Maulana Maududi's Responses To Western Civilization, Ideologies And Institutions (Nationalism, Communism, Secularism and Democracy)
The present chapter makes an attempt to study some of these interesting issues regarding the basic characteristics of Western Civilization and its vehement attack by a radical scholar namely Maulana Maududi.

The discussion is divided as under

First section provides brief definition of Civilization. This is followed by meaning of Civilization, Western Civilization, Western Ideologies and Western Institutions.

Thereafter Maulana Maududi’s responses to the above mentioned Civilization, ideologies and institutions are analyzed.

Civilization (Definition)

Civilization is derived from the Latin word for city, civitas. There is reason to emphasize this derivation, for every great civilization has great cities, and the basic characteristics of civilization are easier to observe in cities. Civilization is first of all cooperation- men working together to satisfy their material and spiritual needs. It requires organization- as soon as several people start working together there must be some sort of social, political, or economic pattern to regulate their activity. It encourages specialization- as soon as several people begin to cooperate in an organized way there are obvious advantages in dividing the work so that no one man has to do every thing for himself. The character of a particular civilization is determined by the type and degree of the organization and specialization of that civilization. Ten thousand Greeks living in a small city state could accomplish much more than ten thousand Indians scattered through the forests of Northern America. A few hundred men specializing in Science have done more to change our civilization in the last few centuries than millions of artisans working through past ages. Intensive organization and specialization can produce spectacular results, and they can also create spectacular problems.
Civilization requires faith in certain ideals and values as well as skill in organization and techniques. The immediate and direct advantages of organization and specialization are not very apparent to most people. Organization sets limits on personal freedom, and specialization makes a man dependent on other men who may not wholly trustworthy. In the long run the advantages are greater than the disadvantages, but farsighted, enlightened self-interest is a very rare human quality, probably rare than altruism.¹

Meaning of Civilization

The term “civilization” is widely used by historians, anthropologists, and other workers in the social Sciences, but it has no single, fixed meaning. Three distinct meanings of the term “civilization” are in common use. Sometimes it refers to the state of being civilized, that is, to the possession of good manners and self control, as in the phrase “a thoroughly civilized man.” This was the original meaning of the term when it was introduced, first in to French, during the 18th century by writers like Voltaire.

From this meaning, writers of the 19th century expanded the term “civilization” to mean the growth through the time of knowledge and skills that encouraged or allowed men to attain “civilized,” behaviour. Lewis Henry Morgan, for example, put his central thesis in to the title of his book: Ancient Society, or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery Through Barbarism to Civilization (1877). Karl Marx accepted Morgan’s thesis, and many Marxists today defined it as the only correct picture of the human past.

The third meaning of “civilization” came in to English usage from German. Johann Gottfried Von Herder and other writers of the 18th century took great pains to rescue the German language and style of thought from the borrowed finery of French. In so doing, they stressed the uniqueness of their own nation and the differences of its culture from that of any other folk. By generating this idea, civilization of course becomes plural. A writer ought to
speak, not of the progress of civilization in general as the French did, but of the rise and fall of separate German, Roman, Hebrew, Chinese, or European civilizations.²

**Western Civilization**

Western Civilization presents one of the most difficult tasks for historical analysis, because it is not yet finished, because we are a part of it and lack perspective, and because it presents considerable variation from our pattern of historical change. The first two of these difficulties are obvious enough. If Western Civilization is still in its course, its future is not yet settled and its past is, accordingly, capable of diverse interpretations. Moreover, our own involvement in it handicaps our interpretation because many of its more significant features are so familiar to us that we accept them without statement or even recognition. No culture has ever exceeded Western Civilization in power and extent. Our society now covers more than half of the globe, extending in space from Poland in the east to Australia in the west. In course of this expansion, most of it during the last five centuries, the power of Western Civilization has been so great that it has destroyed, almost without thinking about it, hundreds of other societies, including five or six other civilizations.³

Western civilization is only one, and by no means the oldest, of the civilizations that have left a historical record. The earliest civilizations touched Europe and the West only slightly, they centred in the river valleys of Egypt, the near east, and China. Only with the appearance of the Greek city states after 1000 B.C. can we see the beginnings of civilization which belongs to the same family as our own. The Greeks drew heavily on the older civilizations of their neighbours, but they recognized their borrowed materials and added significant elements to them. Ideas and forms of organization which have remained important in Western civilization for over twenty hundred years first appear in ancient Greece. The Romans followed the Greeks as the dominant people in the Mediterranean basin. Like the
Greeks, they borrowed from their predecessors, rearranged the old materials in new ways, and ideas of their own, especially in government and law. Roman civilization is the direct ancestor of the civilization of the modern European Countries (Western Civilization). There has never been a time, from the first conquests of the Roman Republic down to the present, when Roman law and Roman political ideas were not being discussed in some parts of the continent.

Yet there is unbroken continuity between the civilization of the Greeks and the Romans and that of the modern West (Western Civilization), it is well to remember that continuity is not identity. Much has been added— for example, the ideas brought in by Christianity— and much has been changed.4 Western Civilization as we observed it in the 20th Century could not have reached the present stage without undergoing various phases. To quote Carroll Quigley “Although western civilization emerged from the wreckage of classical antiquity, it differed from it in every important aspect of its culture. Even in its various stages it had a different military system (based on specialized cavalry rather than on infantry), a different technology (based on animal power rather than on slavery), a different economic organization, a different political organization (formed about rural castles rather than around municipal acropolises), and, above all, an entirely different religious system and basic ideology. The only level where a certain similarity between the two cultures could be found is on the social levels where both civilizations began with a two class society of fighting nobles and agricultural peasantry organized in a self sufficient economic units (genos and manor) and slowly changed, in both cases, by the insertion of a town-dwelling commercial middle class between the original two.5

**Western Ideology**

Western ideology is optimistic, moderate, hierarchical, democratic, yet social and dynamic. All these terms refer only to the aspects of the whole and do not really get us to its essence. This essence might be summed up
in the belief that, "Truth unfolds in time through a communal process." Before we attempt to analyze this rather cryptic statement, we should say a few words about the superficial aspects.

The Western outlook is optimistic because it believes that the world is basically good and that the greatest good lies in the future. This covers all the ideas Etienne Gilson included in the term “Christian optimism”. The classical ideology began by being mundane and ended with a dualism in which it saw the universe as an evil material world opposed to a good spiritual sphere. Western ideology believes that the material is good and the spiritual is better but that they are not opposed to each other since the material world is necessary for the achievement of the spiritual world. The world and the flesh are good because they were both made by God (as in the old Testament). The material world is necessary to the spiritual in two ways:

(I) No soul exists without a body and
(II) No soul can be saved except by its own efforts and cooperative actions with other persons, both of which can be achieved only by bodily actions in this world.

These ideas appeared clearly in the Christian religion, although they had a very difficult time getting accepted because the dualistic late Classical ideology regarded the world and the flesh as evil and felt that the spirit could achieve full spirituality only by freeing itself from the body, from the world and from contact with one's fellow man and that such spiritual achievement was a consequence of the individual's own activity alone, with out cooperation with his fellow men. This attitude appeared very clearly in Persian thinking about 600 B.C, came into classical antiquity through the Pythagorean rationalists, and was given a clear, explicit, and influential statement in Plato's Phaedo about 335B.C. although quite incompatible with the Classical outlook, these ideas became increasingly influential and became generally accepted philosophic outlook after the third century of our
era. This led to a phenomenal outgrowth of anchrotism in the 3rd to 6th centuries. It must be recognized that this philosophic position was basically incompatible with the religious ideas of Christianity. The later has been threatened ever since by dualistic heresies (like Araianism, Catharism, or Jansenism) derived from this philosophic background.

Two aspects of Western Ideology merit a special elaboration. First that there is a truth or goal for man's activity. Thus it rejects despair, solipsism, skepticism, pessimism, and chaos. It implies hope, order, and the existence of a meaningful objective external reality. And it provides the basis for science, religion and social action as the west has known these. Second, this ideology assumes that no one, now, has the truth in any complete or even adequate way; it must be sought or struggled for. Thus this outlook rejects smugness, complacency, pride and personal authority in favor of the Christian virtues and a kind of basic ahnosticism (with the implication "we do not know everything”), as well as the idea of achievement of good through struggle to reach the good. The earliest great work of German literature, has as its subtitle “The Brave Man Slowly wise.” This is typical of the Western ideology's belief that wisdom (or any real achievement) comes as a consequence of personal effort in time. The same idea is to be found in Dante's Divine Comedy, in Shakespeare's tragedies (taken as a whole), and in Beethoven's Symphonies.

The crux of these two aspects can be summarized as:
One is that no one has the whole truth now but that it can be approached closer and closer in the future, by vigorous effort, and the other is that no single individual does this or achieves this, but that it must be achieved by a cumulative effort, by a kind of cooperation in competition in which each individual's efforts help to correct the errors of others and thus help the development of a consensus that is closer to the truth than the actions of any single individual ever could be.
There is also a third idea here, namely, that the resulting consensus is still not final, although far superior to any earlier or more individual version. Thus the advance of mankind or of any single individual is an endless process in which truth (or any achievement, even the development of an individual's personality) is constantly approached closer and closer with out ever being finished or reached.6

The social unfolding of truth, is the basis of the Western religious out-look. This out-look believed that religious truth unfolded in time and is not yet complete. The Old Testament, for example was not canceled or replaced by the New Testament but was supplemented by it. And the New Testament was never, in most of the life of Western Civilization, regarded as a literal, explicit, and final statement of the truth.

The same outlook appears in the basic political ideas of the West. These are liberal and not authoritarian. They can not be authoritarian because no individual or institution has full and final truth, instead a fuller and more complete truth emerges as a guide to social activity from the free debate in free assembly of all men's partial truths. Thus liberalism in this sense is basic in the outlook of the West and goes back, as we indicated earlier, to the dissociation of state and society in the Dark-Ages when the former vanished and the latter continued. In its narrowest version this idea appeared as the theory that all men with different outlooks or contributions cooperate together to form something greater than the partial opinions of any of them. This kind of pluralism is assumed by the Policraticus of John of Salisbury in the 20th century as much as it is assumed by the United States Constitution in the 18th century.

The same kin of pluralist out-look is the real justification of Capitalism and Laissez-Faire or pluralistic economic systems so typical of the West even in its early period when economic development was taking its first steps. Thus we see the basic ideology of the West reflected in all aspects of the society, and continuing to influence ideas and actions even after it has been
explicitly rejected. It is, for example, behind the theories of such late and "unconventional" thinkers as Darwin or Marx, both of whom believed that the Better emerged from the Good by the superficial struggles of the many to achieve what could never have been reached by any single individual alone. In fact, of these two, Marxist dialectic materialism is rather closer to the Western tradition than Darwin's struggle for existence is Marx, like his mentor Hegel, was Western in his belief that progress is achieved through struggle, but, like Hegel, he committed the Western sin of pride (the sin of Lucifer) in the intellectual arrogance which expected achievement of a final goal in the material world and in the near future. 

**Western Institutions**

**Nationalism**

The word 'nation 'has been used since the 13 century and derived from Latin nasci, meaning to be born. In the form of nation, it referred to a group of people united by birth or birthplace. In its original usage, "nation “thus implied a breed of people or a racial group, but possessed no political significance. It was not until the late 18th century that the term acquired political overtones, individuals and groups started to be classified as nationalists. The term nationalism was first used in print in 1789 by the anti Jacobin French priest Augustin Barruel. By mid 19th century nationalism was widely recognized as a political doctrine or movement, for example as a major ingredient of the revolutions that swept across Europe in 1848. In many respects, nationalism developed into the most successful and compelling of political creeds, helping to shape and reshape History in many parts of the world for over200 years.

The idea of nationalism was born during the French Revolution. Previously countries had been thought of as “realms”, “principalities” or “kingdoms”. The inhabitants of a country were “subjects”, their political identity being formed by allegiance to ruler or ruling dynasty, rather than any sense of
national identity or patriotism. However, the revolutionaries in France who rose up against Louis XVI in 1789 did so in the name of the people, and understood the people to be the ‘French nation’. Their ideas were influenced by the writings of Jean Jacques Rousseau and the new doctrine of popular self-government.

Nationalism was therefore a revolutionary and democratic creed, reflecting the idea that “the subjects of the crown” should become the citizens of France. The nation should be its own master. However, such ideas were not the exclusive property of the French. During the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, 1792-1815, much of continental Europe was invaded by France, giving rise to both resentment against France and a desire for independence. In Italy and Germany, long divided into a collection of states, the experience of conquest helped to forge for the first time a consciousness of national unity, expressed in a new language of nationalism, inherited from France. Nationalist ideas also spread to Latin America in the early 19th century, when Simon Bolivar (1783-1830), the liberator, led revolutions against Spanish rule in what then New Grenada, now the countries of Colombia, Venezuela and Ecuador, as well as Peru and Bolivia.

The rising tide of nationalism redrew the map of Europe in the 19th century as the autocratic and multinational empires of Turkey, Austria and Russia started to crumble in the face of liberal and nationalist pressure. In 1848 nationalist uprisings broke out in the Italian states, amongst the Czechs and the Hungarians, and in Germany, where the desire for national unity was expressed in the creation of the short-lived Frankfurt Parliament. The 19th century was a period of nation building, Italy once dismissed by the Austrian Chancellor Metternich as a ‘mere geographical expression’, became a united state in 1861, the process of unification being completed with acquisition of Rome in 1870. Germany formerly a collection of 39 states was unified in 1871 following the Franco-Prussian war.
Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to assume that nationalism was either an irresistible or a genuinely popular movement during this period. Enthusiasm for nationalism was largely restricted to the rising middle classes, who were attracted to the ideas of unity and constitutional government. Although middle class national movements kept the dream of national unity or independence alive, they were nowhere strong enough to accomplish the process of nation building on their own. Where nationalistic goals were realized, as in Italy and Germany, it was because nationalism coincided with ambition of rising states such as Piedmout and Prussia. For example German unification owed more to the Prussian army, which defeated Austria in 1866 and France in 1870-71, than it did to the liberal national movement.

However, by the end of the 19th century nationalism had become a truly popular government, with spread of flags, national anthems, patriotic poetry and literature, public ceremonies and national holidays. Nationalism became the language of mass politics made possible by the growth of primary education, mass literacy and the spread of newspapers. The character of nationalism also changed. Nationalism had previously been associated with liberal and progressive movements, but as increasingly taken up by conservative and reactionary politicians. Nationalism came to stand for social cohesion, order and stability, particularly in the face of the growing challenge of socialism, which embodied the ideas of social revolution and international working class solidarity. Nationalism sought to integrate the increasingly powerful working into the nation, and so to preserve the established social structure. Patriotic fervour was no longer aroused by the prospect of political liberty or democracy, but by the commemoration of past national glories and military victories. Such nationalism became increasingly chauvinistic and xenophobic. Each nation claimed its own unique or superior qualities, while other nations were regarded as alien, untrustworthy, even menacing. This new climate of popular nationalism
helped to feel policies of colonial expansion that intensified dramatically in the 1870s and 1880s and by the end of the century had brought the most of the world’s population under European control. It also contributed to a mood of international suspicion and rivalry, which led to world war in 1914.

The end of the first world saw the completion of the process of nation building in central and Eastern Europe. At the Paris peace conference, U S President Woodrow Wilson advocated the principle of “national – self determination”. The Germans, Austro Hungarian and Russian empires were broken up and new states created, including Finland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Yugoslavia. These new countries were designed to be nation- states that conformed to the geography of existing national or ethnic groups. However, the First World War failed to resolve the serious national tensions that had precipitated conflict in the first place. Indeed, the experience of defeat and disappointment with the terms of the peace treaties left an inheritance of frustrated ambition and bitterness. This was most evident in Germany, Italy and Japan where Fascist or authoritarian movements came to power in the inter war period by promising to restore national pride through policies of expansion and empire. Nationalism was therefore a powerful factor leading to war in both 1914 and 1939.

During the 20th century the Doctrine of nationalism, which had been born in Europe, spread throughout the globe as the people of Asia and Africa rose in opposition to colonial rule. The process of colonization had involved not only the establishment of political control and economic dominance, but also the importation of western ideas, including nationalism, which began to be used against the colonial masters themselves. Nationalist uprising took place in Egypt in 1919 and quickly spread throughout the Middle East. The Anglo Afghan war also broke out in 1919, and rebellion took place in India, the Dutch East Indies and Indo China. After 1945 the map of Africa and Asia
was re-drawn as the British, French, Dutch and Portuguese empires each disintegrated in the face of nationalist movements that either succeeded in negotiating independence or winning wars of national liberation. Anti-colonialism not only witnessed the spread of western style nationalism to the developing world, but also generated new forms of nationalism. Nationalism in the developing world has embraced a wide range of movements. In China, Vietnam and parts of Africa, nationalism has been fused with Marxism and ‘national liberation’ has been regarded not simply as a political goal but as a part of a social revolution. Elsewhere, developing world nationalism has been anti western, rejecting both liberal democratic and revolutionary socialist conceptions of nationhood. The most important vehicle for expressing such ideas has been religious belief, and in particular Islam. The rise of Islam as a distinctive political creed has transformed political life in the Middle East and North Africa, especially since the Iranian revolution of 1979. In some respects Islam currently represents the most significant challenge the worldwide predominance of western liberal democracy.

It is however, often argued that nationalism has had its day and is now an anachronism, relevant to only European nation building in the 19th century, or the anti colonial struggles of the post 2nd world war period. Nevertheless, there is evidence not only of the persistence of nationalism but also of its revival. Since the 1960s apparently stable nation states have been increasingly disrupted by nationalist tensions. For example, in the U K, Scottish, Welsh and rival Irish nationalism have become an established feature of political life. Separatist movements have developed in the Canadian province of Quebec and among such groups as the Basques in northern Spain, the Kurds in Turkey and Iraq, the Tamils in Sri Lanka, and the Muslims of Kashmir in India. The Transformation of Eastern Europe in 1989-91 also led to a resurgence of nationalism through the area. The Soviet Union collapsed in the rising nationalism amongst its non Russian
peoples Czechoslovakia ceased to exist in 1992 with creation of separate Czech and Slovak republics. Yugoslavia was torn apart by intensified ethnic conflicts, which resulted in full scale war between Serbia and Croatia in 1991 and a 4 year civil war in Bosnia, 1992-96. Such forms of nationalism have moreover, been characterized by the desire for ethnocultural unity, and in some cases they have been openly chauvinistic and expansionist.

To treat nationalism as an ideology in its right is to encounter at least three problems.

The first is that nationalism is sometimes classified as a political doctrine rather than a fully-fledged ideology. Whereas, for instance, liberalism, conservatism and socialism constitute complex sets of interrelated ideas and values, nationalism, the argument goes, is at heart the simple belief that the nation is the natural and proper unit of Govt. The drawback of this view is that it focuses only on what might be regarded as 'classical' political nationalism, and ignores the many others, and in some respects no less significant, manifestations of nationalism, such as cultural nationalism and ethnic nationalism. The core feature of nationalism is therefore its association with self government and the nation state, but its broader link to movements and ideas that in whatever way acknowledge the central importance of the nation.

Second, nationalism is sometimes portrayed as an essentially psychological phenomenon—usually as loyalty towards one's nation or dislike of other nations—instead of as a theoretical construct. Undoubtedly one of the key features of nationalism is the potency of its effective or emotional appeal, but to understand it in these terms alone is to mistake the ideology of nationalism for the sentiment of patriotism.

Third, nationalism has a schizophrenic political character. At different times nationalism has been progressive and reactionary, democratic and authoritarian rational and irrational, left wing and right wing. It has also been associated with almost all the major ideological traditions. In their different
ways, liberals, conservatives, socialists, fascists and even communists have attracted to nationalism, and perhaps only anarchism, by virtue of its outright rejection of the state, is fundamentally at odds with nationalism. Nevertheless, although nationalist doctrines have been used by a bewildering variety of political movements and associated with sometimes diametrically opposed political causes, a bedrock nationalist ideas and theories can be identified. The most important of these are the following-

The nation, organic community, self determination, identity politics. Maulana Maududi looks at these and other problems of Nationalism from Islamic perspective. His severe criticism against Nationalism will be presented shortly.

There are various criteria which are used to define the Nationalism. Nationalism is often defined in terms of common culture based on shared values and traditions, in particular a common language, religion and history, and usually occupying the same geographical area. From this point of view, the nation can be defined by objective factors people who satisfy a requisite set of cultural criteria can be said to belong to a nation, those who do not can be classified as non nationals or members of foreign nations. However, to define a nation simply as a group of people bound together by a common culture and traditions raises some very difficult questions. Although particular cultural features are commonly associated with nationhood, notably language, religion ethnicity, history and tradition, there is no blueprint nor any objective criteria that can establish where and when a nation exists.

Language is often taken to be the clearest symbol of nationhood. A language embodies distinctive attitudes, values and forms of expression that produces a sense of familiarity and belonging. German nationalism, for instance, has traditionally been founded upon a sense of cultural unity, reflected in the purity and the survival of the German language, nations have also been highly sensitive to any dilution of or threat to their
languages. It is essentially language that divides the French speaking peoples of Quebec from the rest of English speaking Canada, and Welsh nationalism largely constructs an attempt to preserve or revive the Welsh language. At the same time there are peoples who share the same language without having any conception of a common national identity. Americans, Australians and New Zealanders may speak English as a first language, but certainly do not think of themselves as members of an "English nation".

Religion is another major component of nationhood. Religion expresses common moral values and spiritual beliefs. Islam has been a major factor in forming the national consciousness in much of North Africa and the Middle East. The Iranian Revolution of 1979 was largely inspired by the fundamentalist beliefs of Shiite Muslims, who sought to purge Iran of western, particularly American influence. Nevertheless, religious beliefs do not always coincide with a sense of nationhood. Divisions between Catholics and Protests in mainland U.K do not inspire rival nationalisms. At the same time, countries such as Poland, Italy, Brazil and Philippines share a common Catholic faith but do not feel that they belong to a unified 'Catholic nation'.

Nations have also been based upon a sense of ethnic or racial unity. This was particularly evident in Germany during the Nazi period. The German word for "people" volk, implies both cultural unity and ties of blood. The significance of race has also been highlighted by far right anti-immigration groups such as the National Front in France and the BNP in the U.K. However, nationalism usually has cultural rather than a biological basis, it reflects an ethnic unity that may be based upon race, but more usually drawn from shared values and common cultural beliefs. Nations usually share a common history and traditions. National identity is often preserved by recalling past glories, national independence, the birth day of national leaders or important military victories.
The cultural unity that supposedly expresses itself in nationhood is therefore very difficult to pin down. It reflects a varying combination of cultural factors, rather than any precise formula. Ultimately, therefore, nations can only be defined "subjectively," by their members, not by any set of external factors. In this sense, the nation is a psycho-political entity, a group of people who regard themselves as a cultural political community and are distinguished by shared loyalty or affection in the form of patriotism. Objective difficulties such as the absence of land, small population or lack of economic resources are of little significance if a group of people insists on demanding what it sees as "national rights". Latvia, for example, became an independent nation in 1991 despite having a population of only 2.6 million (barely half of whom are ethnic Lats), no source of fuel and very few natural resources. Likewise, Kurdish peoples of the Middle East have nationalist aspirations, even though the Kurds have never enjoyed formal political unity and are presently spread over of Turkey, Iraq, Iran and Syria.

Before concluding the discussion on Nationalism it is imperative to look at this concept within the ambit of rising phase of Globalization which has posed a serious challenge to the basic foundations of the concept. Globalization has had a far-reaching impact on both the nation state and political doctrines rooted in the idea of national distinctiveness. It has, for instance, led to the emergence of an integrated global economy, meaning that material prosperity is often more determined by the investment decisions of transnational corporations than it is by the actions of the national governments. In cultural terms, with the growth of air travel, foreign tourism, satellite television and the internet, globalization means the spread of a market-driven society, sometimes seen as the 'McDonaldization' of the world. Can nations any longer be regarded as meaningful entities when people in different parts of the world watch the same films and television programmes, eat the same food, enjoy the same sports and so on? Given
the remorseless nature of such developments, surely the 21st century is going to witness the final eclipse of political nationalism.⁹

Nationalism is generally defined as a sentiment or a condition of mind of a group of people sharing some things in common.

A. E. Zimmerman views nationalism as "a sentiment to share the glories of the past, to have done great deeds together, to have a common will in the present and a desire to do more in the future."

According to Richard Snyder, "nationalism, a product of political, economic, social and intellectual factors at a certain stage in history, is a condition of mind, feeling or sentiment of a group of people living in a well-defined geographical area, speaking a common language, possessing a literature in which the aspirations of the nation have been expressed, attached to common traditions and common customs, venerating its own heroes, and in some cases, having a common religion."

A similar definition is given by Hans Kohan who identifies nationalism as "a state of mind permeating a large majority of people." He further recognizes "the state as the ideal form of political organization and the nationality as the source of all creative cultural energy and economic wellbeing. The supreme loyalty of man is, therefore, due to his own nationality, as his own life is supposedly rooted in and made possible by its welfare."

The definition by Hayes views nationalism in quite different terms. He states that it is a "modern emotional fusion and exaggeration of two very old phenomena- nationality and patriotism."¹⁰

**Communism**

"Communism, at least according to classical theory, aims at creating a classless society to which all the means of production, distribution, and exchange will be owned by the community and from which the state conceived as an instrument of coercion and oppression will have disappeared."¹¹ ......................................................... (R.N. Carew Hunt).
“There is little merit in socialism as a matter of pure economics. Nationalism and all the rest of it is so much mere machinery, essential machinery; the aim is, or should be, the enhancement of personality. A technically socialist state, in the economic sense, can be as illiberal as materialistic, as inhumane as a capitalist one; indeed, it can be more so. In other words socialism is valuable only in so far as it serves western (human) values.” (Victor Gollanez; Our Threatened Values)

The philosophy of communism is a revised version of Marxism, largely the work of Lenin and therefore often called “Marxism Leninism.” Trotsky’s part in it, which was in fact considerable, is systematically denied or obscured by communist writers because of his later expulsion from the party.

The official definition of Lenin’s relation to Marx stated by Stalin in his Foundations of Leninism (1924) is that" Leninism is Marxism in the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution.” Emphasis is thus put upon Lenin’s writings and speeches during World War I and after the Communist revolution in Russia in 1917. The implication of Stalin’s definition is therefore, that Lenin’s revisions were occasioned by the revolution of European Capitalism after the publication of Capital (1867), especially its colonial expansion and hence its supposed responsibility for the war of 1914. In the same essay Stalin mentioned another interpretation of Lenin’s philosophy, that it was an adaptation of Marxism to the state of affairs in Russia, which Stalin of course rejected, because it reduced Leninism to a merely ideological adaptation of Marx. Nevertheless, the latter interpretation has often been repeated by non-communist writers, because in 1914 Lenin had been for a dozen years or more a leader of one wing of Russian Marxism, and most of what he had written up to that time had in fact dealt with the problems of a Russian party.

Communism is known as ‘scientific socialism’. Communism as a systematic and consistent political doctrine is as old as Karl Marx. In the pre-Marxian period there were traces of Communistic thought in the writings of Plato,
Thomas More, St. Simon, Robert Owen and Charles Furrier. But Marx has dismissed their ideas as "Utopian socialism" and claims to have established the first scientific doctrine of socialism. Hence our study of Communism must begin with Marx. An introductory note on pre-Marxian Communist thought is given.

Saint Simon, Robert Owen, Charles Furrier, Proudhon, Louis Blane, John Gray, etc, are the leading socialist thinkers in the pre-Marxian period. They are known as "utopian socialists". They are criticized on the ground that they were more threatened in their approach. Karl Marx made socialism scientific and practical. Socialism before Marx was merely a protest and aspiration but Marx made it practical and militant. Marx, therefore, is considered to be the greatest socialist of the world. His scientific socialism is otherwise known as Marxism.

The theory of Marxism has been influenced by three major factors, namely, the common idealism, the English economic ideas, and the French revolutionary and socialist thought. Marx derived the idea of dialectic from Hegel, the famous idealist thinker of Germany. The idea that "labour is the most important factor of production" and the labourer is always paid less, has been derived from the English economists of the 18th century. That society can be changed through revolution and force is required to bring about the desired changes is the product of French revolutionary and socialist thought. The theory of Marxism is a curious mixture of above three theories. It is correct that Marx collected stones from various places but he used them to build a temple which was very much according to his own design. As Laski has said that "the Communist Manifesto" is one of the outstanding documents of all times.

Lenin made few changes over Marxism. The present philosophy of communism is the result of what is known as "Marxism-Leninism". Sabine has rightly observed, "The philosophy of Communism is a revised version of
Marxism, largely the work of Lenin and therefore, often called Marxism-Leninism”. The important influences on Marx’s thought were those of Hegel and Feurbach (1804-72). From Hegel he borrowed the idea of the dialectic, which means that progress comes about as a result of an interaction between opposites. According to Hegel history precedes a dialectic path in its predetermined goal. Hegel had taught the dialectic in the realm of ideas, whereas Marx applied it to matter. While Hegel had taught dialectical idealism, Marx taught materialism. Writing on this difference, Marx claimed that he was placing Hegel “right side up”. To quote his own words “with him (Hegel) it (the dialectic) is standing on its head. It must be turned right side up again.” To Hegel the primary thing is the evolution of the idea. To Marx, however, matter is primary spirit, thought and consciousness are derivative. The material life of society determines the spiritual. Adapting the highly speculative conception of the dialectic to man’s economic life, Marx contended that the earliest stage in Marx’s economic development was one of the primitive communism and that this economy later came into conflict with feudalism and capitalism, and that out of this interaction between the two a scientific communism was coming into existence.

From Feurbach Marx learned that it is not God who creates man but it is man who creates God. In his own words, “man makes religion, religion does not make man.” Religion, he said, is “the opiate of the people,” and these words have become widely known through the world. According to Marx, God exists only in man’s mind. Interpreting this thought Hallowell writes that history in Marx’s thought is not a conflict between spirit and matter, it is not the unfolding of the spirit of the Absolute. It is nothing else than the activity of man pursuing his own aims.”
Secularism

A belief that religion should not intrude in to secular (worldly) affairs, usually reflected in the desire to separate Church from State.\textsuperscript{16}

Secularism: Machiavelli separated religion and morals from politics but Hobbes subordinated both to politics. He thus stood for secularism which even today is considered as the best basis for stability of Government.\textsuperscript{17}

Hobbes believed in absolute sovereignty. He did not believe in the spiritual authority of the Church and its right to equate itself with the sovereign. His conception over lordship of sovereign, both temporal and spiritual, left no ground for the Church to exert its influence. The Church had no power whatsoever. It was an assembly of persons believing in some particular religious doctrines. If they assembled without the permission of the sovereign or the sovereign did not refuse permission that was his good will. Thus the Church is the department of the state and not at par or above the state and the sovereign. Hobbes condemned ideas of both world religion, state and the sovereign. The Church always tried to superimpose itself and sought for establishing his own authority over temporal lords but there is no spiritual government there could not be a world church. Each church is confined to its own state. The sovereign is both temporal and Spiritual authority. His authority is derived from God. He is the deputy of God on earth. Being representative of God there is no need to separate spiritual authority of Church from that of the state. Hobbe's philosophy had no place for church state.

To quote Maxey, "He was so devastatingly critical of the theological absurdities of the time, so cogently insistent upon the supremacy of temporal authority, so skeptical of supernaturalism in all its forms and pretenses, and so savagely disparaging to the Roman Church in particular, that his name became anathema to the pious of all creeds."\textsuperscript{18}
Secular State

It was due to the efforts of Aquinas that the old idea that the religions acting through the machinery of the state should dominate Science and philosophy was substituted by national sentiment for religious authority as the dominating force behind Government. In this way he contributed to the idea of nation state.19

Arguments for Secular supremacy

To face strong arguments of Papacy the monarchs or the kings could advance equally weighty arguments. They exercised uncontrolled sway over the secular affairs. However, usually the monarchs adopted defensive attitude and were not on the offensive. They effectively repulsed the onslaught and did not take the offensive attitude. They agreed that the church and the state were two distinct organizations. They agreed that the state should content itself by claiming rights and supremacy over the secular and not over the temporal affairs. Thus the secularists were moderates and never extremists. According to Sabine, “The position taken by the imperialist parties to the investiture controversy was on the whole more defensive than that of the Papalists.” The claim for church supremacy over secular affairs was challenged.20

Democracy

Democracy is a very old word but the meanings have always been complex. It came in to use in the English Language in the 16th century, from a translation of demokratia (Greek), from the root words demos (people), and Kratos (rule).

According to Herodotus, democracy is “the insolence of the unbridled commonality”. Aristotle wrote: “a democracy is a state where the freemen and the poor, being in the majority, are invested with the power of the state”. Plato made Socrates say in the Republic that “democracy comes in to being after the poor have conquered their opponents, slaughtering some and
banishing some, while to the remainder they give all equal share of freedom, and power."
The history of political science suggests that democracy was, until the 19th century, an unfavorable term, and it is only since the late 19th and early 20th centuries that a majority of political parties and tendencies have united in declaring their belief in it. This is the most striking historical fact.
Aquinas defined democracy as popular power, where the ordinary people, by force of numbers, governed-oppressed-the rich, the whole power acting like a tyrant. This strong class sense remained the predominated meaning of democracy until the late 18th and early 19th centuries and was still active in mid-19th century arguments. To Aquinas' definition of the people as the multitude there was added a common sense of the consequent type of rule: a democracy was a state in which all had the right to rule and did actually rule; it was even contrasted, for instance, by Spinoza, with a state in which there was rule by representatives, including elected representatives.
It was in this sense that the first political constitution to use the term democracy— that of Rhode Island in 1641—understood it: "...popular government; that is to say it is in the power of the body of freemen orderly assembled, or major part of them, to make or constitute just Laws, by which they will be regulated, and to depute from among themselves such ministers as shall see them faithfully executed between man and man".
Bentham formulated a general sense of democracy as rule by the majority of the people and then distinguished between "direct democracy" and "representative democracy", recommending the latter because it provided continuity and could be extended to large societies.
Austin, Bryce, Dicey, Lowell, Seeley and several others treated democracy chiefly as a form of government.
Definitions Of Democracy

Machperson: "Democracy is merely a mechanism for choosing and authorizing governments or in some other way getting laws and political decisions made."

Seeley: "Democracy is a government in which every one has a share."

Dicey: "Democracy is a form of government in which the governing body is a comparatively large fraction of the entire nation."

Lipset: Democracy is "a political system which supplies regular constitutional opportunity for changing the government officials, and a social mechanism which permits the largest possible part of the population to influence major decisions by choosing among contenders for political office."

James Bryce: Democracy is "the rule of the people expressing their sovereign will through the votes."

Abraham Lincoln: "Democracy is the government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

John Stuart Mill: Democracy is that form of government in which "the whole people, or some numerous portion of them, exercise their governing power through deputies periodically elected by themselves."

Evolution of Democracy: It is said that democracy's long history is the story of how people, instead of property, became its frame of reference. It is also the story of how the term for a particular type of governmental institution in ancient Greece has come to express a philosophical approach to the control and regulation of governmental power regardless of the particular institutional format in which it is organized. From the 5th century B.C. until the establishment of the American republic, democracy meant a government which functioned on the basis of direct and constant participation by the mass of its citizens.21

The Struggle For 'Popular Democracy': Although it continued to bear the "mobocracy" stigma which Aristotle had placed on it, popular democracy
continued as a persistent underground influence in the shaping of political thought. For long periods it exerted no influence.\textsuperscript{22}

\textbf{The Model Of Democracy}

From a structural standpoint, democratic societies ideally reveal a balance between conflict and consensus. That is in handling four core problems - creation of common identity, development of effective power, establishment of legislative authority, and the reduction and distribution of goods and services - democratic political actors reveal both cohesion and division around values and resources.

According to C.F Andrain, democratic systems seek a common identity around civil values. Citizens retain their attachments to diverse primordial sacred and personal ties and are not expected to give their exclusive, unitary loyalty to the leader the party or the state. No ideological orthodoxy defines dissent from the dominant opinions as treason. People give their loyalty to several sources. Thus, democratic societies tend to preserve diversity and conflict. Civil ties also imply consensus and a commitment to common ends.

The leaders and citizens of a democratic system seek to realize a common identity that transcends but does not obliterate the diverse primordial, sacred, and personal values. They share a common commitment to democratic institutions. The leaders accept the need for mutual trust and confidence for tackling corruption. They also accept the notion of a larger public good, which encourages a concern for the welfare of the whole community. The citizens in turn, have a basic trust among them. They participate in politics not only to satisfy their private needs but also to make policies that will benefit the whole community, including diverse racial, ethnic, religious, and regional groups. In short, the ideal democratic identity rests on “unity in diversity.” Civility implies both consensus and conflict.
The power relations of democratic systems show the same balance between conflict and consensus. On the one hand, democratic societies experience competing centers of organized power; both in societies and in government there is a division of power. At the political institutional level, the court, judges have some autonomy from the key decision-makers. At the non-governmental level, a number of voluntary groups mediate between citizens and the government. In their socially pluralistic arrangement, interest groups, the mass media, political parties, and other voluntary associations compete for power; and each power center retains the independence from the government and from other groups. Thus, formal institutions and non-governmental organizations limit the arbitrary exercise and the monopoly of power, and they facilitate the dispersal and conflict of power.

On the other hand, the power relations in democratic societies show consensus, a concern with the use of power for common ends. Social groups, political parties, and individual citizens exercise control over governmental power. Yet, the political leaders need to have sufficient powers (resources) to make and carry out policies for the society. Therefore, the citizens of the democratic societies agree that their leaders' responsibility for society must be accompanied by the power needed to meet new problems, evolve tentative solutions, and take actions to handle social tensions. Without this grant of political power to leaders motivated to serve public goals, the various sub societal groups can dominate the society. Thus, in democracy, there needs to be a balance between power relations expressing conflict and those showing consensus.

The rule of law in a democracy also tends to produce consensus. The law regulates the conflict among groups and between groups and the government, and it imposes certain common, shared obligations on both the leaders and the non-leaders. The question of legitimacy assumes greater importance in democratic societies.
Popular attitudes towards authority in a democratic set-up reveal a balance between conflict and consensus. Citizens do not oppose all authority; rather, they insist that authority be reasonable, not arbitrary or capricious. The ideal democratic citizen expresses a basic trust in the democratic structures. His support for the system does not extend to the point of allowing undemocratic structures, laws, leaders to go unchallenged.

In short, if political leaders in a democracy expect the citizens to grant them legitimacy, they will act to uphold procedural and instrumental principles of legitimacy. The production and distribution of goods and services in a democratic society also show a balance between conflict and consensus and so also the production and distribution of resources. Concern for the general economic welfare is balanced with a recognition of benefits stemming from private, diverse economic interests. However, in an ideal democracy, both private and public economic needs are pursued.

Elite Theories OF Democracy

Modern elite theory is largely associated with Gaetano Mosca, Vilfredo Pareto and Robert Michels. In their works on elite recruitment and elite circulation, these writers sought to justify the authority of rulers and to question the basis for democratic government as it was developing in Europe towards the end of the 19th century. In their view, all societies are sharply divided into rulers and masses. Ruling elites are recruited in a self-perpetuating manner from the higher strata of society, are autonomous in their exercise of power and control the masses through superior political skills and organization.

Their works were opposed to the classical theory of democracy. They opposed the rise of the universal franchise, and feared that extension of voting rights to the masses, to ordinary workers and peasants, would threaten the just authority of political leaders, and would also open the door to socialism. Michels, a German disciple of Mosca and in his early years a
syndicalist, later a professor at the University of Turin and ended his career as a scholarly supporter of Mussolini and Italian fascism. Pareto also judged fascism as a positive development in Italy. Mosca, a political liberal, nonetheless opposed the extension of voting rights to ordinary workers and peasants, which in his view would be lowering standards and dangerously flirting with the possibility of socialism through manipulation of the proletariat. Mosca's commitment to liberalism, as was the case with several German, Italian and French liberals of the time, did not preclude opposition to parliamentary democracy with universal adult franchise. Common to these elite theorists was their opposition to the further evolution of Parliament beyond middle-class participation, their distrust of ordinary workers and peasants as potential voters and citizens, and their abiding fear of socialism in any form. However, some scholars committed to the values of liberalism and democracy attempted to search for ways to combine the insights of elite theory with the basic requirements of democratic theory. Joseph Schumpeter was one of the pioneers in this field. Schumpeter's work borrows from elite theory the notion that even in a democracy elites must rule; the question is how to structure the selection of political leadership according to democratic procedures that result in an effective and stable governing elite. The main problem for Schumpeter is the avoidance of mass movements led by anti-system elites (fascists or communists) in societies which are increasingly mass societies. Writers like Mosca and Pareto argued that elites were not so much advantageous as inevitable, democracy not so much undesirable as impossible. This was a' scientific' law.23

Western Democracy

The origins of the term 'democracy' can be traced back to Ancient Greece. Like other words ending in 'cracy'- autocracy, aristocracy, bureaucracy and so on—democracy is derived from the Greek word kratos, meaning power or
rule. Democracy thus stands for ‘rule by the demos’, demos meaning ‘the people’, though it was originally taken to imply ‘the poor’ or ‘the many’. A more modern version of the democratic principle is found in Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg address of 1863, which extolled the virtues of ‘government of the people, by the people and for the people.’ However, democracy is a contested concept: there is no agreed or settled definition of the term, only a number of rival definitions. There is therefore no single model of democratic rule, only a number of competing versions. Historically, the most successful of those has been liberal democracy, by the end of the 20th century, liberal democracy approved to have vanquished its major rivals. Nevertheless, liberal democratic political systems have a hybrid character they embody two distinct features, one liberal, the other democratic element reflects commitment to popular rule. As a model of democracy, liberal democracy has three central features:

Liberal democracy is an indirect and representative form of democracy, political office is gained through success in regular elections conducted on the basis of formal political equality—'one person, one vote; one vote one value'.

It is based upon competition and electoral choice. This is ensured by political pluralism, a relevance of a wide range of contending beliefs, conflicting social philosophies and rival political movements and parties.

It is characterized by a clear distinction between the state and society. This is maintained both by internal and external checks on government power and the existence of autonomous groups and interests, and by the market or capitalist organization of economic life.

The hybrid nature of liberal democracy reflects a basic ambivalence with in liberalism towards democracy. In many ways this is rooted in the competing implications of individualism, which both embodies a fear of collective power and leads to a belief in political equality. In the 19th century, liberals often saw democracy as threatening or dangerous. In this
respect they echoed the ideas of earlier political theorists such as Plato and Aristotle, who viewed democracy as a system of rule by the masses at the expense of wisdom and property. The central liberal concern has been that democracy can become the enemy of individual liberty. This arises from the fact that 'the people' are not a single entity but rather a collection of individuals and groups, possessing different opinions and opposing interests.

The 'democratic solution' to conflict is a recourse to numbers and the application of majority rule, the principle that the will of the majority or greater number should prevail over that of the minority. Democracy thus comes down to the rule of the 51%, a prospect that the French politician and social commentator, Alex de Tocqueville(1805-59), famously described as 'the tyranny of the majority'. Individuality and minority rights can thus be crushed in the name of the people.

James Madison articulated the similar views at the U.S Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787. Madison argued that the best defence against majoritarian tyranny is a network of checks and balances that would make a government responsive to competing minorities and also safeguard the propertied few from the property less masses.

Liberals have expressed particular reservations about democracy not merely because of the danger of the majority rule but also because of the makeup of the majority in modern, industrial societies. As far as J.S Mill was concerned, for instance, political wisdom is unequally distributed and is largely related to education. The uneducated are more liable to act according to narrow class interests, whereas the educated are able to use their wisdom and experience for the good of others. He therefore insisted that elected politicians should speak for themselves rather than reflect the views of their electors, and he proposed a system of plural voting that would disenfranchise the illiterate and allocate the one, two, three or four
votes to people depending upon their level of education or special position.

Ortega y Gasset (1883-1955), the Spanish Social thinker, expressed such fears more dramatically in *The Revolt Of the Masses* (1930). Gasset warned that the arrival of mass democracy had led to the overthrow of civilized society and the moral order, paving the way for authoritarian rulers to come to power by appealing to the basest instinct of the masses.

By the 20th century, however, a large proportion of liberals had come to see democracy as a virtue, although this was based upon a number of arguments and doctrines. The earliest liberal justification for democracy was based on consent, and the idea that citizens must have a means of protecting themselves from the encroachments of government.

In the 17th century, John Locke developed a limited theory of protective democracy by arguing that voting rights should be extended to the propertied, who could then defend their natural rights against government. If government through taxation possesses the power to expropriate property, citizens are entitled to protect themselves by controlling the composition of the tax-making body - the legislature. During the American Revolution, this idea was taken up in the slogan: 'No taxation without representation'. Utilitarian theorists such as Jeremy Bentham and James Mill (1773-1836), developed the notion of democracy as a form of protection for the individual in to a case for universal suffrage. Utilitarianism is based on the belief that individuals seek pleasure and wish to avoid pain, in which case they will vote so as to advance or defend their interests as they define them. Bentham came to believe that universal suffrage 'the greatest happiness for the greatest number'. However, to justify democracy on protective grounds is provide only a qualified endorsement of democratic rule. Ultimately, protective democracy aims to give citizens the greatest scope to live their lives as they choose, and thus tends to be associated with minimum government intervention.
A more radical endorsement of democracy is linked to the virtues of political participation. This has been associated with the ideas of J.J. Rousseau but received a liberal interpretation in the writings of J.S. Mill. In a sense, J.S. Mill encapsulates the ambivalence of the liberal attitude towards democracy. In its unrestrained form, democracy leads to tyranny, but in the absence of the democracy ignorance and brutality will prevail. For Mill, the central virtue of democracy is that it promotes the 'highest and most harmonious' development of human capacities. By participating in political life citizens enhance their understanding, strengthen their sensibilities and achieve a higher level of personal development. The form of developmental democracy holds democracy to be, primarily, an educational experience. As a result, although he rejected political equality, Mill believed that the franchise should be extended to all but those who are illiterate and, in the process, suggested (radically for his time) that suffrage should also be extended to women.

However, since the 20th century, liberal theories about democracy have tended to focus less on consent and participation and more on the need for consensus in society. This can be seen in the writings of pluralist theorists, who have argued that organized groups, not individuals, have become the primary political actors and portrayed modern industrial societies as increasing complex, characterized by competition between rival interests. From this point of view, the attraction of democracy is that it is the only system of rule capable of maintaining equilibrium with in complex and fluid modern societies. As democracy gives competing groups a political voice it binds them to the political system and so maintains political stability.

The U.S. political scientists Robert Dahl (1915) and Charles Lindblom termed modern democratic systems 'polyarchies', meaning rule by the many as distinct from all citizens. A polyarchy is characterized by the extension of citizenship to a relatively high proportion of adults and the right of those citizens to oppose government officials by voting them out of office. Whilst
this may fall a long way short of the classical ideal of popular self-
government, it has the crucial advantage of maintaining a consistent level of
accountability and popular responsiveness.\textsuperscript{24}

Now a brief summary of Islamic responses by Maulana Maududi is given as under:-

**Islamic responses to Western Civilization**

Some people consider that knowledge and arts, life style, fine arts, societal
behaviour, style of culture, mode of politics is Civilization. This is not the
base or spirit of Civilization, these are manifestations or result of civilization
and not its origin. These are leaves and branches of the tree of Civilization.
And Civilization is not evaluated by these external manifestations and
outside adornments. One has to reach out to the core of the Civilization,
reach to its assets and principles of Civilization.

**Components of Civilization**

To assess, search the origin of Civilization, it is imperative to know what is
the concept of man towards religious life? What position does it assign to
man living in this world? What is his view about life? And what are the
relations of man with the world?. The question of life is so vital that all
proceedings are affected by it. The change of this concept disrupts the
civilization’s very nature. What is the purpose of life of the man, for what is
his struggle, efforts. What are the requirements towards which the man has
to run and what is the destination of man. This question defines the course
and direction of man’s life and as such he can apply his resources for the
achievement of the same. Civilization in this world has a definite basic
concept and this concept provides dynamics for the whole system of life, for
understanding of Civilization this basic concept is to be judged. Civilization
has to build a collective system, that system is made up of men and the
castle of the society gets firmness from the strength of stones, bricks and
beam/spars, which are these men, the men of this system form the base
material, if the material is rotten the building is itself rotten. Morals, society,
politics international relations come under the ambit of Civilization which ultimately as to how the family, society and government is organized by such a Civilization. The Civilization’s composition is:

I. Concept of Worldly Life.
II. Objective Of Life
III. Basic Creed and Thought
IV. Educating(Training) Individuals
V. Societal Set-up (Organization).

Every Civilization of the World comprises of these five elements similarly Islamic Civilization too is based on these five components.

**Similarity between Islamic Civilization and Western Civilization**

Both the civilizations have their own philosophy, and are in the process of evolution. Both claim to pervade the entire life, as such knowledge, Arts, technological advancement comes in to its orbit. The basis of western civilization and Islamic civilization is research and exploration in the fields hitherto unexplored.

**Divergence between two Civilizations**

On seeing wonderful feats of Western nations in the fields of politics, trade and commerce, industry, knowledge and arts; heart and intellect get a shiver (or are terrified), and this presumption strengthens about the prosperity of these nations is eternal and it has been decided out that their domination of these nation too is quite eternal. The government of Rabba Muskoon and Ansar has been monopolized by these, and their strength has been put on strong planks that it can not be razed to ground. Such supposition has been prevalent every time about all nations. Pharoah of Egypt, Aad and Thamud of Arabia, Chaldian of Iraq, Emperor of Iran, Jehangir conqueror of Greece, Ruler of Rome, Jehan kushan of Muslims, world –shaker Tar Tar—— all came on the terrestrial sphere of this Earth’s stage and demonstrated the feats of their power and dominance. Out of all these all have demonstrated their feats in their respective allotted periods,
and played up their own inning very beautifully thus throwing the world in a wonder, every rising nation has pervaded the world in the same way. In the same way all the nations have blown the trumpet of their grandeur in all the four directions of universe and world under pressure has presumed that their power is beyond the pale of downfall, but when they completed their term allotted to them the real eternal authority decreed the down fall of these nations and they fell down in such a way that not a trace of them remained on the surface of this earth and some if left out lived up in the world, but how? They became subordinate of their subordinates, slave of their slaves, and dominates of their dominants.

The system of the universe has proved out in such that way it is not stopped and there is no stationariness—there is a constant movement and revolution that never lets any thing to be unmoved and stucked to one condition. There is a fluctuation with every seemingly stationary condition, every spring followed by an autumn, and every ebb followed by a flow, and similar is it’s reflection, a small grain moves over in the air flying here and there, the other day it gains momentum and emerges out of the earth as a very stable and strong tree, there after it dries up and dies down into the earth, the vigour giver powers of nature leaves out it and tries nourishing the other seed. These are ups and downs of life. Whenever a man sees the stable condition for a long time he considers the condition is stable or unchanged for ever. If there is an ebb, he assumes the ebbed position is permanent and flow form for ever, it is not so, the difference is that of the duration i.e. earlier or later and no eternity is sealed over the face of any condition.

The condition of things in this world is moving like a wheel, birth, death, youth, old age, power, weakness, spring, autumn are phases of this revolution and occur turn wise in this revolution, and everybody perceives the period of prosperity in which it develops, expands, shows force and energy, exhibits the beauty and spring till it reaches the zenith of its prosperity. Then comes an epoch where in it decays, loses its lusture, then
is gripped in weakness and is de-energized via those forces that firstly helped its growth.

Allah's Divinity has dominated Western nations by two Satans—that drive them towards destruction and fast extermination.

(I) Satan of Genocide and
(II) Satan of Nationalism.

First Satan is encircling on their individuals and the other Satan has dominated their nations and kingdoms. This Satan has wrought havoc upon the reason of their males and females, they are bent on their own racial termination and teaching them plans of prevention and arrest of pregnancies---- even readying them for abortion and preaching them benefits of sterilization, via it they kill down the seeds plus power of procreation and makes them so damned that they kill their young ones. In short this is a Satan that does the gradual suicide to their nation.

The other Satan has snatched the right and thought and reflective power from their mega politicians and military Generals. He generates selfishness, competition, hatred, arrogance, greed and avarice like sentiments. He (second Satan) has divided them in camps and blocs and lets them to taste the power and force of the other. It is a form of Divine punishment he prepares up him for a big suicide that will not be gradual but wholesale one. He has stored up stocks of ammunition and thus prepared sites of potential danger- which is just in wait of time, on the approach of that time it will breakup in day light then will descend the destruction before which all previous destructions will be miniscule.26

**Islamic responses to Western Ideologies**

To fully grasp Maulana Maududi's criticism against ideological foundations of western thought we briefly summarize his criticism against the philosophy of life advocated by three towering philosophers of this thought namely Hegel, Darwin and Marx:-
The Western nation- that dominated us and we were cowed down by its power and the yoke of the Civilization fell up on our necks- with what concepts it came, what was its philosophy and religion? And to what extent it collectively influences religion.

Europe's Renaissance Period was deterioration for religion. The Renaissance emerged with controversy of religion and this Civilization of ended tragically and it proved ravaging not only for Europe but for all the world (religion became a casualty).

Ancient Christians (mutakalimeen) have based their religious creed and Biblical concept of universe and full construction of man's building on Greek Philosophy and scientific theories plus reasoning and information. They assumed that if these basis collide with something the whole building would come down and religion will terminate with it. So they did not like any research and criticism that cast doubts on Greek Philosophy and science (its theorems) nor liked any philosophical thought that deviated from their norms and presented any other thought, which could result to compel a review to the Christian people into their knowledge (ilimul-kalam) nor allowed any literary research that presented some thing about universe, man, Bible, and prove anything wrong in their accepted axioms. They considered it danger for their religion and system of culture and politics and economy.

Contrary to it those working for Renaissance Movement, its effects, criticism, research and discovery, on every step knew weaknesses of philosophy and science on which this system of creed and knowledge was based. The more they advanced in their research, the Christians under the influence of religion and political power stopped these on their research track.

Eyes could see in day light many things against their recognized realities, but Christians insisted upon cutting out the eyes of researchers instead of
reviewing their recognized realities. Eternal creeds looked dusty but the Christians wanted to piece down the brains of those who thought on the research lines. This struggle resulted right from the first day into a malice between religion and people of religion, it got increased with the atrocities of religious-people, this malice multiplied and this does not remained confined to church and Church-people, but religion was its hit target.

People of modernity and standard-bearers of Civilization understood religion a hoax which could not stand the test of examination. Its theories depend upon assumptions and blind imitation. It is afraid of spread of knowledge, lest its secret should be out.

When their struggle spread out in the field of politics, economy and system of collectivity (society) and after the defeat of Christians, under the guidance of new Civilization and its standard-bearers it too gave results that affected the living history of humanity. It expelled religion from every phase of life and restricted it to personal creed. It was clear in the basis of the modern Civilization that the religion has no right to interfere into any matter of life, politics, economics, morals, law, knowledge and crafts. It (religion) is a personal and private affair, any body can privately agree upon existence of God, His messenger and can obey Him but outside the collective scheme of life.

The views of modern civilization produced a secularity and anti-God tendencies. Whatever evolution in knowledge, literature and Arts, its roots still contained the malice about religion and all that is concerned with the religion.

This thought nourished by the civilization resulted in that whatever religion offers though it be concerned with the conviction of God’s existence, inspiration and Apostleship, or any cultural or moral principle is sceptic and even if it is proven still then it is deniable. Contrary to it whatever is presented by these teachers of worldly ‘knowledge experts’ deserves credibility even if there is no proof.
This thought pervaded and influenced every Western system of thought and it not only deviated knowledge and art but also the whole philosophy and collective system from the ambit of religion and the concept of hereafter.

**Philosophy Of Life**

This was a sheer materialistic philosophy. Western thinkers (advocates of this) philosophy are not ready to accept the reality of any unseen and non-material reality. Nor they believed in revelation and inspiration, they did not believe even in the fact that there was any source of knowing (e.g. revelation and inspiration), the reality of the unseen and correct understanding. The scientific spirit interrupted to raise any building on mere abstract and assumptions. If any attempt was made it too could not sustain against literary criticism and could not move ahead far from skeptic and doubt and they were bound to be confined with the world and worldly life.

Their philosophy of life was purely based on formalism (of external manifestations). They thought that the man is an animal, he is not subservient to any body nor accountable to any body, nor does he receive instructions from the above. They thought that he gets guidance from himself and if there is any source of these, it is the physical laws or information of animal life, or the experiments of human history. Life is only whatever is on this earth, his success and prosperity is required. Reality is of those things that can be weighed and measured, or its value and weight can accept measurement. Other things are valueless and running after them is a sheer wastage of time.

Maulana Maududi feels no need to refer to those Philosophical systems that were made in west, then written in the books and taught in the universities. Rather he refers to that concept of universe and man and that concept of worldly life that has been absorbed by the Western Civilization and culture, and that is in the intellect of common man who accepted its effect.

Its outline is all that he explained above.
There are three major Philosophical theories of 18th and 19th century, the period we were slaves of the West, and when we just rose up without going in details, its spirit (core) surrounded the whole civilization and it affected comprehensively the human life.

Hegel's Philosophy

Hegel gave interpretation of Human History, its outline is:

Any human civilization and culture-system of any period is in its form and aspects based on some images that make it, an epoch of civilization and when this epoch of civilization gets matured, then its weaknesses appear and some other images emerge and it begins to wage a war against it (civilization) and this struggle creates a new civilization which contains some elements of old civilization. Its aggression compels the last civilization’s dominant images. At last it comes to a compromise. Then this epoch of civilization matures and opposite images are generated from it and a state of struggle is created which gives rise to third epoch, that possesses virtues of last epoch and absorbs the new images with these virtues. Thus Hegel’s interpretation of evolution of human civilization has accepted this influence that preceding epoch of civilization has terminated itself through its deficiencies. It left virtues for coming civilization. In other words the epoch of civilization through which we pass is thought to be out line of virtues found in the civilization of last one.

If there is possibility of any development, it is in those new images that wage a war against the basic imaginations. There is no profit in u-turn. For achieving any guidance or instruction, the virtue not absorbed by the coming epoch of the civilization need not to be tested and tried as they are struck down already. These are unrevered things of their times and have worked in past human civilization (hence not reverable and do not deserve any consideration as they are already tested by the history).

Maulana cautions the humanity in general about the evil effects of this Western Ideology. He further adds that it is a dangerous Philosophy,
anybody who accepts this concept of human-civilization (of History), is not expected to have reverence towards prophets Abraham, Moses, Muhammad (peace be up on them all) and will not turn towards Caliphs of prophet, prophet hood and Khilafat for guidance and seeking leadership instructions.

This is an organized, detailed conceptual aggression, and if anybody is hit by it on the earth, the result is that roots of religious sensitivities are cut off.

**Darwin's Theory of Evolution**

Maududi feels no need to discuss its (Evolutionary theory's) biological aspects. But he feels it necessary to discuss some Philosophical effects that have come-out of his reasoning and absorbed by wide collective thought.

Maulana Maududi goes on explaining that Universe according to Darwin is a battlefield where there is a perpetual warfare. It goes on explaining that the system is so framed that the fittest only have right to survive, and in this unkind system weakers extinct and stronger sustains and survives. Everything belongs to the stronger and the weaker has to vacate a space to the stronger. In this setup it is might that is always right. Such a concept and philosophy of universe can find no sympathy, love, compassion, sacrifice and other gentle characteristics and human sentiments, justice, equity, honesty and righteousness are of what utility? Right has lost its meaning and connotation and can not reach to the weaker. Oppression can not have a sinful scale or grade in this Philosophy, fighting, infighting is a perennial state of affair in this system.

This philosophy paved way for the Europeans for inflicting the tyrannies in a mandatory way, that they have inflicted upon other nations and it provided a firm bases for Australia, America, and Africa for extermination of old races and then enslaved them.

**Marxian Material Interpretation**

Maulana Maududi viewed this Philosophy at par with that of Darwin.
Darwin penned it, it came out of the womb of Marxian Material interpretation. In other words, (Darwin) too gave the same concept of life for world that was offered by Hegel. Hegel too, as discussed above, has presented the Thought of World as a Battlefield. Darwin presented universe and system of Nature a Battlefield and Marx himself too gave mode of human society in this context.

In this picture man appears a fighter and fighting, his nature demands it, that he has to fight out with his co-geners for his interests(objectives). He was divided in different classes on his selfishness; pure selfishness has created conflict and struggle, in these. And evolution of human history has emerged on this selfish class struggle. The war of nations, the fight of one nation versus different classes of the same nation, in this perspective seems to be an exigency of nature and it reveals that if there is any relation between a man and a man it is that of interests (objectives). To meet and fulfill these interests fighting is justified even though with the relatives where there is a concept of safeguard of economic interests. Restraining from it i.e. not fighting with the relations is against the law of nature.27

Islamic responses to Western Institutions

Maulana Maududi and Western Nationalism

It becomes imperative to come out from wilderness (of Western Nationality) towards patriotism. There is a condition of singularity in majority, in common objectives and matters. So many individuals collectively cooperate, in the evolution of culture. The circle of common singularity widens till a big group of people enters into it. This group of people is called "nation". Though the term of "nation" and 'nationality" is in its technical meaning prevalent. The meaning in which it pervades is as old as culture itself. Nation and Nationality found in Babylona, Egypt, Rome, Greece was in same configuration as that is in France, England, Germany and Italy these days.
Inseparable requirements of Western Nationality

It is doubtless that (Western) nationalism starts with an innocent sentiment. Its first objective is that a specific group for its common benefits and purposes act and becomes a nation for its collective requirements but when nationalism is generated it gets the colour of Asbeyath and the intense the nationality becomes in proportion to it Asbeyath becomes intense. When a nation for the service of its objectives, for the protection of its programmes associates itself in a union or in other words selects a fort around its nationality, its effect is that it begins to differentiate between the people living in and out of its fort and prefer its own to the others not in the line of fort, supports its people to that of the others. Whenever there is a contradiction in the programmes and objectives of the insiders and outsiders it will protect its own interests and sacrifices the interests of the others. These reasons provide basis for war and peace but in peace and war the limit of nationality's line of demarcation lies there always. This precisely is called “asbiyat” and “humiath” and it is the resultant property of nationalism that is generated with it.

Composition of Nationalism

It starts with the direction of commonness and singularity whichever direction it is but there is a condition it should possess intense power and regulation in spite of the fact of number of bodies and density of their breath the people—have to have a word, thought, a purpose, an objective, an act, and unite the differing organs with reference to nationality so as to form them into a strong rock and influencing the brain and heart so that for national interests people are united to undergo any sacrifice. Though there are many ways and directions of commonness and unity and from the beginning of Human History all the nationalities that have been formed, all barring Islamic Nationality are based on the following components. However the other components have helped it.

I. Commonism (similarity) of Race called Racialism:
II. Commonism of bonhomie called Patriotism.

III. Commonism of Language that is a means of unity of thought and it takes a big part in construction of Nationalism.

IV. Commonism of colour that creates a sense of co-kind. This feeling of co-kindness evolves into the objection and hate of others.

V. Commonism of economic interests, which distinguishes between the people of the economic system and it creates the sense of struggle for economic rights and mutual benefits.

VI. Commonism of the government, that associates the subjects of a kingdom and creates barrier between other kingdoms.

From the ancient epochs till the glorious period one may research about the nationalities; they all consist of the above mentioned elements.

Some three thousand years ago Greecianism, Romanism, Israelism, Iraniansim too was based on these bases on which we find these days Germanism, Italianism, Francism Englishism and Japanism - Source of mischief and rebellion.

It is correct that these bases upon which different nationalities have been constructed have vigorously organized the groups. At the same time this reality is undeniable that such types of nationalities are a big misfortune for the mankind. This has divided the humanity into thousand parts and the parts are so devised that parts finish away but do not change. One Race does not change in another Race and one country does not change into another country, speakers of one language do not use other language, one colour does not become the other colour, economic interests of one group do not become the economic interest of the other group, one Kingdom does not become the other Kingdom; its results is that in the nationalities thus framed there exists no way of any compromise. On the bases of nationalistic feelings it generates competition, intervention, and a perennial struggle of hatred and they try to annihilate the other, fight to finish the other, other nationalities emerge to fight. As such they are infested with war,
rebellion, and mischief spreads. It is the weapon of Satan, Allah’s curse and a successful weapon by which Satan preys. Asbiyati –Jahiliyyah it creates in men prepares a nation against the other nation on no reason but why the other nation exists; it does not have any touch with reality, honesty and righteousness. But the basis of hatred is only a particular person is black and he is detestable in the eyes of grey, simply an Asian deserves oppression in the eyes of European and being Israeliite, a great scholar Einstein is hated for his being of an Israeliite origin. Tashkeedi, a Black by origin was rendered powerless on his awarding punishment to an European in a crime committed by an European.

Is it justified on part of civilized residents of America to arrest the Negroes, burning them alive on the crime of being Negroes? Being a German, French gives license to each other to hate and count the positives as negatives. Being free Afghans of border-side, Damascus-Arabs entitles the English and French to rain Bombs on the heads of naked non-English, non-French populations. Though such an act is considered inhuman, wild, barbarous and what not. What if the bombs are rained on the Europeans? In short such a racial discrimination that makes one nation blind towards the other nations, results in changing of universal laws of morals and gentility that a nation counts as, justice, truth, lie, gentleness, meanness. Is there any other unreasonableness of intellect that a nation prefers inefficient, notorious, naughty to an efficient, capable, gentle and perfect man on the basis of poisonous lines of boundaries, colour of black and white, one is born in the Eastern part of the mountain and the other in the Western part of the mountain, former speaks one language and latter the other language, one is the subject of this Kingdom and the other of that Kingdom.

Has the skin any role in purity and pollution of soul? Does the reason justify how the rivers and mountains have any connection with morals, qualities, peace and war? Can any body with a sound body accept a thing right in the East is wrong in the West? Is any sound brain ready to accept piety,
gentleness, essence of humanity has any relation with blood of veins, dialect of a language, birth and residence or criteria of the dust? Certainly the reason defies it. Yet, will brethren, sisters of racialism and nationalism give their averment to it with all valour? A rational criticism on elements of nationalism.

I. Racialism (Communism of blood): Its start is sperm of mother and father that creates blood relation in some persons, this sperm spreads to family, tribe, race to reach to this last stage (race). Man distances from his father whom he considered 'moriss-aala'(primogeniture), his heritage becomes imaginary. In this so-called river of Race many streams and rivulets of exterior blood meet, can any reason ever claim that this river does not contain original water that has emanated from its source. Thereafter after this mingling on the basis of blood, man considers Race his matter of unity and why not to make the blood a basis of unity that connects a man to its first father and first mother? Why are not all humans attributed to the original? Today the people who are primary heritage of different races, their pedigree when goes upwards, at last it is accepted they are from one origin; then for what is this division of Aarayat or Saamiat?

II. Patriotism (Bonhomy or geographic cocoonism): Its reality is more detestable; where a man is born its area does not exceed a square yard. If he declares it his nation he cannot call any other country his nation, but he draws a line around this area sometimes up to hundreds and thousands miles and declares it his country. Outside it all area does not have any concern. It is his narrow mindedness, otherwise there no barrier if he calls all the land his country, where if reason is ramified one yard country can spread to thousand yards and up to all the hemisphere of the Earth. If a man widens his vision and looks upon the rivers, mountains, oceans etc
he can understand these are not the limits of demarcation or differentiation between one piece of earth and the other. On what ground can he enchain the mountains?

Why does not he say that I am resident of the earth and entire earth is my home, all its residents are my neighbours, co-patriots, on this planet. I possess the same right that others possess, others too have the same rights that I do have on this yard of land.

III. Linguistics discrimination (commonism of language): It has the benefit that those people who speak one language can mutually exchange their ideas and have ample opportunities of understanding one another. It raises the curtain of strangeness to a greater extent. Speakers of one language feel closer to each other but expression of ideas is not bound with homogeneity of ideas. One idea can be expressed in different languages. It is possible that the speakers can unite on the idea contrary to it. Ten different statements can be expressed through one language, it is not far from the reality that people of homogeneity of thought can disperse in ideas. Therefore unity of thought that is the life of a nation is not dependent on the language, neither unity of thought needs commonism of language.

Then there arises a big question----
What is the relation between a man, humanity, his virtue, vice and his language?

Is a German speaking German preferred to a French?

Basic crux is humanity of a man not his language. At the most it can be said that his language has an edge in state affairs, commerce than the language of that state\country. But it is not for division of humanity plus national difference.

IV. Commonism of colour: Among human groups difference on the basis colour is the most absurd and meaningless thing. Colour is only
the body's quality. But man has no value for his body, it is because of soul, on his faculty of speech that is colour less.

Yet why a man is distinguished for the yellow, black, red and white colour?

We never find any difference in the milk of a black cow and white cow, we never judge the colour while tasting the milk but to the distraction of the reason we have turned towards the colour instead of "spirit'. Attributes are to be preferred to the colour of skin.

V. Commonism of Economic interests: Commonism of Economic objectives is an illegitimate child of human selfishness. Nature has not given birth to this child, human child is born from the womb of mother with all energies to work, get a wide field for work and enormous resources welcome him, but he does not consider that the doors of provisions opened out for him are sufficient, instead he thinks that these doors are closed down for others. In this selfishness the assemblage of a big group of human beings unite and this helps to form a nationality. Apparently they understand that they have drawn a circle of economic objectives that safeguards their rights and interests but whenever many such parties draw such a fort around them and by it, the life circle of the people shrinks, its selfishness enchains his feet and his hands are muzzled. For shutting down the doors he loses the keys of his own provisions. We see by our own eyes kingdom of Europe, America, and Japan are tasting its fruits, and they do not understand how to demolish these economic forts that have been constructed by them as a wall of protection.

Will we not now understand for acquisition of livelihood division of circles and its establishment on national differences is an irrational act? To allow a man to seek the grace of Allah on His vast earth what is the barrier?
VI. Commonism of Government: The commonism of government system is by itself a very instable and week-grounded thing, and it is impossible to construct a stable nationality. The subjects of a kingdom associated in the relation of loyalty, it is difficult to make a successful nationality, so long as the Kingdom rules and dominates, wherever this grip looses the different elements will be disintegrated. In India when Mughal Sultanates Federal power weakened nothing could stop different Political Nationalities from disintegration. The same doom was of Ottoman Sultanate. During last period Young Turk applied all his force to construct the fort of Ottoman nationality, one simple stroke crushed down all the stones and bricks of this fort of Ottoman nationality. Recent example is that of Austria –Hungary. Many examples can be cited from the History after fully perceiving this that those people who consider it is possible to construct political nationalities are congratulate-able for their sheer imagination.

Humanity and Universalism

The above explains that all the discriminations of human race do not possess any rational basis, these are sensual and material discriminations, on widening the circle of discrimination vision breaks down. Its establishment and permanence, darkness or ignorance, finite vision, narrowness of heart vanishes if the light of the information and knowledge appears. The access of insight increases widening of the heart, and these imaginary and material curtains vanish, and ultimately the Racialism and Nationalism has to surrender, essence of unity appears in the differences of colour and language. On the earth of Allah economic objectives become common, political administrative arrangements look no more than artificial curtains, just as the revolution of the sun vanishes away the darkness.

Contrary to Western Nationalism, Maulana Maududi provides the following concept of its Islamic alternative.
Concept of Nationality in Islam

Allah Almighty addressing to His messenger says: O my servants, who have believed, My earth is vast; so worship Me alone.

This is an allusion to the hijrat (migration), which implies this: “If you feel that it is becoming difficult to worship God in Makkah, you may leave it and move to another place where you can live as the true servants of God, for God’s earth is vast. You should serve Allah and not your nation or country.” This shows that the real thing is not the nation and the home and the country but the worship of Allah. If at some time the demands of the nation and country's love clash with the demands of Allah's worship, it is the time of trial for the believer's faith. The true believer will worship Allah and spurn the nation and country and the home. The false claimants to the Faith will abandon the Faith and remain clinging to his nation and his country and home. This verse is clearly indicative of the fact that a true worshipper of God can be a patriot but he can not be a worshipper of the nation and the country. For him the worship of God is the dearest thing in life for the sake of which he will sacrifice everything else, but will never be prepared to sacrifice it for anything else.

Well, the concept that Islam establishes is that there is no material and immaterial discrimination between a man and a man, Islam says all human beings are from one origin:

God has created you out of a single soul and then made its pair and then spread many men and women. (An Nisa)

In the Quran even a single verse is not in the support of racialism and nationalism. The Quran addresses the whole humanity as one. It (Quran) invites whole humanity towards betterment and reform, there is no speciality of any nation on earth. If there is any speciality it with the Mecca; there too it has been ordained that all Meccans, non-Meccans are equal. The polytheists of Mecca are dirt. This explanation renders total annihilation of
nationalism in Islam. In reality a Muslim says “every country is my country, God’s country is my country”.

**Asbiyath and enemity of Islam**

When Islam appeared the biggest obstacle in its way was race, national prejudices and differences. The nation in which Muhammad peace be upon him was born was deeply infested in these prejudices, dynasty proud, pedigree and personal greatness. These imaginary concepts were in the way of Islam. The polytheists of Mecca said “Why was not this Quran sent down upon the great man of these habitations?”.

Abu–Jahal thought Muhammad peace be upon him has added the proud to his dynasty by proclaiming prophethood. Abu Jahal said “we had a competition with Banu Abde Munaf, we had a competition in archery, in eating and feeding people in offering and bestowing, we were equal. Now they say revelation has come to us by God we will not certify prophet hood of Muhammad peace be upon him.

These were not the ideas of Abu-Jahal but all polytheists of Arabia considered it the defect of this religion (Din).

His religion cuts roots of country and lineage, considers no Arabian Queraish, non-Arab chiefs as superior, for him all up and low are equal, he eats with his slaves on the same table, gave no weight to free Arabs over slaves of Abyssinia, connected the red with the black and trampled under his feet the theory of two periods.

This was the basis of discord for all clans of Quyarash with Bani Hashim and Bani Hashim too supported on this line of Qoomi –Asbiyat though many among them were not Muslims. Bani Hashim were besieged in Shaibi Abitalib and all Quyarash boycotted against Bani Hashsim. The families with weaker background were oppressed, tried with the severe conditions. They emigrated to Abyssinia and those with strong family back ground did yield to the conditions not for their being on the right path but by the strength of family and this persecution least affected these people. Banking on the
forecasts of prophets of Bani Israel Jews of Arabia waited for coming of a
prophet, it was on the basis of these forecasts when the message of the
prophet spread that many residents of Medina became Muslims. The Jews
deprecated to certify the veracity of prophethood on this national arrogance.
They objected on the ground of prophets coming from Bani-Ismail? They
were so intoxicated in the prejudice that they allied with polytheists, leaving
monotheists . The same state was that of the Christians. They waited for the
coming of prophet and were not ready to accept any prophet from Arabia.
According to their expectations the coming of the prophet would be from
Syria. Hercules on seeing the letter of the prophet said to the merchants , “I
knew that a prophet is to come but from Syria.” Muqosus of Egypt on
seeing the letter of Islam, “I expected the coming of the prophet from Syria.”
The same prejudice was prevalent in Non – Arab areas. On seeing the
letter of the prophet Khusro Pervez was frustrated and said, “ a man from
slave dynasty and addressing king of Ajam (non Arab).” He considered the
Arab nation mean, subordinate, not prepared to accept coming of any
prophet from Arabia. Enemies of Islam, Jews had a very potent weapon
against Islam to create tribal arrogance. They had a connection with
hypocrites of Medina. Once the Jews referred to War of Bugaas and
ignited such a fire between OΩs and Khuzraj (a tribe in Arabia). Swords
were drawn and on it a verse was revealed “ O, Muslims if you listen to one
group of the People of the Book, they will drive you towards unfaith.”
This prejudice of race and nation and seeing ruler ship of prophet in Madina,
the movement of emigrants in gardens of the Ansar (Helpers) has filled the
hypocrites at Madina with anger and fire. Abdullah Bin Uby, chief of the
hypocrites, used to say “these poor of Quyarash have prospered in our
country, these are like dogs who eat and fatten then bite at you.” He used
to tell “you have rose these Emigrants on your head ,accommodated these
in your country, gave them shares in your property, by Allah if you stop
them they will speak out .”
Quran has replied in these words, "these are the people who say do not spend on those who are with prophet, so they disperse. Though Allah is the Master of all treasures, but they (hypocrites) do not know. They say if we come back from the battle field towards Madina the honourable will drive out the disgraceful. Though honour is to Allah and His prophet. But they do not understand." (Al Munafiqoon)

This was the heat of national fervour that Abdullah Bin Ubby had calumnied mother of the believers Hazrat Ayshya may Allah be pleased with her and support of Oos and Khuzraj (two tribes) has averted the punishment from this enemy of Allah and Rasuls (Apostle’s) enemy.

In this way Allah and His Rasul (Messenger) has razed to ground all limited material and

Immaterial visionary based upon which different nationalities have been constructed, colour, race, nation, language, economy and politics—irrational divisions, that man has devised by his misinformation, ignorance.

Islam has equated and declared equi status all humans in the matter of humanity. By this destruction it (Islam) constructed a new nationality on purely rational bases. The basis of this nationality too was on discrimination, not upon selfish material bases but on spiritual and essence. It presented a national reality to man named "Islam." It invited on the programme of servitude and obedience to Allah, piety and purification of spirit, piety of action and general piety. Then told with emphasis he who accepts this call plus invitation is a nation—and the deniers are the other nation—one nationality is of Iman (Faith) and Islam and all its individuals are a community-----thus we have framed you an integrated Ummah (community of Muslims)" (Al Quran). One nation is of Kufr (disbelief) and off the tract, its followers are despite their differences one group, Allah does not guide the nation that is disbeliever. Between these two nations the bases of difference is not race and lineage, it is creed and action. It is possible that two sons of a father are separate in the division of Islam and Kufr, and two strange
persons being united in Islam are common in one nationality. The difference of nation between these two nations is not reason of distinction, but distinction is based on the basis of truth (Haq) and untruth (Batil) that has no nation, it is possible that the nationalities of two men in a city, mohalla, home are different because of Islam and Kufr, an Abyssinian in relation with Islam can become a national brother of an Morrocon by being common in Islam.

The variation of the colour is not cause of national division, here no trust is of the colour of the face, it is the colour of Allah that is the best colour, the colour of Allah and what can be beautiful than that of Allah---(Quran).

Possibly in the scale of Islam a grey and a black has nationality and in the scale of Kufr two grey people have separate nationalities.

Language distinction can not be reason of variation in Islam and Kufr, here is trust on the language of heart not that of language of mouth that is spoken and understood throughout the world, according to it an Arab and African language can be one language and the languages of the Arabs can be different.

The difference of Economic and Political systems is valueless in view of Islam and Kufr. Here is not the conflict of monetary wealth but that of wealth of Iman, not of human kingdom but of Allah’s Kingship. Those people loyal to Divine government and those who sold their souls to God they are a nationality, though residing in India or in Turkistan, the rebels of Divine government have sold their life and property to Satan. They are other nationality we do not debate under whose sultanate they are and connected to what Economic system?

The circle drawn by Islamic nationality is not a material and measurable circle but it is purely a rational circle, this circle can separate two men of a home and can unite two distant men of far East and west.
"The secret of love is not from the universe of wombs, nor of superstitious base neither of Rome or Syria, it is that star sans east, west, never doomed to set and its orbit is neither north nor south".

The circumference of this circle is a Kalimah [basic article of Islamic faith] on this word there is friendship and enmity, its agreement assembles and its denial separates, those whom it has separated no relation of blood or land, language, colour, breed, government can not unite and the vice-versa. No mountain, ocean, language, race, colour, money or land posses a right to draw demarcation lines in Islam. To make a distinction between Muslims, every Muslim though he be a resident of China or Morocco, grey or black, speaker of Hindi or Arabic, Sami or an Aryan, subject of this government or that is an individual of a Muslim nation, soldier of an Islamic army, citizen of an Islamic state, is obliged to defend Islamic law. There’s not a clause in Islamic law that can transgress the rights in worship, affairs, society, economy, politics, or in any phase of life on the considerations of sex, language, or nation.30

This party i.e, Islamic Nationality organized with relation to Islam, had no difference on the basis of blood, land, colour or language. Salman may God be pleased with him was from Persia when he was asked about his lineage he would say “Sulman Bin Islam”.

Hazrat Ali may Allah be pleased with him used to say “Sulman is among our family members”. It [his family] consists of Bazan–Bin Saman and his son Shahar BinBazan whose pedigree connected with Bahram Gur. Prophet Muhammad peace be upon him appointed Bazan and his son state managers of Sana. This group contained Bilal of Abyssina about whom Hazrat Umar may Allah be pleased with him “Bilal our masters servant and our leader”. In this party was Suhaib of Rome he was made a commander in prayer by Umar (may Allah be pleased with him), there was Hazrat Abu Huzaifa’s servant Saalam (may Allah be pleased with him) about whom Hazrat Umar said at the time of death had he been alive I would select him
for Khilafat, there was Zaid Bin Hariss a servant, whom the prophet wed with his own daughter of aunt, in it there was son of Zaid Osama God be pleased with him whom the prophet appointed a commander of an army and Hazrat Abubakr, Umar Farooq, Abuabidah Bin Jarah (God be pleased with all of them), they all accepted his commandship. Hazrat Umar would say about this to his son Abdullah (God be pleased with him) “Osama’s father was better than that of your father and Osama better than you.”

Islam addresses a man as a man, Islam presents for all men a collective system on the basis of which creed, morals, justice and piety, calls all humanity towards this system, whoever accepts this system which gives equal rights in its fold\circle. Whoever obeys the ideology of Islam, there is no discrimination of whatsoever kind social, legal rights or duties, there is no room for any discrimination national or racial, class or geographical, he who accepts Islam, its ideology his vision visualizes a world-state, where in national and racial chains break down, human-beings get equal rights and get a position for development a system cultural cum political, where rivalry competition takes place of friendly cooperation so that people facilitate for material prosperity and spiritual development. Islam offers the humanity that system of life and principle that appeals it only if there are no prejudices of ignorance, connections of national traditions, sentiments of racial superiority, love blood and land relations. Above all these considerations on a condition of being a human to examine what is right, wherein lies justice and righteousness, not of a class, nation, country but collectively of humanity towards the direction of its progress.

Contrary to the above, nationalism discriminates between a man and a man on the grounds of its nationality, nationalism means every nation’s nationalist prefers his nationality to others. If he is not an aggressive nationalist, still then the demand of nationalism is that one has to discriminate on cultural, economic, political and legal grounds between a nationalist and non-nationalist, preserve more and more benefits for own
nation, erect walls of economic discrimination, protect his nationality vigorously, historical traditions, traditional prejudices and nourish in itself the sentiments of racial superiority.

His (nationalist's) heart becomes blind for discrimination of law and justice and his vision stops at national state instead of world-state, wherever he adopts the view of world state it will take the form of an imperialism or Caesarism, as the people of other nationality can not enter in his state as equal share holders, but in the capacity of a slave. The principles of these two ideologies, objective and soul is its ordinary design looking at it one can easily assess, these two ideologies are opposite to one another, wherever there is Islam there can not be nationalism, Islam can not evolve where there is nationalism Progress of one[Islam] means the retreat of nationalism and vice-verse. Progress of Islam means uprooting of nationalism one can opt for one at a time and it is impossible for a man to board the both boats, to claim the one ideology and to support the other ideology clearly shows distraction of vision, which clarifies that such people are unaware of Islam and vice-verse.  

Now we come to Maulana Maududi’s response to Communism

Maulana Maududi and Communism

In truth Communism is the worst form of social tyranny such as was unknown even in the times of Nimrod, Pharaohs or Changez Khan. How can a right minded person interpret it as social justice when man or a coterie of men sit together and formulate a social philosophy of their own and then use the unlimited power of government to impose this philosophy by force upon millions in the country. How can any rational person believe that they establish social justice when they forcefully grab the property and land of the people, nationalize the industrial units and turn the whole country into a prison camp in which all doors of criticism, petition, complaint, writ or equity are tightly shut.
How can there be social justice in a country in which there is no party, no organization, no forum where people may air their views, no press to mirror public opinion and no court of judicature to which the people may to turn to obtain justice.

Can the ends of social justice be met in a country in which the espionage network is so wide-spread that every person may suspect the other of being an informer; where before uttering a syllable even in the privacy of the home a man should around for a lurking listener ready to carry the intelligence to the government. Again what fair minded judge will call it social justice when elections are held to play a fraud on democracy and the election machinery is so manipulated that no one who dissents from the authors of this social philosophy may stand in these elections, nor may any man of independent opinion or a conscientious person intrude into the electoral process.

Supposing this doctrine brings about an equal distribution of economic wealth—although no form of communism anywhere has succeeded in achieving this—what then, shall we say that justice is synonymous with economic equality?

We are not posing the question whether there is economic equality between the rulers of this system and their subjects. We also do not ask whether the dictator and the farmer enjoy an equal standard of living in this system. We only wish to know whether if complete economic equality is really established among all these people, will it be called social justice? Would this be a just system in which the dictator and henchmen are free to impose their self-conceived philosophy upon the people by the force of police, army and the intelligence system where as the freedom of an individual member of the nation to speak but one word of criticism on the philosophy, or the least action or part of an action of the ruling clique is prescribed? Is justice that where as the dictator and his few cohorts are vested with the right of using all means of communication in the country to dissimilate their doctrine and to setup all kinds of organizations and not even two persons among the
dissenters may be able to organize themselves into a body, or to address a meeting or publish a single line in the press? Is it right in the name of justice to evict all landholders and owners of industries and to make the government.

The sole proprietor of land and industry – government- which is run by an oligarchy who take all possible measures to incapacitate the nation and eliminate all chances of the transfer power into alternative hands?

If man is not merely a consuming animal and if human life is not merely an economic egalitarianism be equated with justice? If by clamping tyranny and oppression in all walks of life and by suppressing all other facets of life, an equal distribution of economic wealth between the people does take place and the dictator himself and his agents do come down to an equal standard of living with the general run of the people, even then setting up of such equality by means of great suppression shall not be regarded as just. On the other hand, as it has been pointed before, this kind of barbarous inequity has never before been witnessed in any epoch of the history of man.  

The defects of Communism

1. The concepts of individual liberty, liberalism, capitalism and the system of secular democracy thrown up by the French revolution were contrary to social justice so in the same measure, may even on a greater scale, is the Communism that is being adopted in conformity to the thesis of Karl Marx and Engels inimical to social justice.

The defect of the former system was that it allowed liberty to the individual to such an improper extent that the individual enjoyed unhindered freedom to exploit such institutions as the family, tribe, clan, society and nation. Moreover, with a view to activating the individual for achieving the collective well-being, it greatly relaxed the social control of the community over individuals.
The folly of the latter system is that by establishing a totalitarian state, it completely suppresses the freedom of individuals, families, tribes and clans and in order to harness the individual to the service of the collective, this system vests such a great power in the state that the living human beings are reduced to the level of the inanimate cogs of the machine. He who claims that communism establishes social justice is a liar.  

II. One method of solving (economic) problem has been suggested by Communism and it is this: That the means of production should be taken out of the hands of individuals and transferred to the community for collective possession and that the community should also collectively under the distribution of wealth to every individual each according his needs. Prima facie this solution appears to be very sensible, but the more one considers its practical aspect the more will one realize its defects until one will have to concede that, in the ultimate analysis, its results are as bad as the disease for which its cure has been offered. It is as clear as daylight that although, theoretically speaking, the arrangements for the utilization of the means of production and distribution of products are proposed to be entrusted to the whole community, in practice the task will, of necessity, have to be handed over to a small executive body. Even though this small body may, to start with, be elected by the community later on when all means of livelihood come it to its hold and individuals are not able to secure their share except through its hands, the whole community will be left helpless in its grip. Nobody will be able ignore its will and no organized power could rise in opposition to it and be able to remove it from its place of authority. If this body dislikes any one of it will mean that the poor fellow will be deprived of all the means of living in the land, since all the means of livelihood will be in the hands of this small clique.
Labour will be left without power to strike work, if it has a grievance against the management, for, under this system there will not be many factory-owners and capitalists to enable the labourer to resign from one place and take up employment with another rather in the whole country there will be only one factory owner, only one capitalist, who will be the ruler of the country as well, and it will not be possible even to secure against him the help of any public opinion. This state of affairs will therefore have the following results, that after abolishing all the capitalists, industrialists and land holder rolled into one giant, will be imposed on the people, and he will combine in himself the autocracy of a Czar with the absolutism of a Caesar. In the first place such an absolute and all-pervading authority is so intoxicating in its nature that it is extremely difficult for any man to restrain himself from becoming a tyrant and autocrat, particularly so when he does not believe in God and in his accountability to Him. Nevertheless, even if it is assumed that this small body, on obtaining vast autocratic powers, will not overstep proper bounds and will work with justice and fairness, even then under such a system there can be no opportunity for individuals to develop their personality.

What human personality needs above everything else for its evolution and advancement is that it should have freedom, it should have some means at its disposal which it may use in accordance with its own discretion and its own will and choice and in no so doing develop its hidden potentialities. But in the communist system there is no possibility of this. Under this system all the means pass out of the hands of the individuals into those of the executive body of the community. This executive body utilizes them according to its own conception of the interests of the community. The individuals have no alternative but to work according to the plans made by the executive body if they desire to take the advantage of those means; indeed they have to surrender themselves body and soul to their administrators to be moulded for purposes of communal welfare accordingly.
to the plans of their masters. Thus all the individuals in the society become practically slaves of a few individuals, as they were all soulless, raw materials to be shaped and moulded to their desires and plans exactly as shaped to suit the needs of a craftsman.

Quite obviously human civilization and culture has to lose a great deal under this arrangement. Even if it is presumed for argument’s sake that the necessities of life will be distributed with fairness and justice under such a system, its advantage will be outweighed by the defects and deficiencies of the system. The development of culture and civilization depends wholly upon this, that different people who are endowed with diverse faculties should have the opportunity to develop themselves and play their individual part in the combined communal life. But this can not be secured through a system wherein wholesale planning of human beings is undertaken. A few individuals, however capable and well intentioned, can not be so omniscient as to be able to assess correctly the inherent and inborn faculties of millions of people and their natural inclinations and also be able to determine correctly the mode of their development. They will err both in estimating individual capabilities and in forming opinions about what really constitutes the true interest of their society. But, in spite of it, they will try to enforce their plans and mould according to their blue-prints the whole mass of people under their influence. This individual diversity and the variety so necessary for civilization will place to a soulless uniformity. The natural evolution of civilization will suffer a set back and an artificial and spurious growth will commence. Human faculties will begin to shrivel and ultimately a great mental and moral degeneration will ensue. After all men are not like grass and vegetation to be pruned by a gardener and made to grow after a set pattern. Every man has his own personality with a natural urge to develop according to its inclinations. If you deny him this freedom he will not develop according as you desire but will either rebel against you or fade away in unnatural gloom.
The fundamental mistake of communism lies in the fact that it treats the economic problem as the central problem and then tries to revolve the whole of human life around this axis. It lacks the true scientific attitude towards human problems. On the other hand, it looks at all problems with a deep economic bias. Metaphysics, history, sociology, in fine, everything with in its sphere is influenced and overridden by the economic viewpoint and because of this one-sidedness the whole balance of life is upset. Thus it is clear that in reality the communist theory presents no correct or natural solution of the economic problems of the man. It offers a solution which is both unnatural and artificial.  

Maulana Maududi now explains how Islam seeks to solve this problem. In dealing in all problems of life, it is a fundamental point with Islam that natural laws and principles of life inherent in human nature should not be tampered with, and that whenever there is any reflection from the path of nature it should redirected to the natural path. 

The second important principle on which Islam has based all its social reforms is this; that the introduction of a few external regulations in the social system should not be considered sufficient; on the other hand, a far greater stress should be laid on moral reformation and the creation of the right moral attitude among men so that evil in the mind of man should be suppressed at its root. 

The third basic principle which one can trace in the whole of the Islamic system is that the authority and pressure of law and the coercive power of government should not be used except when it becomes inevitable to do so. 

Keeping in view these principles on the economic side of life which have always formed the foundations of human economy, and it abolishes only those wrong principles, not by reliance on the state but the maximum of moral instructions and a small measure of external force, which mankind follows when it falls a victim to satanic desires. The principle that man
should free to strive for its livelihood that he should retain the right of ownership over what ever he earns by his labour, and that disparity must exist between various men due to their varying abilities and circumstances has been conceded by Islam to the extent to which it is in accordance with nature. It then seeks to qualify this principle and introduce certain restrictions on its actual practice with the object that it may not be misused and made a means of exploiting and oppressing the weaker sections of the society.

Let us first of all take the example of the acquisition of wealth. Islam recognises the right of man to seek the means of livelihood on God’s earth according to his capacity, ability, and natural endowments. But it does not concede him the right to adopt such means in acquisition of wealth as would lead to his moral degradation or up set the social order. Islam sets up the distinction of lawful (Halal) and unlawful (Haram) in respect of the different means of earning and imposes the ban of illegality on all those methods which are morally injurious. For this purpose it has clearly specified those methods which it regards as injurious. Under the Islamic law wine and other intoxicants and drinks which spread evil and immorality are not only unlawful (haram) in themselves; even their manufacture, sale, purchase, and possession have been declared to be unlawful. Islam does not recognize adultery, music, dancing and other similar things as lawful means of livelihood. It declares all such dealings as unlawful in which the gain of one individual is secured by the loss and injury of some other persons or of society as whole.

Bribery, stealing, gambling, speculation, business based on fraud and deceit, hording and holding back the necessities of life with the object of raising the prices, monopoly of means of production by one or several persons which narrows the field for others; all these methods have been declared unlawful. It has picked out carefully and branded as illegal all such forms of business as are their by nature capable of causing litigation,
or in which loss or gain depends on mere luck or accident, or wherein the mutual rights of the parties are not distinguishable. If one studies in detail the Islamic laws of trade and industry one will see that the methods by which people become millionaires and multi-millionaires in modern time are mostly methods on which Islam has placed stringent legal restrictions. If business is carried on within these Islamic limitations there would be little chance for any one to accumulate immense wealth.

While Islam recognizes the right of the individual to the possession of all that he may acquire by lawful means, it does not leave him entirely free in using the wealth so acquired. On the other hand it lays down restrictions on its use in different ways. It is obvious that there can be only three possible uses of the wealth which a man acquires. It can either be spent or invested to procure more wealth or may be hoarded.

We shall explain here briefly the nature of restrictions which Islam has placed on each one of these uses.

All methods of spending which causes moral or social injury are forbidden. One can not fritter away ones wealth in gambling, neither can drink wine, nor can commit adultery, and even one can not waste money in music and dances or other means of self- indulgence. One is forbidden to wear silken dresses, and is prohibited (except in the case of women) from using golden ornaments and jewels, and also can not decorate his/her house with pictures and statutes.

In short, Islam has closed all those outlets through which the greater portion of a man's wealth is spent on his won luxuries and indulgences. The items of expenditure which considers lawful are of such a type that a man may just be able to live a decent life of an average standard, and if any surplus is then left —over, Islam suggests that it should be utilized in the service of virtue and righteous in public welfare, and in rendering assistance to persons who have been unable to secure and receive their share according to their needs.
According to Islam the best course to adopt is that one should spend all that he earns on his lawful and reasonable needs, and if any surplus accrues, hand it over to others so that they may satisfy their needs. Islam regards this quality as one of the highest standards of morality and has put it forward as an ideal with such force that a society influenced by Islamic ethics will always respect those who earn and spend, much more than those who keep their wealth hoarded or who go on investing their surplus incomes in earning more. However, in spite of all this moral education and the exercise of moral pressure by a reformed society, it is not possible to get rid of individual tendencies towards greed and avarice. A good many persons will always remain who will like to invest their surplus wealth in earning further wealth over and above their needs. For this purpose Islam has placed some legal limitations on the use to which this surplus wealth can be put. It is strictly prohibited in Islamic law to lend these accumulated savings on interest. If you lend your money to any it does not matter whether he borrows for his private needs or for business purposes, you are entitled to return of the principal only, but not a pie more.

In this way Islam breaks the very backbone of aggressive capitalism and blunts the edge of the greatest instrument by means of which the Capitalist tries to concentrates in his hands the economic resources of the community by relying on his money power. As regards the method of using the surplus wealth investment in one's trade, industry, or business or providing capital to others and participating in the gains and losses of the joint undertaking, Islam considers it quite lawful and proper but seeks by other means to remedy the evils which flow from the accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few persons.

First of all, Islam does not permit the hoarding of this accumulated wealth. As it has been just mentioned, it demands that whatever wealth one has must either be utilized in the purchase of one's own necessities or handed over to others so that they may satisfy their needs, and thus the whole of
the common wealth may be kept constantly in circulation. But if one does not do so and insist on its accumulation, then two and a half percent per annum will be taken out of this accumulation by force of law and spent on giving assistance to such persons as are not fit to take part in the economic struggle or have not in spite of their struggle been able to secure their full share. This is called “zakat” (Obligatory due paid by a Muslim) and the administrative machinery proposed by Islam for this taxation is the joint-exchequers of the community in which ‘zakat’ is collected and then redistributed among those sections of the community which need and deserve help. This is in fact the best form of insurance for the society and destroys all the evils which arise from the absence of any regular arrangement for collective help and co-operation. What really forces a man, in the capitalistic system, to accumulate wealth and invest it in profitable business and bring into existence, institutions like the life insurance, is that under this system every one’s life is wholly dependent on his own means. If one has not laid by any thing for his old age; if he dies without leaving any inheritance for his progeny, they will be driven from door to door with out being able to secure a bit of bread, if he falls sick and has nothing in store he may not be able even to secure medical treatment for himself; if his house is burnt or he sustains loss in business or some other calamity befalls him he can not find away support anywhere.

Similarly what forces the labouring classes under a capitalistic system to accept any terms of employment offered by the capitalist and become his slaves is this very thing; i.e, the fear that if the labourer does not accept the remuneration which the capitalist is prepared to offer for his toil and sweat, destitution will stare him in the face and he will not be able to hold off starvation for a single day. Moreover, it is only due to this system that the spectacle is witnessed the greatest curse that has afflicted the world by the ‘grace “of this capitalist system---- that while on one side millions of hungry mouths are to be fed, on the other side there are large stock of agriculture
produce and manufactured articles which can not find any market, with the
result that lakhs of tons of grain is thrown into the sea instead of feeding of
hungry. The reason for this lies in the fact that no social arrangement exists
for providing means of livelihood to the needy and the destitute. If these
people are provided with purchasing power and enabled to buy
commodities according to their needs, trade, industry and agriculture, in
short every branch of economic activity will expand and flourish.
Islam roots out all these evils through the institution of ‘zakat’ and the
agency of the public exchequer for its collection and distribution. The public
exchequer is always available as a helper. There is no need to take thought
for the morrow. Whenever it is needed one can go to public exchequer and
obtain his rightful due. There is no necessity of keeping deposits in banks
and of having insurance policies. One can leave this world with out any
anxiety for the future of ones children; the exchequer of the community will
be responsible for them afterwards. It is a constant and permanent helper to
which one can have recourse in times of disease, old age, calamities due to
earthly or heavenly causes, and under any other similar circumstances. The
capitalist can not compel any body to accept a job on his own terms and
conditions. There is no risk of starvation, nakedness or lack of shelter for
anyone in the presence of the public exchequer. Then again it should be
noted that this social agency enables, all those sections of the population
who can not earn or who earn much less than they require, to purchase
commodities necessary for their life. Thus a proper balance between
production and consumption is permanently maintained and the necessity
does not arise for a people to go on imposing their bankruptcy up on other
peoples and after exhausting all victims in this world to seek them in other
planets.
Besides the “zakat”, another plan which Islam has adopted for diffusing the
wealth concentrated in one place in its law of inheritance. All other laws,
except that of Islam tend to perpetuate the concentration of wealth even after the death of the person who had accumulated it during his life time. Islam on the contrary, adopts the method that the wealth which a person has been confining in his hands by gradual accumulation from all sides should be distributed immediately on his death. Under the Islamic law sons, daughters, father, mother, wife, brothers, sisters, all succeed to a person's inheritance which must be appointed among all of them according to regular code. If near relations do not exist, a search will have to be made for distant ones and this wealth be distributed among them. If no relative, near or distant, is forthcoming even then a man is not entitled to resort to adoption of any heirs himself. In that even the whole community will succeed him and so all his accumulated wealth be deposited in the public exchequer. In this manner even if a man may concentrate millions and billions of money it will all be dispersed after his death in small portions with in two or three generations, and every such accumulation will be turned gradually into circulation according to a regular legal procedure.

If we consider this economic system of which a brief plan has been presented. It is clear that this system removes all those evils of individual ownership which result from the wrong guidance of devil? There remains no necessity at all for adopting the Communist or Fascist or National-Socialist ideologies, and using those artificial methods of economic management which do not remove the evil but replace it by another.

The complete economic system of Islam has not been mentioned here. It is difficult to explain within the compass of this brief discourse, all the methods that can be adopted in accordance with the Islamic principles for the management of land, the settlement of trade disputes, and the raising of capital for all of which complete provision has been made in the Islamic law. However Islam has, by removing all tariffs restrictions levied on exports and imports, and by abolishing octrois, cesses and tolls on the movement of commodities opened the door absolutely for free trade. Islam has reduced
to the minimum possible extent the expenditure on the administrative machinery, on the civil services and the army, and by abolishing altogether the stamp duty on judicial proceedings, Islam has lightened a very great economic burden from society, and provided opportunities for spending the taxes for the good of the society instead of allowing them to be absorbed in the unbounded expenses of the administration. By this means the economic system of Islam becomes a great blessing for humanity.

Studied with an unbiased mind free from those prejudices against Islam which have been inherited as an evil legacy from past history and unawed by the blaze of modern social system, it is not only the hope but the trust that this Islamic system will satisfy every reasonable and truth-seeking person as the most useful correct and the rational one for the economic welfare of humanity. But if any one thinks it feasible that this economic system can be successfully implemented even if divorced from the complete whole of the ideological, moral and cultural system of Islam, it is humbly requested to him to get rid of this misunderstanding. This economic system has a deep relationship with the political, judicial, cultural and social system of Islam. And all these branches are fundamentally based on the moral system of Islam. Then again this moral system does not stand by itself but is wholly dependent on your behalf in an all power-full and all-knowing God and your sense of responsibility to Him, in the conception of an after-life when all your actions will be judged by God, in the belief that man will be punished or rewarded according to His judgment, and in the acceptance of the fact that the code of law and morality which Muhammad (peace be on him) the Messenger of God, has placed before you as from God(of which this economic system is only a part) is really based on Divine guidance in all its details. If anyone does not accept this creed, this moral system and the whole of this code of life completely as it is, the economic system of Islam, divorced from its source, can not be maintained or administered in its purity.
even for a single day, nor will any appreciable advantage accrue from it if one takes it out of its wider context and then seek to apply it to ones life.\textsuperscript{36}

In Islam there is a concept of Caliphate instead of Democracy. \textbf{Now Maulana Maududi’s Response to Western Democracy is as:} Democracy invests the people with authority in every phase of life. People elect the body of people who afterwards make laws for the people and as such run the day to day affairs of their government. They frame the rules and as such have a right for legislation, speaking in a political parlance the elected body of the people are invested with a political sovereignty. Similarly executive, judiciary in its’ own sphere have the powers according to a concept called popular sovereignty. The people are responsible to the people from whom they seek votes if voted in they again come into power and legislate for people and run the government.

In Islam there is a basic and major gulf between the term ‘democracy’ and that of term ‘Caliphate’. The term caliphate is used in Arabic for succession or vicegerency. From Islamic point of man on the earth is a successor of God, he uses in the domain of God His given authority. When we give any body the authority of arranging our property, we consider that the master of the property is really the owner of the property and not the arranger to whom we have assigned the authority, and the arranger has to act upon the instructions of the master, and he has to act with in the limits prescribed by the master. The conditions put forth by the master are to be obeyed by the caliph or it will be a transgression on the part of the caliph, if he breaks the agreement of succession. This is the precise position of the succession on the earth (land), the state based on this political concept will be a Caliphate under the umbrella of God’s sovereignty –a human Caliphate. It will serve the purpose of God in His land according to His instructions.
Explanation of this Caliphate reveals that Islamic Political Concept does not give this position of Caliphate to some person, family or a class but entrusts it to whole society that accepts the principles of oneness of Allah (Tawhid) and Apostleship (Risalah) motivated on the conditions of successor ship. Such a society as a whole is entitled to caliphate and by its virtue every individual is part of this Caliphate. This is the base point in Islam where “Democracy” starts. Every individual of Islamic society possesses rights and authority of viceregency, every individual is equal share-holder in these rights, nobody is preferred or debarred from these rights and authorities. Any Government thus framed for running the state administration will be framed according to the choice of these people, these people will entrust some share of their viceregency to the people. It will be framed in consultation of their vote and decision, so long as it enjoys the confidence it will continue to perform the duties of khilafat and will be deposed once the confidence is lost.

According to it Islamic democracy is a complete democracy and so perfect as any democracy can be.

But what differentiates Islamic democracy from the western democracy is that western concept of democracy is “democratic sovereignty” and Islam orients towards “democratic caliphate”. In west there is republic itself a king and in Islamic democracy the kingship is of God and republic is its caliph. In the west the republic frames its own Shariat (laws prescribed by Islam) and in Islamic democracy the Shariat is obeyed that has been framed by God through its Apostle. There in the west the objective of the government is fulfilling the will of the republic, here in Islamic democracy the government and its framers fulfill the objective set by God. Precisely western democracy is an autocratic Godhead that uses its authority independently. Contrary to it Islamic democracy is bound to constitution of servitude that uses its authority according to the instructions of God with in limits.
Now a brief but clear map of the Islamic democratic state based on Tawhid, Risalah, and Khilafat is presented here. The objective of this state has been clearly told in Quran that this state establishes, promotes, flourishes those virtues that God loves to see the decorated with and stop, suppress and terminate those vices the presence of which is disliked by God of this universe. In Islam the objective of the state is not only the state administration, nor only to fulfill the collective wishes of a particular nation, instead Islam puts before him a high goal for its achievement he has to spend his resources and energies—that god wants in the life of its servants purity, beauty, virtue, progress and betterment let these prevail and termination of all those forms that are detrimental for God’s earth and destructive for the servants of God. While presenting this goal Islam puts before us a lucid picture of virtue and vices where in the desired virtues and undesired vices are shown up. Keeping in view this picture in every time and every environment Islamic state can frame its reformative programme.\(^{37}\)

Besides, in another book titled “Khilafaat Aur Mulokiat” under chapter “Islami- Riyasat Ki Khususiyat” Maulana Maududi has stated among Quran’s six points the picture of the state that comes to us with its visible properties as:

I. A deliberate covenant brings this state into existence, mastering full independence as an independent nation, with its choice submitted to Allah lord of the worlds in accordance to His subordination and accepting the position of Caliph, to work under those orders that He has given in the book via His Apostle.

II. It is akin to the concept of Theocracy while attributing sovereignty to God but acting on this concept his way is different. It does not entrust to any special religious group special caliphate and all authorities of dispensing of affairs rests in the hands of all people, who profess to
have taken a covenant of submission of Allah. They are all given a right in Caliphate.

III. He is agreeing with the principle of democracy the formation and change of government with popular vote. But the people are not autocrat for keeping law of the land, laws of life, its external and internal politics, its resources under its total subordination, these would not turn to suit according to their choice. But the dominant rule of God and His apostle and their limits, moral orders and instructions control the wishes of people and the state runs on a definite way. The power to change these rules are neither in the hands of executive, judiciary, legislature nor collectively in the hands of nation, except that the nation decides to break its covenant and come out of the circle of faith.

IV. It is a theoretical state whose running is naturally the domain of those accepting its basic concept and principle. But all the disagreeing people living under the law get the rights of citizenship at par with those who are agreeing.

V. It is such a state that is principle based and not based on colour, race language or geographical barrier. The individuals on any surface of the land if willing can accept these principles and with out any prejudice or discrimination with equal rights can be associated with this system. A government established any where in the world on these principles will be certainly Islamic whether in Africa, America, Europe or Asia and its administrators are anyone be it that they are grey, black or yellow. A pure principled state of this category can not be debarred from becoming a universal (global or international) state. But if there are different states with these characteristics these can be called Islamic states equally. Without any nationalistic struggle there is every possibility of full brotherhood and co-operation any time with concord they can establish a universal (global) federation.
VI. Thus such a state keeps morals dominant over vested (self interests) interests and such a state administers God fearingly, with piety which is the soul of such a state. There is superiority of morals. In selection of its governors, people at the helm of its affairs, piety of morals have a considerable weight along with intellectual and physical fitness. Every department of its exterior system is run by honest and trustworthy people, it imparts spotless justice (in dispensation of law). Its external politics is fully upright, honouring all agreements, is peace-loving and loves to establish international justice based on better treatment.  

Soul of Khilafat in Islam

One of the important features of this Khilafat is that there is freedom of criticism and expression of thought (choice) and Khalifa is always within access of their nation. They sit with the members of consultative body and take part in the deliberations. They (are non-aligned) belong to no official party nor is there the existence of any opposite party. They move in atmosphere of freedom, attend the Consultative Body, give their suggestion (vote) in concord with their conviction and conscience. Without concealment of any thing they take all affairs up to the people at the helm of affairs. Decisions are given on the basis of support of reason sans pressure, without alignment towards some body with concoction.

Caliphs meet their nation not only via Shaura (consultative Body) but directly five times a day at prayers, at Friday Assembly weekly and at two 1ds and Hajj (annual pilgrimage to the Ka’abah) occasions. He (caliph) meets the nation and nation in reciprocity with him (caliph). Their homes are usually amidst the nation, with out chauffeurs and gate-keepers, the doors lay ajar and always open for every body (public). They move in markets with out (special) black-cats, without arrangement of signals and whistles (hato-bacho), they liberally move among the public. On all occasions people had a right to rebuke and wield a tongue for criticism and there is a
freedom for any accountability. They merely not only allow the freedom of criticism but encourage them (people).

Citing example of Hazrat Abu Bakr (may God be pleased with him) in a speech during his successorship said in an address to the people if I run straight you should cooperate with me and if I run unstraight you should straighten me.

Similarly, Hazrat Umar once in a Friday Assembly expressed his view to delimit the dower (muhar) to the extent that no body should be allowed to pay more than four hundred dirham (currency). In this context a woman cross-questioned him. Then and therein a cross-section of the people said that you (Umar) do not possesses any right to delimit the dower that has been allowed by the Quran up to qintar (an abundant revenue in muhar). On this Hazrat Umar reviewed his opinion.

Similarly, on other occasion Sulman of Persia (may God be pleased with him) took Umar (may Allah be pleased with him) to task as why he had two blankets. On this Hazrat Umar presented the witness of his son Abdullah bin Umar that he has borrowed the blanket from his son.

On other occasion, Umar (may Allah be pleased with him) while sitting in his association said if I exercise some lenience in some affairs what will be your reaction. Hazrat Basher Bin Saad (may God be pleased with him) said we will straighten you like an arrow. Hazrat Umar said then you are effective people.

Hazrat Uthman faced out many severe criticisms but he did not gag the mouth of his critics, instead gave clearance to all objections of critics.

Hazrat Ali (may God be pleased with him) during his khilafat tolerated with cold heart the bad treatment of Khurijites (a tribe). One day five Khurijites were arrested while abusing him and every one of them uttered on oath that they will murder Ali (may Allah be pleased with him). But Ali set all of them free and told you can reply their abuse with abuse but I can not so long as
they do it practically a rebellion act mere verbal opposition is not any crime by which I can lay my hand on them.
The period of the rightly guided caliphs that we mentioned was a light house towards which all successive wise men traditionalists and common Muslims looked and considered it a criterion of Islam of religious, political, moral and collective affairs.  
Islamic democracy (khilafat) presents the idea of accountability of caliph not only before God but also before republic and they have copied the traditions and the sayings of companions in its support that proves out that the Muslims have a right to criticize its rulers for what they have a liberty and there is a betterment of nation and government in this liberty of criticism.

Maulana Maududi and Secularism
Commenting upon the emergence of Secular tendencies among Muslims Maulana Maududi in one of his classical lectures commented:-
It is one facet of our ill-luck that not the antagonists of Islam but a greater portion out of our Millat (organized community) are off and away from glorious heritage of Din (constitution) that has been left by our ancestors (aslafl). We did not reach to this condition all of a sudden but after a constant deterioration of centuries has pushed us into this situation plus since yore the evolution of civilization and culture inclusive of flourishing of knowledge and Arts has remained suspended.
After this static and stagnant position we came under the grip of Political decay and Muslim nations of the world were subjugated by non-Muslims, though some of them got a degree of freedom but it was no less than a dependence, as the effects of rout have gone down up to their nerves of heart and soul, when we tried to stand up, there was one option of standing up-to stand up on the props of modern civilization and culture, knowledge. The elite of religious knowledge suffered the degeneration in which the whole Millat (organized community) was gripped. It was not under their power to acquire any life-giving and revolutionary dynamism on religious
ground. Disappointed with their leadership, the restless class of the Muslim
—country turned towards that system of life that seemed absolutely
successful, they got the principles from it and learned its knowledge and
obtained its design of its cultural institutes and followed its foot-steps.
Gradually the society of religion was thrown into the corner, and reins of
government came to the hands of those who were away from Din
(constitution) and coloured in the colour of modern civilization’s mould (its
thought and practice). It resulted leaving aside a few Muslim countries all
other independent Muslim countries became samples of Western Secular
states where in Islamic Shariah was abrogated and somewhere only Muslim
Personal Law was Islamic in some Secular system of government e.g, in
Muslim government Muslims were given those religious rights that were
given to the protégées in Islamic Governments. Similarly in those countries
that were slaves, all the workers of civilizational institutions and political
movements were similar people and their every footstep that marched
towards independence was the same as that of other independent Muslim
nations. If these people were demanded the implementation of Islamic
constitution they were compelled to avoid it or suppress it as they were not
able to understand even its alphabets. Then such a demand of
implementation and establishment of Islamic Constitution from the people
who have received the education, intellectual and practical training from
secular institutions has driven them far away from the spirit of Islamic law,
its soul and essence that the simple understanding of it is beyond their
reach and the religious education system that runs under the supervision of
these ‘people of Din (constitution)’ has engaged them to prepare soldiers for
20th century out of stuff of 12th century. So there exists no group that can
expel the Western disciples and frame independent system of State under
Islamic constitution and Islamic Law.
It is really a complicacy that has made the implementation of Islamic Law
and constitution difficult for Muslim countries, we have been fighting in
Indian continent since last 10 years that we have our own permanent civilization, separate concept of life and a specific constitution. We have not accepted a united nationality of Muslims and Non-Muslims, whose way of life is different that of ours. We need a separate portion of land on which we can frame a constitution of life to run a state. After a long and constant struggle we got a portion of land that we have been demanding, for its achievement we sacrificed honour and lakhs of Muslim lives thereafter we could not enforce our Islamic constitution, instead we framed a Democratic and Secular constitution, Indian Penal Code with regulation of Civil Code. If we had a programme to implement Communistic objectives this blessed work could have been done with Indian Socialist Party and there was no need to put in such a great labor and toil, in fact we have bound ourselves as a nation before God, His creatures and History for enforcement of Islamic Constitution and it is not possible to back track our words, let other nations do what they can we have to surmount these complicacies, so far as the implementation of Islamic laws concern we can remove these away, basic difficulty is to prepare the brains to perform this enterprise, their disinterest is based on their ignorance of the Islamic System, and expressly introduction of the Islamic Law is the base, its reality, what is its objective, its principles, soul and spirit. What is absolute and permanent and what utility it has. What is ever developing and how can it cater to our increasing cultural requirements and on what basis its dos are, and what all these misunderstandings are. If it is settled properly on understanding the workers will get satisfied, their satisfaction can open out doors of planning and it can pave a way for the implementation of Islamic laws.
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