to wipe out the opponent, resulting in the destruction of both the countries.

This is but a short resume of future war preparations. Details can be had from the book titled: *What Would Be the Character of a New War*, published after regular research by Geneva's Inter-Parliamentary Union. Its study will reveal how Western civilization has piled up, with its own hands, the means and material for its destruction. Now its life span is no more than the date of declaration of a new world war.⁵

The day a war is declared between two superpowers, take it for granted, the doom of Western civilization is sealed. A war between two superpowers would, beyond any doubt, turn into a world war. And a world war would definitely result in world-wide destruction.

Disorder doth appear on land and sea because of the evil which men's own hands have done, that He may let them taste some part or that which they have done, that haply so they may return. (33:41)

Anyhow it is not very far off that the power and authority on earth may change hands and some down-trodden nation may come up and replace the autocrats and the oppressors. It is yet to be seen who is chosen by Allah to replace the present superpowers.

We cannot anyway guess which nation is to take over next. It is but a favor from Allah. He snatches power and authority from whom He likes and bestows it on whom He chooses:

Say: O Allah! Owner of Sovereignty Thou givest sovereignty unto whom Thou wilt and Thou withdrawest sovereignty from whom Thou wilt. (3:26)

But this too is governed by law of Nature which has been explicitly stated in His Book. It says that a nation is toppled as a result of its misdeeds. Allah replaces it with some other nation that is not corrupt and rebellious like its predecessor.

If you disobeyed you will be replaced by some other people who will not be like you. (47:38)

Thus, apparently it looks that the next change stands no chance for the success and rise of those backward and licentious nations that are aping Western civilization, not in its virtues, whatever little it may have retained, but in its vices, which are the real cause of its decline.

NOTES

1. An article published in the monthly *Tarjuman-ul-Quran* in Oct. 1932 by Jamadi ul-Akhir, 1352 A.H.
2. The Quran, 7:129.
3. The Israeli State was formed in Palestine a few years after this article's publication. That made the people doubt the authenticity of the Quranic prophecy. But it is a known fact that the state of Israel has been established not on its own strength, but with an all out assistance and support from America, England, Russia, and France. Jews are being brought into this tiny state from all over the world. The day these Western powers are involved in any world war, and rendered incapable of supporting Israel, shall be the Doomsday for Israel and the Arab countries around shall push this bundle of filth into the Mediterranean sea. Apparently the Jews seem to have won a homeland in the heart of Arab nations with all out support of Western powers, but in fact it is the beginning of a very big calamity for them.
4. The apprehension of the late 1930's came true in 1945 when the atom bomb totally liquidated Hiroshima and Nagasaki, two densely populated big cities in Japan. It was just a sample Demonstration of the devastating weaponry, which later developed a far more powerful hydrogen bomb.
5. An example of what happened during the Second World War of 1939-1945 can be seen in the Hiroshima and Nagasaki holocaust. Lord Russell's "Scourge of the Swastika" presents much more support for the fact that a Godless civilization proves itself a thousand times more beastly than a beast.