



# CLASH of Civilizations

*A note on Clash of Civilization from the viewpoint of traditional Philosophers and Thinkers of Subcontinent.*

*Compiled and Translated by Omar Javaid, Inspired from the writings of Shahnawaz Farooqi*

## Table of Content

<i>Naked History and our Historical Slumber</i>	4
Collective Amnesia of the Muslim world	4
Old Crusades – New Crusades	7
<i>The Cow, Lota and ‘Clash of Civilizations’</i>	17
The Story of Seed and Tree	17
The Cockfight	22
Clash of Civilization for Beginners	28
A Philosophical View from a Bird’s Eye	33
<i>Syed Ahmed Khan and the Two Nation Theory</i>	40
<i>The Confusion</i>	47
Shave Him He is a Fool	47
‘Uncivilized Civilizations’ verses ‘Civilized Civilizations’	50
The So Called Contemporary Intellectuals	54
The Road under construction since 1947	58
<i>Traditional Thinkers and Philosophers on Clash of Civilization</i>	63
Imam Ghazali (RA)	63

## The Clash of Civilization

<b>Akbar Ala Abadi</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>Allama Iqbal (RA)</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>Abu Ala Maududi (RA)</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Syed Qtub Shaeed (RA)</b>	<b>128</b>
<b><i>The Radical Islam and the West</i></b>	<b>133</b>
<b>Inferiority Complex of the Western World</b>	<b>136</b>
<b><i>The Case of Hijab</i></b>	<b>143</b>
<b><i>Tales of some Modern Crusades</i></b>	<b>146</b>
<b>A Breaking News</b>	<b>148</b>
<b><i>A Ray of Hope</i></b>	<b>151</b>

# 1 –

---

## Naked History and our Historical Slumber

### Collective Amnesia of the Muslim world

Amnesia is a term used in psychology about the condition in which loss of memory occurs due to psychological or physiological reasons<sup>1</sup>. It is though unfortunate to observe that most of the Muslim population, particularly the educated class, is suffering from this disease today. It can also be argued that it is rather a blessing, as otherwise excruciatingly painful memories of past centuries would haunt us day and night.

Those of the so called Muslims, who rather prefer to adhere to the episteme of the west, instead of that of Islam, are rather more prominently found chanting 'ignorance is bliss'. Often they wake up from their slumber, and try to have a look around and prefer to remain hallucinated, *"There is no such thing as clash of civilization ... we would be the first to know if there would have been!"* ... Thomas Grey, an English poet, once exclaimed:

*To each his sufferings; all are men,*

---

<sup>1</sup> Amnesia. (2010, February 22). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 09:33, February 23, 2010, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Amnesia&oldid=345726072>

## The Clash of Civilization

*Condemned alike to groan,—  
The tender for another's pain,  
Thomas unfeeling for his own.  
Yet ah! Why should they know their fate,  
Since sorrow never comes too late,  
And happiness too swiftly flies?  
Thought would destroy their paradise.  
No more; where ignorance is bliss,  
Thomas is folly to be wise.<sup>2</sup>*

The history on the contrary tries to shout loud, though unsuccessfully penetrating our deaf ears. The crusades against Muslim population which started in 1096 and lasted around 200 years, is a fact too hard to be ignored, yet ignored. On the other side, The shades of these crusades still hover over the thinking of Europeans, unlike Muslim population; who are still at unease on the “... waves of Muslim immigration from North Africa and the Middle East have transformed the demographics of Europe. Because their [Muslims] families tend to have birth rates higher than the European average -- parts of Northern Europe would actually be de-populating were it not for immigration -- the Islamic presence in Europe has risen dramatically”<sup>3</sup>. Europeans even today perceive this rapid increase Muslim population’s as a threat to their sovereignty or perhaps an indication that some day Muslims would conquer Europe without an armed conflict. Words Archbishop Giuseppe Bernardini, a 72 year-old Italian who heads the Izmir archdiocese<sup>4</sup> in Turkey, can be quoted as an example:

---

<sup>2</sup> Ignorance is Bliss: Thomas Gray, repr. In *Poetical Works*, ed. J. Rogers (1953). Ode on a Distant Prospect of Eton College, stanza 10 (written 1742, published 1747)

<sup>3</sup> “Europe’s Muslims worry bishops” by John L. Allen Jr, published at *New Catholic Reporter* on 22<sup>nd</sup> Oct 1999. Weblink:

[http://natcath.org/NCR\\_Online/archives2/1999d/102299/102299a.htm](http://natcath.org/NCR_Online/archives2/1999d/102299/102299a.htm)

<sup>4</sup> Archdiocese Izmir. (2009, Dec 23). In *Wikipedia*, Feb 23th 2010, From [http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Roman\\_Catholic\\_Archdiocese\\_of\\_Izmir&oldid=333671097](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Roman_Catholic_Archdiocese_of_Izmir&oldid=333671097)

## The Clash of Civilization

*“The ‘dominion’ has already begun with the ‘petro-dollars,’ used not to create work in the poor North African or Middle Eastern countries, but to build mosques and cultural centers in Christian countries with Islamic immigration, including Rome, the center of Christianity”.*<sup>5</sup>

Muslims, on the other side, don't or perhaps don't even want to remember the impact which crusades have on the lives of Muslims. Just for the sake of argument let us agree that crusades were way back in history (about 900 year ago) therefore their recall might be tough on our memories, however it is appalling that we don't even remember a clash of similar nature which started in 17<sup>th</sup> century and lasted till mid of 19<sup>th</sup> century. This wasn't also initiated by Muslims either, rather by the blood thirsty conspirators of European nations, who exploited the deteriorating state of the affairs with in the entire Muslim world all in the name of upliftment, progress and development. This isn't a story which lasted a couple of years, rather a couple of hundred years. During this period the *Goras* (Englishmen) tried to further corrupt and hollow out the already decaying Muslim civilization, and undoubtedly remained very much successful as well. It is hard to believe that the present generation has negligible awareness on how it all went, and who herculean and laudable was the corollary of the resistance movements, who despite being fraction in size of their counterparts, heroically endured the blows of imperial forces.

It is important to note that these imperialistic onslaughts or crusades were not limited to subcontinent rather descended upon the entire Muslim world, which expanded to over 200 years, if added with the earlier crusades which also lasted near about the same period, makes a bloody and forgotten period of four centuries. It is innocence, illicit though, of our contemporary educated class, as we would ironically call it, that they still find it hard to grasp the possibility of yet another clash, and remain oblivious to a clash already taking place since a couple of decades.

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid

## The Clash of Civilization

After the Second World War, it apparently seemed that the imperial colonist abandoned the subcontinent and other occupied territories of Muslim world. However they left behind their slave despots (generally known as democratic leader) who deceptively continued the same agenda dictated from their masters mostly residing in London, Paris or Tel Aviv , and the trend continued till 9/11, only to be soared exponentially afterwards. This onslaught started as an armed aggression but escalated into cultural, psychological, intellectual (academic) and even ideological warfronts, about which we will further discuss shortly. Though still naïve Muslim brothers are drowned in self deceit, assuming that how come there could be a clash in the first place?

This deceitfulness is indeed horrific and venomous for the Muslim world, and the need to open our eyes and to see the truth has never been so urgent. There is no option left, other then to wake up from the collective slumber as otherwise the price we would have to pay would be much higher in comparison to the price we had already paid for ancient crusades.

### Old Crusades – New Crusades

The publication of caricatures of Prophet Muhammad (SAW) in a Danish newspaper, and more recently the draw Muhammad Day competition on the famous social networking site Facebook, has taken the clash between Islam and west to new heights. Although these incidents were full of raciest vigor and were loathsome in nature, yet they opened the eyes of many among the Muslim world that there is a clash indeed among Islam and the west. These incidents were even condemned by the Leaders of the Muslim world, surprisingly though; perhaps as otherwise their sincerities would have been exposed.

After September the 11<sup>th</sup> the negativity in the perception against Muslims have increased many fold<sup>6</sup>. On the night of September 11, Mullah Omar and

---

<sup>6</sup> "More than 4 in 10 Americans (43%) admit to feeling at least "a little" prejudice toward Muslims -- more than twice the number who say the same about Christians (18%), Jews (15%) and Buddhists (14%). The findings are based on a new Gallup Center for Muslim Studies

## The Clash of Civilization

Usama Bin Ladin were in the limelight, and today the focus has propagated up to Prophet Muhammad (SAW)<sup>7</sup>. On 11<sup>th</sup> of September a few so called extremist Muslims were the talk of town, today the 'Islam is the Problem'<sup>8</sup>. That day only those who insisted to strive continuously in the name of Islam were the trouble makers, today even the headscarf<sup>9</sup> has become a threat for modernity. Previously the abhorrence which was only seen on Danish newspapers against Muslims is spread across the Europe<sup>10</sup>. A beginning of the birth to a global abhorrence as it may seems.

A faction among Muslims surfaced after 9/11, who attributed the entire blame of the incident to a particular group (Al-Qaeda) and audaciously presumed that if they wouldn't have existed then Americans and allies had absolutely no rational for attacking Afghanistan; some from this group woke up from the slumber when they were struck by the news that WMD never existed in Iraq<sup>11</sup> and the entire military ambush had more resemblance with a crusade<sup>12</sup> then any thing else. From this example, this group also realized that in order to attack any country Americans really don't need an excuse like that of Mullah Omar, Osama Bin Ladin or WMD, for that matter. Besides, FBI still isn't sure whether Osama Bin Ladin did planned 9/11 incident or not as

---

report, "Religious Perceptions in America: With an In-Depth Analysis of U.S. Attitudes Toward Muslims and Islam." Reported in an article "In U.S., Religious Prejudice Stronger Against Muslims" published on 21<sup>st</sup> Jan 2010 at GALLUP. Source:

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/125312/religious-prejudice-stronger-against-muslims.aspx>

<sup>7</sup> "Pope 'sorry' for offence to Islam", reported BBC on September 16<sup>th</sup> 2006 – web link: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/5351988.stm>

<sup>8</sup> A Google search with Keywords "Islam is the Problem" reveals 12.4 million results.

<sup>9</sup> "French MPs back headscarf ban: French MPs have voted by a massive majority to ban the Islamic headscarf and all other overt religious symbols from state schools." Reported on 10<sup>th</sup> Feb 2010 at BBC News, Source: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/3474673.stm>

<sup>10</sup> Violence Against Muslims: 2008 Hate Crime Survey. New York: Published by Human Rights First, 2008. Website: [www.humanrightsfirst.org](http://www.humanrightsfirst.org). Accessed on 16 Feb. 2010 at <http://www.eumap.org/library/linker?rid=702197>.

<sup>11</sup> "CIA's final report: No WMD found in Iraq", reported by Associated Press on April 25, 2005. Source: <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/7634313/>

<sup>12</sup> Search Google with keywords "Crusade in Iraq".



## The Clash of Civilization

on the most wanted page on FBI's website<sup>13</sup> Osama is not wanted for 9/11, surprising isn't it! I can only wonder how liberal fascist would respond to this fact.

Furthermore it is also interesting to note the conclusion over the analysis on the findings of Europol report on "EU Terrorism Situation and Trend Report", Denis noted:

*"The results are stark, and prove decisively that not all terrorists are Muslims. In fact, a whopping 99.6% of terrorist attacks in Europe were by non-Muslim groups; a good 84.8% of attacks were from separatist groups completely unrelated to Islam. Leftist groups accounted for over sixteen times as much terrorism as radical Islamic groups. Only a measly 0.4% of terrorist attacks from 2007 to 2009 could be attributed to extremist Muslims ... Acts of terrorism committed by Muslims are purposefully sensationalized and focused upon, culminating in the idea that "(nearly) all terrorists are Muslims."<sup>14</sup>*

And yet we hear the chant the "Islam is the problem".

This abhorrence has a historical context as well and can be traced back to 14 centuries. Torah and Bible prophesized their respective followers that Prophet Muhammad (SAW) will arrive in Arabia as Last Messenger of Allah SWT<sup>15</sup>, and for the same reason before the advent of Islam Jews and

---

<sup>13</sup> It is mentioned at the FBI most wanted webpage: "Usama bin laden is wanted in connection with the august 7, 1998, bombings of the United States embassies in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, and Nairobi, Kenya. These attacks killed over 200 people. In addition, bin laden is a suspect in other terrorist attacks throughout the world."

Source: <http://www.fbi.gov/wanted/topten/fugitives/laden.htm>

<sup>14</sup> "Europol Report: All Terrorists are Muslims...Except the 99.6% that Aren't" by Danios published at <http://www.loonwatch.com/2010/01/terrorism-in-europe/>

<sup>15</sup> Islamic view of the Bible. (2009, December 14). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 10:27, February 16, 2010, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Islamic\\_view\\_of\\_the\\_Bible&oldid=331546075](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Islamic_view_of_the_Bible&oldid=331546075)

## The Clash of Civilization

Christians were anticipating the arrival of Prophet Muhammad<sup>16</sup>. However when the Holy Prophet (SAW) actually arrived, the followers of Torah and Bible turned against him, on which Allah SWT mentioned in Quran, *“The people of the Book know this as they know their own sons; but some of them conceal the truth which they themselves know.”*<sup>17</sup>

After the establishment of Islamic Empire it wasn't until five centuries the Christians regained the courage to stand against the superpower of that day. Majority of Muslims are not aware of the history of Christian crusades on Muslim world<sup>18</sup>. It is also interesting to note that these bloody confrontations were never initiated by any Muslim nor there was any Osama bin Ladin at that time.

*“Regard the Franj! Behold with what obstinacy they fight for their religion, while we, the Muslims, show no enthusiasm for waging holy war.” – Salahuddin Ayubi.*<sup>19</sup>

Furthermore there wasn't any George bush or Tony Blair, or any Danish newspaper. Though still, the first crusade in 1096 was sprung from Pope Urban II's sermon in 1095<sup>20</sup>. In that sermon Pope Urban said that Islam is a Satanic Religion and Muslim are its followers, and it is our (Christians) sacred responsibility that we eradicate this religion and annihilate its followers from the face of this planet<sup>21</sup>. After that he united entire Europe under a single

---

<sup>16</sup> Safi-ur-rehman Al-Mubarakpuri. Ar-Raheeq Al-Makhtoom (The Sealed Nectar): The Autobiography of The Noble Prophet Muhammad (SAW), page 76. Published January 2002 by Islamic University Al-Madinah Al-Munawwarah.

<sup>17</sup> Al-Qur'an, Surah Al-Baqarah, verse 146, translated by Yousuf Ali.

<sup>18</sup> Started in 1095 AD.

<sup>19</sup> Maalouf, Amin. The Crusades Through Arab Eyes. Translated by Jon Rothschild, 1984. Al Saqi Books, 26 Wetbourne Grove, London W2.

<sup>20</sup> The Crusades - Introduction, source:

[http://crusades.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=46&Itemid=53](http://crusades.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=46&Itemid=53)

<sup>21</sup> There are however multiple versions of his speech available today widely different from each other, as it were recorded after a long time. However, within Fulcher of Chartres account of pope Urban's speech we find the following: "O what a disgrace if such a despised and base race, which worships demons, should conquer a people which has the faith of omnipotent

## The Clash of Civilization

flag and in 1096 Peter the Hermit led the first crusades<sup>22</sup>. These crusades lasted near about 200 years.

Those infested with inferiority complexes and apologetic attitudes often utter that on 9/11 we destroyed a landmark which was a symbol of America's economic and military power; if not then why the west would have aggressed upon us? Observation of these ignorant naiveté's is reprimandable for the reasons already stated; Federal Investigation Bureau of United States of America even isn't sure as yet, but some of the apologetic secularized Muslims are.

Did Bahadur shah Zafar (1775-1862) attack London during his times that the colonial powers in turn invaded the subcontinent<sup>23</sup>? Did Muslims were found accused of any terrorist attacks against Germany, Holland, Portugal and Italy that they in turn invaded the middle east and African Nations during colonial periods?

The history is indeed just repeating it self today.

It must be made loud and clear that 9/11 was an inside job so were 7/7 London bombings, and were planned and conducted by their own so as to have rational to attack Afghanistan and Iraq; a conspiracy, not a theory.

---

God and is made glorious with the name of Christ! With what reproaches will the Lord overwhelm us if you do not aid those who, with us, profess the Christian religion! Let those who have been accustomed unjustly to wage private warfare against the faithful now go against the infidels and end with victory this war which should have been begun long ago". Taken From: Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, 1, pp. 382 f., trans in Oliver J. Thatcher, and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., *A Source Book for Medieval History*, (New York: Scribners, 1905), 513-17

<sup>22</sup> Chronology of Crusades, source:

[http://crusades.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=47&Itemid=54](http://crusades.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=47&Itemid=54)

<sup>23</sup> Company rule in India. (2010, February 14). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 11:40, February 16, 2010, from

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Company\\_rule\\_in\\_India&oldid=344055305](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Company_rule_in_India&oldid=344055305)

## The Clash of Civilization

Nevertheless, today west is at war with Islam at multiple fronts; let it be economic, cultural, psychological and even Ideological fronts, let alone militarily.

There was a time when Islam was limited to Middle East but latter it spread to Asian and African countries as well; proportionally the circle of crusades has escalated likewise.

Today Islam is a 2<sup>nd</sup> major religion on this planet quantitatively; however from qualitative angle Islam must be ranked at number one, from the author's viewpoint, i.e. if seen in comparison with the quality of fellowship of other major religions.

It has been a long time since the church was separated from the state<sup>24</sup>, therefore Christianity was eliminated as a threat against the secular, liberal and modernists ideological framework; however this separation is yet to be materialized from the final traces of Islamic Civilization, as required by the western civilization for the sake of its hegemonic agenda; a sturdy enough Raison d'être for the west to peruse with universality. Internally planned 9/11 incident and the subsequent deceptive propaganda, also the fake reports on Iraq's WMDs<sup>25</sup>, were means toward the very end i.e. dominion of secular, liberal and modernist mindset over the Islamic world. Slumbered? Wakeup, in the modern western civilization, ends justify the means.

During past few years there have been numerous incidents of defaming Islam and Muslim in the western world, specifically the status of women in Islam has been under immense criticism among western circles. Insulting

---

<sup>24</sup> Separation of church and state. (2010, February 15). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 12:39, February 16, 2010, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Separation\\_of\\_church\\_and\\_state&oldid=344206955](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Separation_of_church_and_state&oldid=344206955)

<sup>25</sup> "CIA's final report: No WMD found in Iraq", reported by Associated Press on April 25, 2005. Source: <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/7634313/>

## The Clash of Civilization

caricatures of Arab figures has also become a permanent part of memory and history. In addition to that, Islamic laws has been under critical and discourteous debate among western academic circles and media, however the Muslims remain silent on all this, and have now in turn allowed the west to challenge the foundations of Islamic Ideological framework. Silence means consent. Plans to bomb Makkah and Medina, the holiest site of the Muslim world, has been in discussion in the media since 9/11<sup>26</sup>, though not taken seriously by many Muslims; which can be a grave mistake; nevertheless the publication of caricature of The Holy Prophet Muhammad (SAW) and competition of these caricatures on a Facebook back on 20<sup>th</sup> May 2010 was no lesser then psychological nukes, and probably wasn't the first ones in the row.

Noam Chomsky calls America a Rogue state<sup>27</sup>. But today we can term the entire western civilization as a Rogue Civilization, though only few would agree.

### **Big Mouths of the West and Clash of Civilization**

Tony Blair in his speech to the Foreign Policy Center<sup>28</sup> highlighted that it's the values of Islam and the west which are on a course of clash.

*"Others found themselves caught between colonization, nascent nationalism, political oppression and religious radicalism. Muslims began to see the sorry state of Muslim countries as symptomatic of the sorry state of Islam ..."*

*"This is, ultimately, a battle about modernity. Some of it can only be conducted and won within Islam itself ... It is the age-old battle between progress and reaction, between those who embrace and see*

---

<sup>26</sup> "Tancredo: If They Nuke Us, Bomb Mecca" Monday, July 18, 2005, by Associated Press weblink: <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,162795,00.html>

<sup>27</sup> Rogue States, an article by Noam Chomsky, published in Z Magazine, April, 1998. weblink: <http://www.chomsky.info/articles/199804--.htm>

<sup>28</sup> <http://fpc.org.uk/>

## The Clash of Civilization

*opportunity in the modern world and those who reject its existence; between optimism and hope on the one hand and pessimism and fear on the other. That is what this battle is about; it is a battle of values and progress; and therefore it is one we must win.”<sup>29</sup>*

This would perhaps be an elaboration of his earlier statement *“This is not a clash between civilizations. It is a clash about civilization ...”<sup>30</sup>* I am sure that many would agree with Tony here, as Islamic civilization today doesn’t really look much like a unique civilization; however one must not forget the past and the potential scrawling underneath the skin. Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi seems to be at variance with Tony Blair on an occasion when his tongue slipped uttering the following historical statement:

*“The West will continue to conquer peoples, even if it means a confrontation with another civilization, Islam, firmly entrenched where it was 1,400 years ago.”<sup>31</sup>*

If readers disagree then they would also have to disagree with Giovanni Berlinguer when said:

*“Silvio Berlusconi has gone abroad and launched into eccentric and dangerous calls for conflict between civilizations... using terms that no statesman worthy of the name has used in these recent terrible weeks for humanity.”<sup>32</sup>*

And with the Belgian Prime Minister Guy Verhofstadt, who would also agree with Berlinguer:

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid

<sup>30</sup> Tony Blair's speech to the Foreign Policy centre, 21<sup>st</sup> March 2006:

Source: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2006/mar/21/iraq.iraq1>

<sup>31</sup> “In quotes: Berlusconi in his own words” published on BBC World on May

2<sup>nd</sup> 2006 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/3041288.stm>

<sup>32</sup> EU deplores 'dangerous' Islam jibe, reported on BBC world on 27th September 2001.

Source: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/1565664.stm>

## The Clash of Civilization

*"These remarks could, in a dangerous way, have consequences ..." whose nation holds the EU presidency, was quoted as saying. I can hardly believe that the Italian prime minister made such statements ... rather than bringing civilizations together, they could feed a feeling of humiliation."*

Later Silvio Berlusconi, to calm down the situation, clarified that there were attempts to misinterpret his statement against Islam, the term Islamic Civilization in the following statement as well:

*"They have tried to hang me on an isolated word, taken out of context from my whole speech ... I did not say anything against the Islamic civilization... It's the work of some people in the Italian leftist press who wanted to tarnish my image and destroy my long-standing relations with Arabs and Muslims."*

George W. Bush also is reported to have said in his reaction to the event of 9/11, "... this nation is [now] at war with Islamic fascists ..." <sup>33</sup> and said (in another of his speech) "This crusade, this war on terrorism is going to take a while." <sup>34</sup> Either Bush didn't know the historical significance of the term crusade, or he did use it on purpose to really communicate the real agenda.

The former head of the British armed forces who recently retired and appointed as a defense advisor to Prime Minister David Cameron on Sunday broke all the ice by exposing and confirming the western intentions behind the war in Afghanistan i.e. it is a war on Islam! Speaking on the BBC Radio 4 programme about Britain's continued occupation of Afghanistan, Gen (r) Sir Richard Dannatt said:

---

<sup>33</sup> "The day the enemy became 'Islamic fascists'" by By Kari Huus and Tom Curry. Published on MSNBC on Aug. 11, 2006. <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/14304397/>

<sup>34</sup> Remarks by the President Upon Arrival in the south lawn on September 16th 2001. Source: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010916-2.html>

## The Clash of Civilization

*“There is an Islamist agenda which if we don’t oppose and face it off in southern Afghanistan, or Afghanistan, or in South Asia, then frankly that influence will grow. We could see it moving from South Asia to the Middle East to North Africa and to the high water mark of the Islamic caliphate in the 14th, 15th Century.”<sup>35</sup>*

The Nation newspaper further commented *“He explicitly said if Muslims adopted Islam’s political ideas and the Khilafah ruling system, this would be unacceptable and warranted a military response from Britain. He had no issues with Muslims praying or enacting spiritual rituals, provided they surrendered political life to Western values.”<sup>36</sup>*

If any one still have some doubts then we wouldn’t hesitate to say that his loyalties are not indeed with Islamic civilization or rather he should get himself treated with at any psychiatric facility, or he has been ill-informed by the media or the authorities on the reality and seriousness of the situation. What ever the issue may be if not fixed now then we wouldn’t be here in the future perhaps to fix it either.

---

<sup>35</sup> Audio recording of the interview can be found at [http://news.bbc.co.uk/today/hi/today/newsid\\_8682000/8682052.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/today/hi/today/newsid_8682000/8682052.stm)

<sup>36</sup> Afghan war is war on Islam: UK PM advisor  
Published: May 17, 2010 <http://www.nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/Politics/17-May-2010/Afghan-war-is-war-on-Islam-UK-PM-advisor>



## 2 –

---

# The Cow, Lota and ‘Clash of Civilizations’

### The Story of Seed and Tree

Discussion on relationship between Ideology and civilization is fundamental to the subject of “clash of civilizations”. We can but won’t quote too much from of Moulana Room (RA), Imam Gazali (RA), Iqbal (RA), Moulana Mododi (RA), Rene Ginuon, Muhammad Hasan Askari, Anand Kumar Sowami, Syed Hussain Nasir and Salim Ahmed, unless where extremely necessary, as it would over complicate the subject for many. Among the contemporary scenario it would also be foolish to ignore the importance of the correct communication; there is a famous saying “Did anyone notice the peacock dancing in a jungle”, henceforth we would try our level best to make the discussion as understandable, distinctive and audible for every one to comprehend.

We believe that the relationship between seed and tree would be clear among the readers. This relationship can be simply used as a metaphor to understand the relationship between Ideology and Civilization. We know that the essence of the tree exists within the seed, however without its expression it’s impossible to know what it would be. When we sow a seed in

## The Clash of Civilization

“fertile land”, it turns into a plant and then a tree. Metaphorically, here seed is the concept, an idea, a philosophy, a scheme, and the tree is its manifestation. The tree emerges as a multiplicity of the individual seed; a tree which has a stem, branches, leaves and fruits, et al.

It is obvious that the chemistry of seed would determine how the tree would be like. The seeds of orange would yield an orange tree, seeds of papaya would yield a papaya tree, same would be the case with apricot, and guava et al. Since these seed are different from the core, therefore the tree is also unique and distinct; any layman would agree.

The human capacity to distinguish among different trees is also very crucial as the same applies when identifying the difference among two civilizations; distinguishing two trees is easy, though distinguishing isn't.

This capacity, if present, also allows people to acknowledge or discard an aspect of any civilization partially or in totality, hence assist them in deciding when borrowing something from a particular civilization, therefore making this capacity of critical importance.

However if we are incapacitated to make such a distinction, then we can be fooled by what is apparent, and may adopt something from alien civilization despite its inherent incompatibility with core constituents (seed, ideology) of our own civilization. This brings us to the most important point of the discussion "It is not just sufficient to believe in an ideology, rather it is also important to understand and have consciousness of its physical manifestation as well", as otherwise one would be deceived by the mere looks; despite realizing what glitters is not gold.

It is out of question that seed is the core, however it is all the more necessary that this seed must develop into a tree, as otherwise it is of no importance. We know that some seeds have an ill fate, and some seeds are not lucky enough despite having the capacity of turning into a tree. Sometimes appropriate water or fertilizers are absent and sometimes proper sunlight or

## The Clash of Civilization

fresh air, due to which the chances of turning out as a tree are eradicated. All the more, seasonality influence the growth of trees and plants, we all know what autumn season does to foliage. All the more, many of us have seen plants which seem to be shivering with cold; often some people shiver the same way, so do societies and civilizations. Furthermore hot and dry winds of summer also create havoc; however this is not the case with all types of foliage, as some do need such a milieu to produce their yield.

Moulana Room once said:

*Maslehat dar deen-e-Eesa ghar o koh  
Maslehat dar deen-e-ma jang-o-shikwa*

Which means that Christianity tends to denounce the worldly affairs; however Islam rather demands striving against the odds with honor and dignity. It is important to see that in context of the discussion, the verses of Moulana Rumi are of crucial importance. This tells us the real signification of physical manifestation of the core i.e. the seed or ideology.

Hazrat Omar (RA) once said, "We recognize you from your actions and any human can do nothing beyond that", as Intentions are known by Allah SWT alone. This, on the other hand, tells us about the importance of a civilization (physical manifestation of the core) as it also distinguishes its inhabitants from others.

If the fertile grounds are rather human beings in context of our metaphor, then we should eventually ask: what causes the lack of expression of an ideology, or restricts its expression in ritualistic worships, and doesn't allow its propagation into other facets of life like daily affairs or routines, knowledge, decisions, arts et al?

If that's happening then how a civilization would survive at individual or collective levels? Further we should ask, what are the implications if people are not aware that their actions and expressions etc are local (compatible

## The Clash of Civilization

with their ideology) or foreign or incompatible with their own ideological framework? These questions were not valid in history when the civilizations were formulated purely around a core ideology; let it be Christianity, Judaism or Islam, for that matter. Philosophy, literature, science, technology, psychology, mutual relationships, daily routines, etiquettes, wardrobe, forms and shapes in architecture or cutlery making, even the minor details in art and literature, wars, peace pacts, and what not ... was emerging from a core ideology. However, today we must force ourselves to think on these questions.

It's not child's play to construct physical manifestations of a civilization. Consider the huge difference in between public relations and real relations, having only one thing in common, a smile i.e., however a professional smile, though look similar, is different in essence from a smile expressing real emotions of love. Tears of movie actors and tears of real people crying due to physical or psychological pain are not identical. We repeat ... looks can be deceiving ... and deception if ignored can be deadly ...

Ideology is the basis of action, not an action in it self. If there is a crack in the ideological framework of a person or that of a civilization, then its physical manifestation (or action) would also be rich with discrepancies. But once this manifestation materializes, it becomes a basis of our identity and survival. This is the significance of a civilization.

It is crucial that we recognize the discrepancies in physical manifestation of our own civilization ... which would eventually hint us toward the loop holes that we would have punched in our own ideological framework. Even more importantly we also need to analyze and realize the trends in this manifestation as, where it is leading us? What are its deriving forces? Is it getting more compatible with our true ideological framework or taking us away from it? Please remember that the relationship in-between the civilization and ideological framework is a two way. Adulteration of

## The Clash of Civilization

civilization occurs when ideological begins to corrupt, and this adulteration eventually catalyzes the falsification of ideology as well.

Ideological framework of western civilization is built around taming their lust for power, monetary gains, accumulation of wealth etc, as confirmed by many authors; western civilization has also emerged around the same ideals, and it's a little surprise today that they intends to bring every other civilization, non-compliant with their ideological framework, subservient to their own. Case in point: modern crusades in Iraq, Af-Pak, and now in Yemen etc.

An idea gives birth to an action, and actions can instigate ideas. If you inspire someone to imitate your actions without telling him the real intentions behind them, it's then possible that this imitation might make him or her, a tool facilitating your intentions, hence become subservient to your ideas. Media do that exactly, presenting foreign action as norms, and herd mentality of masses unfortunately acts as a catalyst in eliminating the xenophobia from the minds of the natives.

And that's what exactly is happening ... we are so much bogged by the influence of foreign media and consequently willing to alter our lifestyles, so much so that its influence on our ideological frame has become inevitable. But unfortunately the cracks which have been propagating in our ideology, weakening the core of our civilization, aren't being noticed by most.

Is this eventuality something ordinary? And is it possible that we counter the situation by insisting only on our ideology and forgo or ignore its physical manifestation i.e. the civilization? If and only if our ideology is dear to us, then we, at any cost, should insist also on tree and the fruits that it yields, as otherwise the consequences are clear in the light of the relationship we have already discussed. Iqbal once complained:

*Tujhe Kitab se Mumkin naheen fragh ke tu  
Kitab Khuwan he magar sabib-e-kitab naheen*

## The Clash of Civilization

(your approach is limited to theory alone  
you yearn for it but don't deserve)

It is also important to ask the ontological significance of this discussion, which indeed confirmed from the following hadith:

“I (Allah swt) was a hidden treasure, I sought to be recognized, and therefore I created this Universe”

This also clearly indicates that this Universe is also a kind of civilization, Mir confirms:

*Muhabbat ne karha he zulmat se noor  
Na hoti muhabbat na hota zahor*

(Love carves itself fervently into illumination  
Absence of love is absence of expression)

## The Cockfight

Cockfight is part of the subcontinent's culture; those living here can graphically imagine the scene of two cocks plucking on to each other in a battle of supremacy. So far so good, though it's awful that after hearing the term of 'clash of civilization', the film of two cocks fighting each other runs through minds of many. At worse, such imaginative individuals often have a weapon (read pen) in their hand and are very much willing to fire rounds and rounds of bullets (words, actually) without knowing which cock they are should actually target, and why! It's a pity that such ambitious folks are not even aware what cockfight is all about, let alone the subject of 'clash of civilizations'. Let us explain ...

The term Clash of Civilization is to Samuel Huntington just like clean water is to Nestle', satirically! It must be made loud and clear that the awareness on this clash has been there since centuries, just like clean water. We will discuss about it in while, right now lets have a look at the meaning of the term 'Clash of Civilizations' in global context:

## The Clash of Civilization

Let us try to understand, for the sake of relevancy, if there be any clash between Islamic Ideology and the belief structure (values and principles) adhered by modern secular, liberal and democratic west.

Islam believes in the concept of *Wahi* (divine revelation). This concept leads to the idea of Supernaturalism, Divine Creation of life and Salvation on the Judgment Day.

On contrast, the modern western civilization has science or empirical knowledge in place of *Wahi*, Naturalism is in place of Supernaturalism, Darwin's ideas on origin of life are widely accepted and propagated; consequently the purpose of life is to enhance standard of living, acquire wealth and ultimate state of power.

To further simplify the discussion let us note, at the first step, that in every civilization there exists a question that what is the ultimate source of knowledge, ethics, morals and principles, et al. Islam is on a definite course collision with the west in this context. This is so because Islam considers *Wahi* as an answer to this question and the modern western civilization looks at science and common sense for guidance, and out-rightly reject the concept of *Wahi* as it finds no scientific explanation for this phenomenon. The concept of *Wahi* is simply not backed by any empirical evidence which human logic (secularized, i.e.) could possible digest. Welcome to the first round of the cockfight.

It is beyond doubt that such concepts would exist, even if it assumed that the prevailing frameworks<sup>37</sup> in a specific ideology are authentic, accurate, comprehensive and universal. Philosophically such a concept is known as Epistemological Foundations of any Ideology, and subsequently of any civilization.

---

<sup>37</sup> Frameworks are structures of rules and regulations with which individual and collective affairs are operated. These frameworks provide formats to various activities like worshipping, selection of the head of state, or formation of the family structure etc.

## The Clash of Civilization

Is this epistemological difference among Islamic and modern western Ideology, too small to be ignored? let us be very clear that epistemology of any Ideology is not just for the sake of it, rather it influence the definition of evaluating, judging or criticizing anything local to a particular civilization or something foreign; accepting what conforms to these definitions or rejecting the nonconforming items or actions.

Could any two civilizations, with such a phenomenal difference in their ideologies, like it is found among Islamic and modern western, coexist without compromising on their epistemological foundations in the Global Village of today? Indeed, if they do wish to live in agreement then either of the two must have to compromise on some aspects of their epistemology. Those who think of finding compatibilities among two such contrasts are either blind or sleeping for that matter, or they probably expect any of the two Ideologies to make a compromise ... which one? That would depend to whom their loyalty belongs to.

The next most important question is about the ontological argument i.e. 'who created life?'

The first and foremost constituent is the Ontological argument prevalent within any given Ideology, i.e. the concept of God, Creator, Al-Mighty, et al ... which cannot be avoided by any individual, faction, society, or even any civilization existing on this planet. Even those who do not believe in the existence of God, atheist i.e., also holds to an ontological argument, though contrary to believers.

Islam extracts the answers to this question from *Wahi* or its epistemological foundation, which says that there is indeed a Creator of life and entire universe. Furthermore the traits of the Creator are also impossible to be conceived by human intelligence. Islam further asserts that the human and universe have a spiritual significance as well. These concepts can be tagged under a single word called "Supernaturalism" and in philosophy this



## The Clash of Civilization

discussion done under the subject of Ontology. The modern western civilization, on the contrary, believes in naturalism and disapproves any religious definition of the Creator. Welcome to the second round of the cockfight.

Principles behind Ontological argument of each Ideology has a serious impact on the lives of the believer, like Muslims believe in oneness of God, Christian have a concept of trinity and modern western civilization confines its *Illah* or The Supreme Being within physical dimensions.

Now if we put the Islamic and Modern Western Ontological argument side by side, would we expect to find any likeness? Can both of them made compatible to each other in anyway? If not then why do we see many respected individuals, even intellectuals, trying to assemble the two poles, and attempting to invent means for peaceful coexistence of both? Is this really possible? If yes, then probably we would have to rewrite the entire history of Islamic Civilization known to us today, we would have to find new reasons for the crusades or the resistance experienced by Prophet Muhammad (SAW) and his companions (RA) in Makkah, for that matter. We would also have to de-brief many scholars and intellectuals like Allama Iqbal, Akbar Illa Abadi, Abul Ala Maududi (RA), et al. Iqbal, for example, have highlighted the importance and implications of this incompatibility on hundreds of occasions! Were they wrong? Or didn't know about the possibility of coexistence of two opposites? Or perhaps didn't know how to compromise on their ideals?

The next constituent or question whose answer is also found in a particular Ideology is 'how the life and everything else was created, specially the human race?'

No Ideology and civilization would exist without having a concept of 'efficient cause' of existence itself. In simple words, it is the question of where we came from, or how life and universe came into existence. If we look at

## The Clash of Civilization

Islamic answer to these questions, then we would find the Power of the Creator at work, which according to Quran, comes into action when Allah SWT says “*Kun*”<sup>38</sup> ... The first human being ‘Adam’ was also created spontaneously by Allah in the same fashion. Contrary to this modern western civilization explains it via Darwinian philosophy of ‘Natural Selection’. Can we somehow make these two possible explanations compatible? Could there be a way to make the inhabitant of either civilization agree on the view point of the other? They would rather agree to disagree. Often it is erroneously assumed that since Muslims are rather not vocally insisting on their viewpoint these days, therefore they are now in accord with modern western concepts. According to Iqbal:

*Mullah ko jo he hind me sujde ki ijazat  
Nadan ye samajhta he ke he Islam Azad*

(Mullahs have a permission to bow in Hind  
Gives the fool an impression that Islam is at liberty)

This inevitability brings us to the fourth constituent of any Ideology i.e. the ultimate question: “What is the ultimate purpose of human existence, or why we have been created, if so?”

How to fulfill our purpose and how to know that we have succeeded in fulfilling it? Against this answers Islam reply to us that we exist to submit our wills to Allah SWT or in the words of Quran “*And I did not create the jinn and mankind except to worship Me (Allah swt)*”<sup>39</sup>. Those who fulfill this purpose will be rewarded in hereafter i.e. they will be allowed to live in *Jannat ul Firdose* (The top notch location in Heaven) and avoid Hell fire. Modern western ideology has an answer which is in total contradiction to what Islam talks about; it tells its inhabitants that life is about striving and progressing

---

<sup>38</sup> “Kun is an Arabic word referring to the act of manifesting, existing or being. In the Qur’an, Allah commands the universe to be (kun!), and it is (fayakun)” Source: Kun (Islamic term). (2009, December 6). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 10:59, February 18, 2010, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Kun\\_\(Islamic\\_term\)&oldid=329969669](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Kun_(Islamic_term)&oldid=329969669)

<sup>39</sup> Surah Adh-Dhariat, verse 56

## The Clash of Civilization

for highest echelons of power, wealth, luxury and physical beauty, et al ... technology is meant to help achieve just that. Some argue that Islam isn't totally against that, ok we agree, however this is also not the measure of prosperity and success in Islam. Same would be true about technological development in purely Islamic way of life i.e. any technological development and advancement would be welcomed only and only if it facilitates man in approaching towards his purpose of existence. History also confirms that that's very much a possibility as well<sup>40</sup>.

Lets comeback to the discussion!

Can we compare this clash with the fight over the sanctity of *Shalwar-Qameez*<sup>41</sup> or Pants and Shirt? Indeed no! The challenges we face here are of such stature that even scholars like Moulana Romi (RA) and Imam Ghazali (RA) weren't able to find a solution for a serene coexistence among the two extremes. Now if someone still insists that it is possible that Islamic Ideological Framework can have a union with its western counterpart then he is either an idiot, out of his mind, a psychopath et al, if not then he has its own self-indulgence at work.

It is not just a matter of four types of difference among the two; rather they give birth to hundreds and thousands of disparities which can have serious implications over the lives of the people living in either of the civilizations. The inhabitants of these two civilizations are unique as their belief system, life priorities, intention behind each action, and semantics<sup>42</sup> are way different, let alone their literature, poetry, arts, trajectory of technological advancement, family structures, relationships, definition of love, hate, emotions and feelings, et al, i.e. anything under the sun is defined uniquely and analyzed from an angle contrast from that of other civilizations. It has to

---

<sup>40</sup> For details please visit <http://www.muslimheritage.com/timeline/chronology.cfm>

<sup>41</sup> The traditional dress of subcontinent which consists of a long shirt with baggy trousers.

<sup>42</sup> Semantic is the study of meaning, usually in language. Source: Semantics. (2010, February 10). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 11:31, February 18, 2010, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Semantics&oldid=343215229>

## The Clash of Civilization

be so, and if that's not the case, then either the Muslims have started to adopt from western ideological framework or the west has rather shifted its orientation to the Ideological framework of the Islam. Which of these is true? You decide.

### **Clash of Civilization for Beginners**

Dear Beginners, each civilization in this world is erected over a unique ideology or a set of beliefs. By civilization we mean practical manifestation of any respective ideology, in other words we see a civilization coming into existence when collective actions, priorities, decision, traditions, arts, etc are inspired by the respective ideology. Islamic civilization or Christian civilization also can be explained in the same context. It is also important to note that our belief inspires each and every action we take in all walks of lives, and when the belief structure gets corrupted from the original then eventually its practical manifestation also gets altered accordingly.

Islamic civilization is a religious civilization. Christian civilization also used to be a religious civilization long time back; rather it is interesting to note that prior to the birth of modern western civilization, civilizations were founded on unique religious ideologies. Contrary to this it's only the modern western civilization which is void of any metaphysical or super natural belief system; and for that matter the physical manifestation of this one is also unique to others. In this context it is also important to note that all other civilizations agreed on the idea that culture and traditions emerge from the particular belief structure, however it was the modern western civilization where the very opposite was believed to be true for the first time in history, i.e. the culture and tradition or any civilization inspire its belief structure.

Modern western civilization also cannot be said to void of any ideological framework, rather it has one of its own. The passionate and blind adherence of the inhabitants of this civilization toward certain ideas actually confirms that these are indeed constituents of the ideological framework of modern western civilization, though unspiritual. For example, in modern western

## The Clash of Civilization

civilization can you try to defame, degrade or negate the concept of capital, or that of liberty and even democracy? Can you imagine the consequent reaction? ... Right you are, the descending 1000 pound bombs would tell you, just before the final moments of your life, that this is that prize you get after committing the crime of “Secular heresy” or “Democratic *Shirk*<sup>43</sup>”. In other amongst religious civilization only individuals were punished to death when they were charged of a similar crime, however today entire countries and civilizations are punished accordingly, if found guilty of any such offense.

We have seen that there is an obvious relationship between Ideology and civilization. If there is corruptness in Ideological framework then it would become visible in its physical manifestation. Civilization is the exogenous and Ideology is its endogenous reality. Apparently the ideological framework of any civilization seems something simple to understand, however this is further from the truth. Take the Islamic ontological concept of *Tauheed* for example, if we only try to grasp the discussion done by Sheikh Akbar Muhiuddin Ibn-e-Arabi (RA) and Hazrat Mujdid Alf-e-Sani (RA), then it would take us a life time to do so only if the require zest and the guidance of a qualified and wise teacher is available to us.

Contrary to this exogenous personality of a leader, let alone civilization, can be observed, experienced, sensed and followed in inspiration, henceforth most people perceive and understand the differences, similarities, unisons, disparities and clashes among civilization on this exogenous level.

It is easy to call the modern western civilization a materialistic civilization; however it's the depth and scope of its meaning are not clear to even many so called intellectuals (we, however, don't claim to know its complete meaning either), just like the concept of *Tauheed* among ordinary Muslims. The concept of Trinity in Christianity is yet another example, whose meaning is not realized by most Christians, let alone Muslims; and the physical

---

<sup>43</sup> *Shirk* means to deny the existence of one God, rather bringing some non-godly to the status of God from Islamic point of view

## The Clash of Civilization

manifestation of the concept of Trinity and its implication on the lives of millions is not understood in totality even by Christian scholars. For that matter the term 'clash of civilization' is most suitable for the subject, because the lucidity it creates in ones minds and while communication, unlike the term 'clash of ideologies'.

Dear beginners, in order to understand the describe concepts in details, it is important that we should study some literature, that would make a list of near about 200 books, if that too much ask, then lest shorten it out and focus only on the following.

1. ***Tahafatul Flasa* by Imam Ghazali (RA)**: This is the most initial and comprehensive work on the clash among Islamic and western (Greek) values. This was written to counter the penetration of classical Greek philosophy into Muslim thinkers and intellectuals, when such penetration began for the first time in history. Ideas of Ibn-e-Rushd are greatest evidence of infiltration of Greek thoughts, and in this book Imam Ghazali actually argued the fundamental points of Rushd's thinking. This book was published by Islamic Cultural Institute (*Idara Sqafat-e-Islamia*) in Lahore many decades ago.
2. ***Tahafatul Nahafa* by Ibn-e-Rushd**: This is the answer to the Imam Ghazali's book mentioned above. For anyone who is interested in witnessing the intensity of the counter attack of Greek Philosophy and the stature of response by Rushd, this would be a must read.
3. ***Maktoob-e-Imam Rabbani (3 volumes)***: This book is the collection of the work of Hazrat Mujdid Alf-e-Sani (RA), which contains the discussion on Islamic beliefs, its differences with non-Islamic ones, and the incompatibility of Islamic with the non-Islamic civilizations.
4. **Entire collection of Iqbal's poetry**, especially the one called *Zarb-e-Kaleem* (Declaration of war against modernization).
5. Some books by Abu Ala Maududi (RA) like 'Fundamentals of Islamic Civilization', *Tanqihat*, and *Al-Jihad fi-al-Islam*.

6. **'Jadidiat' and 'Waqat Ki Ragni' by Hasan Askari:** The book *Jadidiat* graphically portrays the history of decline of western values and ideals, and the implication it holds for the humanity. Askari's other book highlights the differences among the traditions of Urdu and English literature.
7. **'Sir Syed and Hali's Concept of Nature' by Dr. Zafar-ul Hasan:** This book beautifully talks about how the western concept of 'Nature' was ill-perceived by Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and Altaf Hussain Hali, and how serious were (are) its implication on the Urdu literature, let alone Islamic concepts. This book discusses the semantic differences in the meaning of the word 'Nature' among Hindus, Christians, and as claimed by Modern Western Civilization, in contrast with its meaning described by Islamic Ideological framework. This is probably the best known work available on the subject.
8. **'The New Poetry and the Complete Man' and 'Mashriq' by Saleem Ahmed:** The first book is one of the most aggressive, antagonistic and significant book in urdu literature's critique section. This book tells us about how the concept of a complete man (with all its physical and metaphysical characteristics) disappeared due to the influence of western thinking and replaced by a partial concept. Siraj Munir compared this work of Saleem Ahmed with metaphysics of literature itself. Ahmed's second book '*Mashriq*' comprise of a long poetry, which highlights the falsification of Islamic values by the influence of western philosophy and alteration in the symbolic elements of its culture.
9. **Collection of Akbar Ila Abadi's Poetry:** Akbar is one of the greatest asset of Urdu literature. The initial stages of the clash among civilizations cannot be witnessed by avoiding Akbar's poetry. The greatness of Akbar can be perceived only by realizing that his poetry even influenced the thinking of Iqbal. Furthermore Akbar's creative ability is very much comparable with that of Iqbal as well. Although

Akbar's style is more satirical, whereas Iqbal discusses the same ideas in a profoundly serious and philosophical way.

10. **'Afqar-e-Sir Syed' by Ziauddin Lahori:** This book is an extract of 25 years of research done by Ziauddin Lahori, in which the author has collected statements of (Sir) Syed Ahmed Khan under different heads. This book reflects Syed's mindset and the immense influence it has on the intellectual and academic development the Muslims of subcontinent.
11. **The Decline of the West by Oswald Spengler:** This book, which was written before the WWI, is considered as a classic among the western literature. However it was published much later in 1926. This book describes the fundamentals of western civilization, the influence of Greek Philosophy on the same, and sequentially talks about its decline. This book presents the clearest synopsis on the crisis within the western ideological framework.
12. **'Crisis of the Modern World', 'The Reign of the Quantity', and 'East and West':** These books were written by a Frenchman Rene Guenon who was named Sheikh Abdulwahid Eesa after he reverted to Islam. One of the most notable critics of Urdu Literature, Hasan Askari, termed the Frenchman as the greatest thinker of the western civilization born in the last 700 years. Revolutionary Intellectual of Iran, Ali Shariati said that Guenon's work is one of the greatest discoveries of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and his influence is no lesser than that of Albert Einstein. These books contain immense and eloquent critique on modern western philosophy which clearly informs its readers that where and how Islamic Philosophy differs from that of modern western ideological framework.
13. **'Figure of speech and Figure of Thought' and 'What is Civilization?':** These books were written by Anand Kumar Swami after getting influenced by Rene Guenon. The first book talks about how the influence of western philosophy on arts and how the concept of creation of life have brought its inhabitants down to such low levels



## The Clash of Civilization

that the difference among humans, animal, and foliage have diminished. The second book 'What is Civilization?' discusses the meaning of civilization in context of different religious civilization and how it differs from the meaning as perceived by the modern western civilization.

A part from that please also try to have a look at the following: 'Dimensions of Islam', 'To have a Center' and 'Forgotten Truth' by Frith Job Schuon, 'Beyond the Post Modern Mind' by Husto Smith, 'The Rise and fall of the Great Powers' by Paul Kennedy, 'The End of the History and the last man' by Francis Fukuyama, 'The World in Collision' Edited by Ken Booth and Tim Dunne, 'The Holy War' by Karen Armstrong, 'The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness' by Eric Fromm and 'Muslim and the West' by Zaffer Ansari and John Esops.

### A Philosophical View from a Bird's Eye

The discussion on the forms of various civilizations and their encounters must begin from its historical context. It wouldn't be too hard to notice that human history is filled with mythologies. Western philosophy is also considered as an extract of Greek philosophy; henceforth it would be foolish on our part to ignore the influence of Plato's thinking on modern western way of life. Alfred North Whitehead has also acknowledged this influence, he once said:

*"...So far as concerns philosophy only a selected group can be explicitly mentioned. There is no point in endeavoring to force the interpretations of divergent philosophers into a vague agreement. What is important is that the scheme of interpretation here adopted can claim for each of its main positions the express authority of one, or the other, of some supreme master of thought - Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Locke, Hume, Kant. But ultimately nothing rests on authority; the final court of appeal is intrinsic reasonableness.*

## The Clash of Civilization

*The safest general characterization of the European philosophical tradition is that it consists of a series of footnotes to Plato. I do not mean the systematic scheme of thought which scholars have doubtfully extracted from his writings. I allude to the wealth of general ideas scattered through them..."<sup>44</sup>*

And Plato's following words would tell us why so:

*"...Are all our actions alike performed by the one predominant faculty, or are there three faculties operating severally in our different actions? Do we learn with one internal faculty, and become angry with another, and with a third feel desire for all the pleasures connected with eating and drinking, and the propagation of the species; or upon every impulse to action, do we perform these several actions with the whole soul?"<sup>45</sup>*

Some asserts that this is an exaggeration; however for the sake of argument even if we agree still we cannot undermine Plato's influence on western thinking and their way of life. Plato indeed had a model of a society called 'Republic', which if analyzed theoretically, is of extraordinary stature, as any one could expect from a philosopher of such repute. However the idea of Republic could never saw daylight rather got mummified right at its theoretical stage and remained a conceptual blueprint only left for academic debate.

Similarly, Utopia of Sir Thomas Moore was based on similar conceptual ideas, however today it has nothing but a satirical significance. There have been infinite debates on Republic and Utopia in western academic circles however it never posed any threat to modern western civilization despite some of their elements could have done so if applied practically, for example, Plato forcefully rejects the idea of democracy and considers it "... as a charming

---

<sup>44</sup> Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, p. 39 [Free Press, 1979]

<sup>45</sup> Plato - *The Republic* : Book 4

## The Clash of Civilization

*form of government, full of variety and disorder, and dispensing a sort of equality to equals and unequaled alike*<sup>46</sup>.

It is also important to note that Karl Marx did all its philosophical and conceptual working in Britain. Marx presumed that socio-economic and political conditions of Britain as ideal for a communists revolution, however contrary to his viewpoint, Russia become a communist regime via a revolutionary coup d'état.

Lenin was to Marxism as Wright brothers were to the invention of the airplane, as the concept of human flight was scientifically conceptualized probably by Leonardo Da-Vinci for the first time<sup>47</sup>, Lenin did the same to theoretical concepts of Karl Marx. Without Lenin, Marxism would have fated in the same way as of Plato's Republic or Sir Thomas Moore's Utopia.

Marxism, when materialized, became a serious threat to its counterpart, capitalism; despite ideological similarity, in Abu Ala Moudodi's point of view. Marxism analyzed history from its unique perspective and redefined the meanings of ownership, constitution and governance, not only theoretically but also applied it practically, therefore erected itself in a competition against its only counterparts. Marxism also redefined the meaning of psychology, as it rejected that of their counterparts by tagging them as 'capitalistic' in nature; Marxism developed its own psychological framework from proletarian's viewpoint.

These were some of the reasons due to which the entire communist experiment and its conclusion produced such a powerful impact on thinking of modern western civilization that Yoshihiro Francis Fukuyama, a renowned American philosopher and thinker, uttered:

---

<sup>46</sup> Plato, the Republic of Plato (London: J.M Dent & Sons LTD.; New York: E.P. Dutton & Co. Inc.), 558-C.

<sup>47</sup> Flight. (2010, January 27). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 10:17, February 1, 2010, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Flight&oldid=340346407>

## The Clash of Civilization

“What we may be witnessing is not just the end of the Cold War, or the passing of a particular period of post-war history, but the end of history as such ... That is, the end point of mankind’s ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government ...”<sup>48</sup>

Later Fukuyama reverted from his statement however this did reflect the nature of impact Marxism made on their counterparts.

Hinduism, for example, has its unique ideological frame work as well; guiding its followers in different facets of life, and unlike Plato’s republic or Sir Thomas’s Utopia, it has become a part of reality and history as well. However modern western civilization has no threat with it for obvious reasons. This is so because presently Hinduism has accepted the hegemony of western civilization and has halted any further establishment and expansion of their own. Modern western civilization has also picked various elements which it liked, from Hinduism and has also not hesitated in its propagation, like yoga, which is appreciated and practiced very much within the modern western cultures. However it has been striped from its originality and spiritual significance which was elaborative with in the conceptual framework of Hindu ideology.

Buddhism and Confucianism, which were also unique civilizations as seen on the pages of history; today however their traces are alive in a few ritualistic activities or architectural artifact only, in some geographical regions where they were alive at some point in the past. It would be appropriate to call these civilizations as mummified rather, as they don’t pose any threat to modern western civilization as well.

---

<sup>48</sup> The End of History and the Last Man, Fukuyama, 1992

## The Clash of Civilization

West on the contrary, has a different stance toward Islam, and rather adores its Sufi version. Westerners conceive that *Shariat*<sup>49</sup> of Islam and *Tareeqat*<sup>50</sup> are two different things. This is in fact a conspiracy rather as in reality as *Tareeqat* and *Shariat* are mutually dependent in reality. However west intends to draw lines among the two and encourage on *Tareeqat* more. Just for the sake of argument if we agree with this western assumption then Islam would be left alone with its spiritual experience and its physical manifestation into a real civilization would be abandoned.

It can be observed that some Islamic movements<sup>51</sup> that have confined their persistence to rituals like Fasting and Praying (*Salah*) alone are also under limelight of western establishment. If any of these movements declares that *Tareeqat* is subservient to *Shariah* and Fasting and Praying are again a physical manifestation of the Philosophy of Quran and Sunnah, then they would eventually witness aggression in the attitude of western establishment like it is witnessed by so called self fabricated Islamic Political parties.

It is not just Islam which western establishment are against, even if Hinduism starts to insist on realization of its standards of right and wrong in totality, then the modern western civilization would come again with a similar bullish attitude; because by doing so Hindu civilization would yield into a universal manifestation and would eventually threaten the *Raison d'être* (reason of existence) of modern western civilization.

---

<sup>49</sup> "Muslim or Islamic law, both civil and criminal justice as well as regulating individual conduct both personal and moral. The custom-based body of law based on the Quran and the religion of Islam. Because, by definition, Muslim states are theocracies, religious texts are law, the latter distinguished by Islam and Muslims in their application, as Sharia or Sharia law." Source: <http://duhaime.org/LegalDictionary/S/ShariaLaw.aspx>

<sup>50</sup> "According to traditional Islamic scholars, *Tareeqat* means, a way or school of *tasawwuf*. *Tasawwuf* is one of the sunnah branches of Islam and in English some people know it as *sufism*, Islamic spiritual or sacred sciences". Source: <http://www.tareeqat.com/component/content/article/30-general-faqs/52-what-is-tareeqat>

<sup>51</sup> Tablig-e-Jamat, for example.

## The Clash of Civilization

The modern western civilization has no threat with any Ideological framework which insists on its belief system, values, or mythology in isolation. The trouble starts when a theory foreign to modern western Ideology becomes a practice, like in case of Marxism. USSR, the breeding ground of Marxist approach, has been disintegrated along with Marxism and as a result American economy suffered a loss of \$295 billion per year<sup>52</sup>, but westerners remained at peace.

Some says that may be in future China and America would be on war fronts<sup>53</sup>, in our view this would rather be a clash of their economies alone. However, unlike china, Islamic Ideological frame work and resulting civilization is in fact in direct clash with its western counter part on all fronts which forms a civilization, let alone economic.

This clash was very much a reality during the times of Imam Ghazali (RA), even during colonization, and today the totality of this encounter hasn't reduced at all. Since the last hundred years the poetry of Akbar Ila Abadi and Iqbal, and since last fifty years the writings of Abul Ala Maududi (RA) are also insisting on the same.

For many the idea presented in preceding paragraphs would seem like an audacious and obnoxious accusation, let alone a conspiracy theory. This is so because, despite the obviousness of the clash among ideologies and resulting civilizations, no one has ever talked about it in the subcontinent like the three gentlemen whose names have just been mentioned. Even their hue and cry has been gravely misunderstood. Either because people are not well versed enough to understand it, or the nature of this clash is too complicated

---

<sup>52</sup> U.S. Annual Military Spending from 1945 to 1996 (Billions of 1996 Dollars in Outlays). Source; <http://www.cdi.org/issues/milspend.html>

<sup>53</sup> "More than half of Chinese people questioned in a poll believe China and America are heading for a new "cold war". Times Online reported in an article titled "China's hawks demand cold war on the US" on February 7, 2010. Source: <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/asia/article7017951.ece>  
A google search with the keywords 'America's war with China' yield more results.

## The Clash of Civilization

to be conceived by the intellectuals of this country or perhaps their intentions are doubtful.

It is however a fact of the matter that Mir Jaffers, Mir Sadiqs and (Sir) Syeds are infiltrating among our ranks since last two hundred years, and their presence also cannot be ignored today.

### 3 -

---

## Syed Ahmed Khan and the Two Nation Theory

No doubt Syed Ahmed Khan was an agent of Britishers, that's why he was labeled as Sir, hence the name Sir Syed Ahmed Khan. He indeed informed in the letters he wrote to his masters (Britishers) about the hideouts of freedom fighters and used abusive words for them (aka Mujahideens) as well. These are not mere allegations but their documented proofs are also available. Despite all this, if we call Syed the 'Samuel Huntington' of subcontinent then it wouldn't also be incorrect. There was a time, although, when Syed used to call Muslims and Hindus like two eyes of a beautiful bride, however very soon he insisted on creating a separate political party for Muslims, independent of the platform provided by congress, so that rights of Muslims remain protected. Syed did so because he believed that objectives of Muslims were indeed different from Hindus; and perhaps this is the reason he is credited to be the founder of the Two Nation Theory, which is yet another example of Clash of Civilizations. Or in other words the idea of Clash of Civilization is not a bit different from that of the Two Nation Theory.



## The Clash of Civilization

However despite this fact, many lovers of this theory doesn't realize, rather get annoyed with the idea of clash of civilization.

Quaid-e-Azam, Muhammad Ali Jinnah was brought up in a secularized environment, however he spent day and night to explain the importance of two nation theory or in other words in highlighting the difference among the Hindus and Muslims, to an extent that he even gave examples of cow and Lota to make his point, as discussed earlier.

Allama Iqbal, on the other hand differs in approach from these two gentlemen, as at one point in time we find him praising the philosophy of Krishna<sup>54</sup> and acknowledging Gurunank<sup>55</sup>; also Iqbal labeled Shri Ram as Imam-e-Hind. That was his broadmindedness, however his thinking suddenly took a u-turn when he joined the bandwagon for a separate Muslim nation and was later called the founder of the concept of Pakistan.

In Iqbal's poetry and thought work, the difference among Islam and western ideological framework is very clear indeed. He explicitly explained how modern western philosophy is the greatest barrier in between Mankind and his destiny, and that modern western philosophy is not only Idolatry, but also insist on selling its Idols and even worshiping them. If seen in this context, we find Iqbal very much different from Syed Ahmed Khan and Muhammah Ali Jinnah, about which we will discuss more in a while.

Syed Ahmed Khan, on the contrary spent his life making Muslims closer to Englishmen. The main reason for that was perhaps the environment in which he was brought up i.e. an environment dominated by a monarchic mindset. Furthermore Syed was a Muslim, by name, and Muslims have ruled Hindus for nearly thousand years, and for that matter Hinduism in comparison to Islam and Hindus in comparison to Muslims were naturally considered

---

<sup>54</sup> Iqbal on Lord Krishna and Ram, web link <http://www.jaihoon.com/943.htm>

<sup>55</sup> "The Mission of Guru Nanak : A Muslim Appraisal" by Professor Mushirul Haq. Web link: <http://www.sikhspectrum.com/102002/mission.htm>

## The Clash of Civilization

inferior by Syed Ahmed Khan. From his viewpoint, Hindus since remained subservient to a Muslim serfdom, therefore there was no point for Muslims to feel encouraged to come closer to Hinduism or Hindus by any means. Contrary to this Englishmen fought and won over Muslims, eventually and ironically Syed perceived Islam very much similar to Christianity, and suggested that Muslims should indeed make their western counterparts as their Role models. This was despite the clear differences among both religions, which Syed Ahmed Khan couldn't see in his lifetime. And perhaps it is due to the influence of Syed's thinking that even today we find many people arguing against the validity of the concept of Clash of Civilization, in contemporary sense.

Analysis of the subject under discussion is indeed interesting and eye opening. Any one who is more interested can do more research to learn more and feel ashamed.

It is indeed a strange fact of history that Muslims ruled Hindus for about thousand years but never attempted to learn Hinduism. Indeed there was a huge opportunity. If Muslim monarchs would have produced hundreds of experts of Sanskrit language then the entire Hindu population could also have been encouraged to revert to Islam. It would have been a tremendous contribution toward Islam, however this didn't happen.

There are two reasons due to which we regard it as a huge contribution. One is the details of concept of Tauheed (oneness of God) discussed in the sacred Hindu scripture called Vedas, particularly in its last volume. Shankar Acharya, a Hindu scholar, has explained this section in such a depth that no such example is found at least among discussion done on the same subject by the Christian scholars, in their own context. The second reason is that with in the holy Hindu scriptures, the arrival of Prophet Muhammad (SAW) is prophesied in such lucidity that we don't find even a close example in Bible and Torah (in other words examples found in Torah and Bible are not that clear as compare to those in Hindu scriptures). Even on two places the name of Prophet

## The Clash of Civilization

Muhammad (SAW) is mentioned with a slight difference of pronunciation i.e. 'Mahamad'<sup>56</sup>. In addition to that more indirect discussion about the Prophet (SAW) and his companions is also found on various occasions<sup>57</sup>.

It is needless to emphasize that how significantly all these references from Hindu sacred scriptures could have been used to bring all Hindu population into the circle of Islam. But this was possible only if thorough research would have been done and an army of scholars with relevant knowledge would have been prepared, which wasn't at all impossible with the level of resources available at the disposal of Muslim rulers<sup>58</sup>. But the question was "Why we Muslims, the rulers, should go as low to study and read or dig out their (Hindu's) religious scriptures?"

Contrary to this with in a period of fifty years, Muslims not even produced thinkers like Moulana Hali and Syed Ahmed Khan, but also developed institutions like Ali Garh, founded with the soul purpose to inculcate 'English

---

<sup>56</sup> The translation of Verses 5-27 (Puranas, Prati Sarg Parv III: 3, 3) is presented below from the work of Dr. Vidyarthi. "A malechha (belonging to a foreign country and speaking foreign language) spiritual teacher will appear with his companions. His name will be Mahamad. Raja (Bhoj) after giving this Mahadev Arab (of angelic disposition) a bath in the 'Panchgavya' and the Ganges water, (i.e. purging him of all sins) offered him the presents of his sincere devotion and showing him all reverence said, 'I make obeisance to thee.' 'O Ye! the pride of mankind, the dweller in Arabia, Ye have collected a great force to kill the Devil and you yourself have been protected from the malechha opponents (idol worshipers, pagans).' 'O Ye! the image of the Most Pious God the biggest Lord, I am a slave to thee, take me as one lying on thy feet.'" web link: <http://www.cyberistan.org/islamic/prophhs.html>

<sup>57</sup> Several prophecies are found in Atharva Veda: (1) XX: 21, Mantras 6, 7, and 9, (2) XX: 137, Mantras 7 through 9, and (3) X: 2, Mantras 26, 27, 29, 30, and 32. Similarly, in Rig Veda, additional prophecies are found in: (1) VII: 96, Mantras 13 through 16, and (2) I: 53, Mantras 6 and 9. Finally, a prophecy is found in Sama Veda III: 10, Mantra 1. These are a sample of many prophecies. The serious reader may want to refer to scholarly work of Dr. A.H. Vidyarthi, entitled "Mohammad in World Scriptures," 1990. This book explains the Hindu terminology used in the Mantras and the meaning and usage of certain words and phrases from within the Vedas and other Hindu Scriptures. web link: <http://www.cyberistan.org/islamic/prophhs.html>

<sup>58</sup> According to economic historian Angus Maddison in his book *The World Economy: A Millennial Perspective*, India had the world's largest economy from the first to eleventh century, and in the eighteenth century, with a (32.9%) share of world GDP in the first century to (28.9%) in 1000 AD, and in 1700 AD with (24.4%).

## The Clash of Civilization

Character' among Muslims along with a feeling of gratitude for their English masters. Magazines like *Tehzeeb-ul-Ikhlaque* were also published and scientific societies were also formed; English novels and poetry also become trendy. Moulana Hali, in all his sincerity, also challenged the foundation of traditional poetry in his book *Muqadama Sher-o-Shairi*; All because Englishmen were the masters and we were subservient to them. It is ironic to note the lowness, conservativeness amongst the mindset of the slaves.

On one side there is no attempt to come close to an entire Hindu civilization in one thousand years of history and on the other side experts, intellectuals inspired with the philosophy of a foreign invader are produced within fifty years of subservience.

Some believe that Islam and modern western ideology have a few things in common. However it is interesting to note that when we talk about the two nation theory then no one intend to claim that indeed there are some similarities in Islam and Hinduism as well, rather the contrary is claimed to be true that Islam and Hinduism are indeed like two poles apart, and if that's true then why isn't the same is considered true for Islam and modern western ideological framework. Could this be because in the past assertion on the two nations theory was beneficial for Muslims, and today we find it advantageous to find similarities in Islam and Modern western Ideology?

Let us now salute the impotent and lowly worshipers of power.

Some also believe that the concept of clash of civilization will elude the opportunities for the propagation of Islam which have emerged in the west, where a noticeable percentage of population is converting to Islam. Just for the sake of argument even if we assume that this is correct then how would we explain the history of emergence and propagation of Islam in South Asia? After Muhammad Bin Qasim arrived in 711AD, the population of Muslims were in mere thousands. Today after including the population of Afghanistan as well, its near around 550 million, and all of them are not generations of

## The Clash of Civilization

Arabs of course, rather comprises of new generations of Muslim converts who embraced Islam after the Muhammad Bin Qasim took control of this region. When the two nation's theory was being developed, the population of Muslim was 60 million, but at that time no one thought that this theory might hinder the propagation of Islam in the subcontinent. If Islam didn't stop spreading after two nation's theory then how come idea of clash of civilization, which nothing more than a modern version of two nation's theory, can possibly hinders its propagation in western countries?

If we closely analyze then we would eventually conclude that our thinking at the time of two nation's theory was influenced greatly by our monarchic history, as mentioned earlier. Back then we considered ourselves among the ruling class, contrary to this today our position relative to modern western civilization is very obvious. Today we consider them as our masters and in the same context our inferiority complex frequently surfaces in different forms and intensity. Another interesting belief which prevails among our society is that modern western ideological framework doesn't pose any threat contrary to Hindu religion which did posed a serious threat in the past. It is even more interesting to note that at the time of two nation's theory Muslims haven't adopted any aspect of Hinduism in their lives, contrary to this today we live our life with many standards which we have directly taken from modern western ideology. In other words, Hinduism threatened Islam from a distance, but Muslim face no threat from modern western ideology despite nurturing in its laps since last two hundred years.

Here we don't mean to disagree with two nation's theory, nor are we against the creation of Pakistan. We would rather fully endorse the philosophy behind two nation's theory and agree that the creation of Pakistan was indeed one of the greatest events in the history of Muslim world. However our argument is rather related with the approach Muslims have taken with the modern form of the two nation theory, which is rather evolving on a global scale under the pretext of clash of civilization. Or, we would rather say that the implication, which two nation's theory holds within the boundaries

## The Clash of Civilization

of subcontinent before the creation of Pakistan, today the idea of clash of civilization holds the same implications for Muslims at global level.

However frogs that dwell inside a 'well' are frightened to realize how deep and vast is the ocean which now confronts them. The reason is obvious talking the walk, and walking the walk are two different things. Today some of consider themselves intellectuals by becoming critics of the efforts and thinking of Quaide-e-Azam and Muhammad Iqbal, despite realizing that these were the gentlemen who really walked the walk, and led the people of subcontinent with dignity and honor. Muslims of that time did had a lot of discrepancies as a nation, however the sacrifices which they made for the great cause deduce the cries of today's pseudo intellectuals to mere croaking of frogs frightened to even look at the level of challenges our time demands. Some are croaking, some have buried their heads in sand like an ostrich and some have closed their eyes like pigeons do when they realize the standing danger.

## 4 –

---

# The Confusion

### Shave Him He is a Fool

Rabindranath Tagore wrote the Indian National Anthem. His collection *Gitanjali* also won a noble prize, making him admired in the west as he was the first non-European who became a Noble Laureate<sup>59</sup>. When he won the noble prize of literature in 1913, his books were translated and published in 30 to 40 languages; he himself as well translated his book *Gitanjali* in English.

Tagore had a long beard and his long hair touched his shoulders, and those who met him observed that he seemed to be immersed in deep thoughts all the time; all of which creating an ambiance of a person who looked spiritually enlightened, enough for the westerners to qualify him as the model of spirituality for the world. Seeing is believing (Satirically)! However this surprised many, including George Bernard Shaw.

George Bernard Shaw was also offered a Nobel Prize; Shaw accepted the honor but refused the paycheck<sup>60</sup>. After the Nobel Prize was awarded to

---

<sup>59</sup> Rabindranath Tagore. (2010, February 24). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 06:57, February 25, 2010, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Rabindranath\\_Tagore&oldid=346101356](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Rabindranath_Tagore&oldid=346101356)

<sup>60</sup> George Bernard Shaw. (2010, March 1). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 06:21, March 2, 2010, from

## The Clash of Civilization

Rabindranath Tagore, Shaw read *Gitanjali* and went to India to meet him. On his return some journalist questioned him on the airport about his experience with the Nobel laureate. Shaw replied “Shave him, he is a fool.”

In other words, it was only the appearance of Tagore which did the magic for him; so much for the western episteme. Similar is the case with Samuel Huntington. The ambiance created after his book on clash of civilization made him most popular in context of the subject. Huntington is also bearded, henceforth needs to be shaved as well, though not in the literal sense. But let us first understand why?

Since the bandwagon of clash of civilization has spurred into action, public has assumed that this subject has been pioneered by Mr. Huntington, without realizing that the debate on the subject even sparked during the time of Imam Ghazali (RA), this debate is even seen in the poetry of Akbar Ala Abadi, Allama Iqbal and even visible in the works of Abu Ala Maududi (RA).

OK, Mr. Huntington wouldn't have got a chance to look at the works of the notables mentioned above, however still we mustn't assume that the pioneer is this gentleman. Even in western literature Mr. Bernard Lewis has discussed the same subject in his book “A Middle East Mosaic”. Some even think that Huntington's has only elaborated Lewis's thinking, which was rather more technical, in simpler terms; *“he relies heavily on a 1990 article by the veteran Orientalist Bernard Lewis, whose ideological colors are manifest in its title, ‘The Roots of Muslim Rage’<sup>61</sup>”,* wrote Edward W. Said in his article published in The Nation Newspaper on October 4, 2001.

This brings us to the question, did Bernard Lewis actually initiated the debate in the western academia for the first time? The answer is plain no! Before Lewis, a book “The World and the West” by Arnold Toynbee was published

---

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=George\\_Bernard\\_Shaw&oldid=347165712](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=George_Bernard_Shaw&oldid=347165712)

<sup>61</sup> Web link: <http://www.thenation.com/article/clash-ignorance>



## The Clash of Civilization

by Oxford University Press in 1953, in which Toynbee used the term 'encounter' instead of 'clash'. When we browse through the earlier works of Toynbee like "A Study of History", we would smell the same fragrance as found in his later work specially in which he specifically discusses the subject of "Clash of Civilizations".

It is an absurd reality that ideas of one person become famous in the name of another. However on ethical grounds all concerned should have an urge to know the origins of a particular idea, so that the real pioneer shall get the credit.

It is important to note that the analytical model and methodology adopted by Arnold Toynbee, who is one of the leading authorities on the subject of analysis and comparison of civilizations in this century, was somewhat different than Oswald Spengler; however Spengler's "The Decline of the West", published in early 1900s, did influence the Toynbee's thinking.

If we go back a little further in history then we would see Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche (1844 – 1900) heavily emphasizing on west's declining state of existence and on its sorry state of democracy, and agonized on its cultural disintegration. The collective amnesia of the new generation also seemed to worry him and he said that we once produced giant personalities, but today we are only capable of producing those who are like dwarfs in comparison. Furthermore he emphasized, *"The Christian resolution to find the world ugly and bad has made the world ugly and bad."*<sup>62</sup> ... Sounds familiar?

Arnold Toynbee has following to say in context of the discussion:

*"Christianity itself will be superseded by some distinct, separate, and different higher religion which will serve as a chrysalis between the death of the present Western civilization and the birth of its children. On the theory that religion is subservient to civilization, you would expect some new higher religion to come into existence on each*

---

<sup>62</sup> Friedrich Nietzsche, The Gay Science, section 130

## The Clash of Civilization

*occasion, in order to serve the purpose of tiding over the gap between one civilization and another.*<sup>63</sup>

Therefore in order to save for modern western civilization from destruction Toynbee propose two alternatives, one is to infest them with spirituality, second would be to bring them out of there love affair with technology. According to Iqbal:

*He Dil ke liya moot Machineoon ki hukumat  
Ehsas-e-murawat ko kuchal dete hein alaaf*

(Supremacy of machines is deadly for ones heart  
Instruments, gadgets slay the sense of courtesy)

The story doesn't end here. However should make our readers realize that why it was important to shave Samuel Huntington, though the shave is not yet complete.

### **'Uncivilized Civilizations' verses 'Civilized Civilizations'**

The level of analysis on western (secular, liberal and democratic) thinking or philosophy done by the Iqbal, Hasan Askari or Abu Ala Maududi (RA) stands out like a mountain as compare to the analysis done by the ordinary Muslim population on the subject, let alone the remaining intellectuals or scholars in this region (read Indian subcontinent); if former is a windstorm then the latter would definitely be a sneeze in comparison.

The mention of Iqbal, Hasan Askari or Abu Ala Maududi (RA) is superfluous as well, because we hardly see any soul realizing the depths and wisdom in their work. Although many students or debaters do memorize Iqbal so as to get marks in exams or beat their competition in a declamation contest. In addition to that, books of Abu Ala Maududi (RA) or other intellectuals lie in our bookshelves impressing our guests, though we seldom bother to read and absorb the knowledge they carry. As far as Mr. Askari is concern, only

---

<sup>63</sup> Christianity and Civilization, From Civilization on Trial, Oxford University Press, 1948

## The Clash of Civilization

one of his students Mr. Saleem Ahmed, has dared to write a book on his teachings; many we see, don't have the capacities to really absorb his work.

Probably these are the reasons why most Muslims today argue "Is western civilization a civilization or a society of uncivilized individuals living together, in contrast to the concept of Islamic civilization?" these innocent (read stubbornly ignorant) individuals though realize the validity of the concept of an Islamic civilization, however it gets hard for them to grasp the idea of that west with its immoral, vulgar and corrupt (from the perspective of the colonized ones) state of being can be tagged with a term like "Civilization". Such folks further erroneously infer that the clash, as it may seem, is actually among a 'Civilized (Islamic) Civilization' (wana be) and an 'Uncivilized Civilization'. A few like-minders would feel that this is a redundant discussion; however it is better that we clarify this confusion right her, right now, so that later no one would complain.

Scholars of subcontinent have often used a phrase in their writings that says 'Devil often mimic God'. How he does that, is also explained by these scholars; however this isn't the right place to dig the details. Even Christian literature has a similar phrase which also says "Satan is the ape of God"<sup>64 65</sup>. It is important to explain what this means, as it would help clear the confused minds, and let's use the Marxist and Modern Western Ideological framework to wipe it of.

Marxism is an anti religious philosophy, who compared religion with opium (a narcotic drug) and preferred atheistic philosophy (There is no God ...); henceforth it neither believes in the Prophets of Islam, Christianity or Judaism et al, in the concept of Revelations from God, nor does it buy in with the idea of the Judgment day, worshiping rituals or even religious etiquettes.

---

<sup>64</sup> "The Challenge of the Cults", a book by Ron Rhodes, page 315. Published in 2001 by Zondervan.

<sup>65</sup> "Angles Among Us", a book by Ron Rhodes, page 197. Published in 2008 by Harvest House Publishers

## The Clash of Civilization

Despite all this the fellowship of Marxism developed, as the world witnessed, and even today we see a lots of individual and political parties insisting on Marxist Philosophy.

When Marxism hit the road, it gained acceptance as any other Ideology. Its Ontological argument was confined in the Communist Government, Karl Marx was its Prophet, '*Das Kapital*' was its holy book or the basis of its epistemology<sup>66</sup>. Therefore Iqbal once commented about Karl Marx that "*Nisbat Peghumber o lekin Da Baghal Dar Kitab*" which means he is not a Prophet but he has a book like any Prophet used to have. Dialectic Materialism<sup>67</sup> is the fundamental concept in Marxist philosophy or can be referred as principle on which its Ontological argument is based. This principle wholly inspires the entire living experience within a communist framework. The day of communist revolution was like the day of genesis of life (of communist regime), as known in Christianity or other religions. And to serve the communist system was given such an immense significance like it is given to any form of ritualistic worship in any other religion. The entire communist experience has so much religious ambience in it that a lot many Muslim scholars like Moulana Obaidullah Sindi, Allama Iqbal<sup>68</sup> or even Hasrat Mohani<sup>69</sup> deceptively exclaimed that if we embed the Islamic concept of *Tauheed* (Singular authority and dominion of God) in Marxist Philosophy then it would get very close to Islamic Ideological Framework. This is however absolutely incorrect, although this indeed tells us about how Marxist

---

<sup>66</sup> Das Kapital. (2010, February 14). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 11:27, February 17, 2010, from

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Das\\_Kapital&oldid=343901572](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Das_Kapital&oldid=343901572)

<sup>67</sup> Dialectical materialism. (2010, January 28). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 08:36, February 18, 2010, from

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Dialectical\\_materialism&oldid=340576323](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Dialectical_materialism&oldid=340576323)

<sup>68</sup> Zikr-e-Iqbal, Biography of Hazrat Allama Iqbal, written by Salik Abdul Majeed, Published by Chaman Book Depot Urdu Bazaar Delhi, page 187.

<sup>69</sup> Hasrat Mohani - A Forgotten Freedom Fighter, an article written by Asghar Ali Engineer on August, 2007 at CSSS. Source: [http://www.csss-isl.com/archive/archive.php?article=2007/aug1\\_15.htm](http://www.csss-isl.com/archive/archive.php?article=2007/aug1_15.htm)

## The Clash of Civilization

Philosophy was perceived as comprehensive and universal, just like universality of Islam is perceived.

We must keep this in mind that the Marxist philosophy did materialize itself into its unique society and culture, having its own economic philosophy, literature, psychological and sociological concepts. In other words an idea gave birth to a comprehensive civilization. Most of the readers, not a few like minded ones, would be astonished to know that Marxism also have its unique concept of sex as well<sup>70</sup>.

Critiques of Marxist philosophy say that it manifestly rejected religion; however it is important to note that it turned out to be not much different from any religious experience (for an outsider of course), which was also ill perceived by many scholars, as discussed. This eventually brings us to the saying of our esteemed scholars that “Satan mimics God”.

The case of modern western civilization is even nakedly obvious as compare to Marxism. Capital is its God, its ultimate source of knowledge is human intelligence alone<sup>71</sup>, its concept of liberty is as sacred as the concept monotheism is in Islam, and democracy is its practical and constitutional manifestation of the idea of liberty, the concept of right or wrong are determined by their economic feasibility<sup>72</sup>, and egalitarianism is its sociology and tolerance is the rational behind it, et al. This is just one way to explain it, in other words Man has himself intend to take place of God in modern western civilization, and René Descartes, Francis Bacon, Friedrich Hegel, Luther, Immanuel Kant, Michel Foucault, and Jacques Derrida statues as its Prophets.

---

<sup>70</sup> "The Woman Question", by Paul Lafargue. First published in French as La question de la femme in Éditions de L'Œuvre Nouvelle, Paris 1904. Web link

<http://www.marxists.org/archive/lafargue/1904/xx/woman.htm>

<sup>71</sup> Demoralization of Western Culture: Social Theory and Delimas of Modern Living, a book by Ralph Fevre, page 79. Published by Continuum in 2006

<sup>72</sup> Ibid, page 209

## The Clash of Civilization

We must also not forget that terminologies like capitalist economy, capitalist literature and art have been in use since quite sometime. In presence of all these indicators why we should shy away from tagging the modern western experience as a complete civilization?

Iqbal, Abu Ala Maududi (RA), Akbar Ala Abadi and intellectuals like Hasan Askari, never shied away from doing so on hundreds of occasions, and neither shall we. It is important to realize that in practical life it is not the conceptual framework rather its practical manifestation which counts. What would mere claims, assertions, ideas, and promises would do in a battle field, when its time for action rather.

### The So Called Contemporary Intellectuals

Some intellectuals assume that phrase 'clash of civilization' is incorrect. They assume that civilizations are never on a course of clash with each other. Clash is rather among two uncivilized groups, societies or nations. This is so because they assume a civilization to be a manifestation of wisdom and civilized approach, which rather cannot lead to any fight, encounter or clash. It is also assumed that among civilizations the atmosphere of peace always prevails, mantras of love and compassion are sung, and a sense of corporation is always in the air. Interestingly some consider such thoughts as intellectual; however we cannot even put them in the category of fiction which is always fabricated even around the theme of a conflict between good and evil, **if not then we see a tussle between fate and 'locus of control' there.**

The concept of good and evil are religious in nature and their clash is as old as the history itself and will continue till the end of time. In this context such a clash can occur among two individuals, groups, and even civilization. And of course such a clash always prevail inside one self as well. Some are scared from the tales of Karbala, but according to Iqbal Karbala occurs inside every individual:

## The Clash of Civilization

*Mera dil, meri razm gah-e-hiyat  
Gumanon ke lashkar yaqeen ka sabat*

Saleem Ahmed also seems to agree with Iqbal:

*Woh run mujh me para he khair o shar ka  
ke apni zat mein ik karbala hon*

In this context various civilizations have stood against each other in history, as well. and when ever this has happened the issues of compatibility among the two colliding civilizations and resulting resistance has always been inevitable.

Just like any individual, civilizations also held their ideologies, which defines their concept of good and evil, as sacred and are found to insist on the same, always. For this reason any two civilizations with unique ideologies are bound to come across each other in an unfriendly fashion; history is filled with such examples, which cannot be nullified just by a state of denial. It is important to note that the way any civilization insist on its ideals can be very much different then that of the other. Today Islamic civilization is also found to insist on certain ideals or beliefs, but does it in a holistic and a universal context, in comparison to the modern western civilization who does in a very materialistic and hypothetical manner. But this brings us to the question, which many ask, that which of them is right?

The answer of this question can be found in the historical background of Islam. Those who believe in Divine Revelation must also believe that these revelation began at the time of Adam (AS) and continued during the times of various Prophets till the last one (SAW). In this context Muslims believe in not just in the message of Jesus (AS) or Moses (AS) but all other prophets who came before of after them, i.e. till the last Prophet Muhammad (SAW) whose message and its practical manifestation will prevail till the end of times. This viewpoint of looking at history and foreseeing the future is not just logical or rational, but also morally correct. For this reason Muslims

## The Clash of Civilization

assertion is considered as Holistic and universal in nature. On the contrary Jews who accepts the message of Moses (AS) denies the message of Jesus (AS) and any other prophet who came after him, this was despite the fact that their books confirmed to them that more Prophets will arrive and even Moses (AS) never also testified that he is the final messenger. Same is the issue with Christians, who denies any Prophet who came after Jesus (AS), despite the fact Jesus (AS) also never claimed to be the last of his kind. For this reason the historical viewpoint of Jews and Christians is rendered as illogical and morally incorrect, and their assertion on their own civilization can only be termed as materialistic and hypothetical.

If we assume that western civilization is based on secularism then we would also have to agree that secularism vehemently negates the concept of Divine Revelation, and would also inevitably oppose Islamic civilization which is indeed founded on the same concept. Divine revelation cannot accept human faculty of reason as final authority, which is indeed considered in secularism, and for this reason it is near to impossible to achieve accord or harmony among the two viewpoints.

Both civilizations can insist on their ideals, however as far as the question of indoctrination of one's ideals over the other is concerned, Muslims even if try cannot do so against west as they have absolutely no influence over western or developed nations, what so ever. West on the contrary is rather indoctrinating Muslim world by all means possible. In such a scenario does Muslim should opt to accept the western ideals and all of its manifestations which assert the status of human intelligence as equivalent to any Divine authority? If Muslims accept them, just for the sake of argument, then they will indefinitely loose the foundations on which their civilization has to be established, and if they don't accept or rather rejects the western agenda then a clash eventually becomes inevitable. Since last two hundred years we have fairly lost the foundation on which Islamic civilization was founded, however the west is nowhere near stopping the excavation of its foundation



## The Clash of Civilization

as yet. The west is rather insisting that the digging has to be done even deeper.

Just for the sake of argument if we assume any of the two counterparts doesn't qualify to be called as a civilization also, even then the eventuality of a clash is inevitable.

Some also propose that we should start a dialogue with the west. This idea can be argued in many ways: If either or any of the two civilizations doesn't qualify as a civilization then how can there be a dialogue among the two. If both does qualify then still due to the colossal disparities among the two such a dialogue cannot be fruitful particularly when one of these disparities is about the immense bargaining power which one of them holds over the other.

Some are even unwiser than the people of the school of thought we just mentioned, they propose that we shall try to bring accord by finding similarities among the two. This is proposed despite realizing the colossal disparities among the ideals on which the two civilizations are founded.

It is often proposed that both civilizations should unite on commonalities. Though it is not realized that these commonalities doesn't hold any attraction or temptation for either parties. Contrary to this, west however is tempted toward various dissimilarities among the two, or more appropriately attracted toward the circumstances or opportunities these dissimilarities tend to create. We should ask ourselves that what western world would gain after uniting on the commonalities, it might have with the Islamic civilization. This fact, despite being so apparent, is invisible to the eyes of the great many intellectuals.

We are dumbfounded over the definition of a civilized individual which is being marketed these days i.e. a civilized man never fights. We would say that a civilized man never fights for anything antisocial, harmful, unjust or vicious. We cannot indeed doubt the character, civilized nature and wisdom

## The Clash of Civilization

of Moulana Jalaluddin Rumi (RA), who was a poet and a sufi, let us see how he comments on comparing Christianity and Islam:

*Maslehat dar deen-e-Eisa ghar-o-Koh*  
*Maslehat dar deen-e-ma jang-o-shikwa*

It is interesting to note that Rumi has defined Islamic civilization while linking it with armed encounters with gallantry. Shall we now compare Rumi with Osama Bin Ladin? Shall we complain what he is trying to propagate violence or intolerance among Muslims? If Moulana Rumi is not shying away from highlighting that the strategy of Jesus (AS) was dominated with pure altruism and on the other hand strategy of Prophet Muhammad (SAW) was equally proportionate by onslaughts and gallantry against the anti Islamic forces along with altruism and compassion, then why so called intellectuals of our times feel ashamed of doing so.

One explanation is that such intellectuals want to be categorized as peace loving (read injustice loving) even when they see injustice around. This is their personal preferences which they unjustly impose on Islam. Some of them also don't believe that Muslims can ever win in such an encounter; **and some cannot even think beyond just winning and losing.**

### **The Road under construction since 1947**

History is evident, Muslims has always used Islam as a shield against adversities during different times, and even today it is Islam which can protect Muslims *Ummah* from the contemporary crisis. Contrary to this, Muslims are rather seeking to cling on to shattered planks of wood in midst of a hostile thunder storm which could hardly save them from drowning into the ocean.

General Pervaiz Musharaf is an example, who on the night of 9/11 thought that he in his wisdom, could prevent the storm of American ferocity and can make Pakistan secure, economically and politically. He assumed that this was the best way to defend Pakistan, despite realizing that amongst the rising

## The Clash of Civilization

storm of aggression against Islamic Civilization, to make Pakistan economically stable was like trying to stop a tsunami with a sand wall. It is important to note that you might not need to be economists to save your self drowning; rather all you need to know is how to swim.

Another example could be the Arab leaders, who probably think that just passing the time would save them from the eventual disaster, despite realizing that this way they are not passing rather wasting the precious time. This is evident from the fact that the threats against the entire Muslim *Ummah* are gradually increasing instead of decreasing.

Lovers of secular lifestyles are yet another example, who intends to blur the revolutionary spirit of Islam by creating a facade of peaceful looking 'cowardice', despite realizing from the history that cowards and wimps have always been ill-fated and have never realized a peaceful living in their lifetime. Imagine 1.3 billion population of the world, living in 57 countries, having more than 70% of known oil reserves<sup>73</sup>, having 75% of the known gas reserves, et al, if they are still begging for mercy and peace then things can only get worse for them.

It has been almost a decade since 9/11, but still a big chunk of Muslim population hasn't been able to realize that George W Bush and Tony Blair, who actually perpetuated the so called war on terror, *'intends to set up a ministerial working group in the Home Office charged with injecting religious ideas across Whitehall'*<sup>74</sup>. Westerners who disagree with them, doesn't disagree on the target (Islam) or end objective, rather on the means or

---

<sup>73</sup> A Battle for Muslims Oil Countries, web link: <http://metaexistence.org/muslimoil.htm>

<sup>74</sup> Kamal Ahmed wrote in 'The Observer', Sunday 3 August 2003, in his article titled 'And on the seventh day Tony Blair created ...': *"The Observer can reveal that Blair is to allow Christian organizations and other 'faith groups' a central role in policy-making in a decisive break with British traditions that religion and government should not mix. The Prime Minister, who this weekend becomes the longest continually serving Labor Prime Minister in history, has set up a ministerial working group in the Home Office charged with injecting religious ideas 'across Whitehall'."* Web link: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2003/aug/03/religion.tonyblair>

## The Clash of Civilization

modus operandi adopted by Blair and Bush (during their regimes). Those in the west who doesn't by the biblical interpretations are rather secular minded, but this doesn't change their stance against Islam. If Christian fundamentalist abhors Islam, secularist only seconds them! For example on the distribution of the cake called Iraq, Evangelical Americans, Protestant Britons and Catholic Italy were on one side and secular France and Germany were on the other; however against Iran they are all united.

If such tactics would have been productive then today Pervaiz Musharaf would have been considered the most successful leader of Pakistan's history at least. However today the reality is nothing but further from where leaders like Pervaiz Musharaf promised it to be. Today it is clear that the challenge that we faced that day couldn't have been countered with the kind of wise thinking (read unwise) Muslims collectively ought to adhere right after 9/11.

Some say that there is a lot of grey area between the extremes of black and white; however we think that this grey area is nothing but a shadow of the towering blackness, darkness! An optical illusion indeed. If this wouldn't have been correct then why America's foreign policy would remain hostile against the interest of Pakistan and that of other Muslim nations till today, let alone the confrontation Pervaiz Musharaf received from his friendly masters.

The history is lying naked in front of us, but we are so much spellbound by our secular masters that we just don't notice it. The attack of Chengaze Khan destroyed Baghdad which was the capital of Muslim world back then. This was a military defeat, exclusively. However the military assault of Britons on the subcontinent was rather transformed into an ideological invasion by Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and his friends. Iqbal once exclaimed that Holy *Kabba* is now getting saviors from a wine-bar (*Kaabe' ko Sanam Khane se Pasban framah hoye*) to. Sir Syed did just that (as we will see in detail, in a while), and even today, in the light of Iqbal's words, the same wine-bar is producing so called saviors for the Muslim world. This makes it extremely crucial to notice the difference between a military defeat and an Ideological one.

## The Clash of Civilization

Even today, we can see a fierce military and ideological resistance given to American and allies by the freedom fighters (aka as terrorists, let us not get confused by the secret agents in disguise) in Iraq and Afghanistan, making them look martially invincible.

This leads us to infer that military defeat cannot be diverged into an ideological one, but rather an ideological defeat can definitely open the door of a military takeover, indeed.

Ideological stability is required instead economic stability, only if we ought our future generations to remember us with pride and glorify their past. Currents of time though are taking us else where, and will continue to do so unless we wake and do something about it.

We now should force our self to think that mere economic stability can never defend us in any way. It is even empirically evident for our secularized friends. If George Bush and Tony Blair look into bible for guidance<sup>75</sup>, then what keeps Muslims to shy away from doing so as well? It is important to note that only the idea of going to a war cannot really inspire, encourage and energize; contrary to this the concept of Jihad or Holy War with a supreme cause can inspire millions and millions of Muslim into undergo the required transformation. This is a universal requirement of entire Muslim *ummah*, contrary to the idea of economic stability at the cost of spiritual death, which is rather like feeding a part of our body at the cost of other.

Instead of luxuries, economic stability or material wellbeing, we need the patience and courage to make sacrifices, which it self is an ironclad shield against challenges we are facing as an *Ummah*; whose importance increases proportionally with the intensity of conflict or clash. It is the nature of mankind that he doesn't make sacrifices of for causes he perceive as meager. Anti-Americanism could be a big cause for Muslims; however it dwarfs in comparison to the contemporary Clash of Civilizations, which if presented

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid

## The Clash of Civilization

and lucidly articulated to the Muslim *Ummah* could spark sufficient energy and courage to steer the course of history in their favor.

Call it as the Two Nation Theory of present times!

It wouldn't be possible; on the other hand, if the cause put at the disposal of *Ummah* isn't in comparison of the stature of sacrifice required to win this confrontation.

Clash of Civilization is not a fictitious slogan, it is reality and with its unique dynamics. Civilization is not an automobile whose dents can be repaired in a workshop; however contrary to this since the time westerners have left the subcontinent, only physically, the road toward establishing the true Islamic civilization is still under construction.

## 5 –

---

# Traditional Thinkers and Philosophers on Clash of Civilization

### Imam Ghazali (RA)

The debate done by Imam Ghazali (RA) on the subject of clash of civilization is of crucial importance. In this regards it is important to as investigate about its nature, about the challenge posed by western or Greek philosophical framework against Islam, and what Role did Imam Ghazali play in this regards?

Imam Ghazali (RA) was born on 505 Hijri and today we are living in 1431 Hijri, and that make about 926 years. It is important to note in this regards that back then the level of this collision, clash or encounter or what ever we might want to call it, was at its peek, rather the common public of that time wasn't also properly able to raise themselves to the heights of intellectual discourse where this clash was occurring. Contrary to this today the general public is very much mesmerized either in the luxuries or problems of modern life, let alone drunk in its most literal sense ... it would be foolish on our part to expect from them to grasp the intricacies this clash offers today (Reader's should relax; drunks can't come this far while reading).

## The Clash of Civilization

We should remember that during the times of Imam Ghazali, Islamic civilization wasn't on a course of a downfall, rather Muslims held the the greatest political power and were leading the intellectual development of the world. This was the time whose fabrics were woven by Al-Kindi, Faribi, Ibn-e-Sina and Ibn-e-Rushd. However the influence of Greek philosophy was also increasing its footholds to an extent that if it wouldn't have challenged with brute force as done by Imam Ghazali, it would have corrupted the ideological framework which in turn had disintegrated the foundations of Islamic civilization.

Today we find lots of easy ways to criticize modern western civilization. We often hear remarks like: western civilization is spreading obscenity and vulgarity, or its brutal use of technology has cause plenty of horror to mankind, or about the double standards of its foreign policy etc. Some people are wiser; who talk about economic and political crisis the west has endangered the world. Some even go further by asserting that the modern western civilization is found on the concept of dialectic materialism. However on the contrary every extent of this criticism is for the sake of criticism, which wasn't really the case during the times of Imam Ghazali (RA), and rather held serious implication for the entire Islamic civilization.

During the time of Imam Ghazali (RA), Muslims did got greatly influenced by western philosophy, but on ideological levels they were seemingly stuck to their fundamental beliefs, like they were firm over the concept of *Tauheed*, Prophet hood and the concept of judgment day etc, however they interpreted western philosophical thought in a way that it eventually began to contradict with the fundamental belief system of Islam. Imam Ghazali (RA) embraced the challenge alone and fought it in a way that it destroyed the roots of Greek theological influence amongst the Islamic Civilization. Perhaps this is the reason why some western intellectuals don't much regard the contribution of Imam Ghazali (RA) and even some secularized Muslims intellectuals also seems to agree with these westerners. This is despite the comments of William Montgomery Watt according to whom Ghazali (RA) is



## The Clash of Civilization

the greatest Man after Prophet Muhammad (SAW)<sup>76</sup> (and of course his rightly guided companions).

At this point the question which should naturally comes in our mind that how Imam Ghazali (RA) did that?

Ghazali (RA) actually realized that western philosophy couldn't be answered until and unless it is understood with utmost clarity. Therefore he did just that. Ghazali (RA) not only emphasized on identifying the inherent contradictions and flaws with the Greek philosophical framework, and used them against it (replying the west in its own language), but also emphasized on erecting the structure of Islamic belief system and contrasted its uniqueness by asserting that Greek Philosophy can only be understood aptly within its own boundaries. We can use the same model today even, but unfortunately it has become fashionable to find similarities among the western and Islamic values.

Let's now look at the questions which Imam Ghazali (RA) answered in his book titled 'Tahafatul Flasafa'.

1. The question of pre-eternity of the world and its refutation.
2. The question of post-eternity of the world and its refutation.
3. Showing philosopher's equivocation of the following two statements: God is the creator of the world vs. the world is God's creation.
4. The question whether the oneness of the Creator can be proved, and philosopher's inability to do that.
5. The question whether the differentiation between the Self and the Attributes causes a duality?
6. The question whether the existence of God can be proved.
7. The question whether the essence of the First is divisible into genus and species.

---

<sup>76</sup> 'The Faith and Practice of Al-Ghazali'. William Montgomery Watt. Published in 1953 by George Allen and Unwin Ltd, London. Pg 14.

## The Clash of Civilization

8. The question whether the First is simple existent without *quiddity*<sup>77</sup>.
9. The question whether the First is a body and the difference between the Eternal Body and the Accidental Body.
10. The question whether the materialist doctrine necessitates a denial of the maker.
11. The question whether the First knows others and *Ahl-e-Sunnat's* belief about this.
12. The question about the relationship among the Knowledge, Power and the Will of the First.
13. The question whether the First knows the Particulars.
14. The question whether the heavens are an animal that moves on its own volition.
15. The question as to what causes the heavens to move.
16. The question whether the heavens are souls that know the particulars and the meaning of *Loh-e-Mehfooz*.
17. The question whether the disruption of causality is possible.
18. The question whether the human soul is a self-sustaining substance that is neither a body nor an accident and the description of animal soul.
19. The question whether the annihilation of the human soul is possible.
20. The question whether the bodily resurrection and the accompanying pleasures of Paradise or the pains of Hellfire are possible.

This would sound overly philosophical and theoretical indeed, however only a few of the readers won't be surprised that this philosophical ideas were having an impact routine petty matters on the life of an ordinary individual. However if Ghazali wouldn't have strived to counter the answer to these questions inspired by Greek philosophy, then there wouldn't have been any other way, unless Allah SWT would permit, to save the Population from the creeping ideological corruption. The model which Ghazali provided for such a

---

<sup>77</sup> Quiddity. (2010, May 19). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 07:58, June 17, 2010, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Quiddity&oldid=363065407>

## The Clash of Civilization

task can also be used today, which requires through study of the philosophy which is foreign, finding how incoherent that philosophy is from inside and how incompatible it is with our own ideological foundations. We indeed have no choice either; we either adopt this model to filter out foreign anomalies the ideological framework we claim to follow, as otherwise we would only see the cock fight with it fullest vigor.

### Akbar Ala Abadi

Akbar Ala Abadi was born in 1848, that's nearly 89 years before the birth year of Samuel Huntington, you must have guessed what we mean to say.

Akbar is considered among one of the greatest poets in Urdu literature. His creative abilities are comparable with Mir, Ghalib and Iqbal, though generally disregarded due to his satirical and humorous style. Furthermore because much of it is inspired with religious philosophy, therefore various secular and modernist critics have tagged his work as conservative, obsolete and retrospective in nature. But in real Akbar's stature becomes clear when we see Iqbal getting inspired from his thinking. When Akbar died, Iqbal in a letter to Akbar's son wrote that no other example comparable to your father is found in Asia, let alone the entire subcontinent.

After reading Akbar's poetry, it is realized that the intense criticism against the west found in Iqbal's poetry, which we will see in a while, is actually an impression or imprint of Akbar's philosophical framework; with a difference that Akbar's style is satirical and humorous as compare to Iqbal's narration which is philosophical and sober.

It is important to note that comparison of civilization isn't just limited to one or two dimensions in Akbar's poetry, rather we find him discussing it amongst the subjects of *Tauheed*, Concept of God, *Wahi*, Prophet hood, knowledge, education, civilization, science and philosophy, let alone items of daily consumption; explaining how the essence of Islamic ideological framework and its physical manifestation is unique and different then that of its Modern western counter part, in all these areas or dimensions. In our view study of this comparison is a must for all inhabitants of Muslim world, from intellectuals, politicians to a common man.

We have selected some verses from *Kulliyat-e-Akbar*, presented here categorically. This is only a glimpse Indeed.

**20 pages of Akbar's poetry**

## The Clash of Civilization

These examples boldly exclaim how Akbar has highlighted the differences, incompatibilities and clash among the two civilizations. This is only half of what we can present as an example but more examples might turn off many people away from the core subject.

Quoting these examples isn't enough, and without their elaboration, in historical and philosophical context, we risk the chance of confusion and misunderstanding.

Let us first look at Akbar's poetry on Islamic ontological argument of *Tautened*.

*To dil main to ata hae samujh me nahin ata  
Bus jan giya main, tere pehchan yehe hai*

(I can feel You in my heart but cannot comprehend  
Alas, I realized this is how You are recognized)

These lines are about the nature of existence of God (SWT), and it is also unlikely that these would have been written before the idea of clash of two unique civilizations emerged, rather these lines signifies that this clash was very much a part of reality during the time of Akbar. This is because since the advent of Islam the concept of *Tauheed* was never challenged until 19<sup>th</sup> century when Muslims came under the influence of modern western thought, which bluntly challenged the existence of God, and Akbar replied:

*Khuda ki Husti pe shuba karna or apni husti ko man lena  
Phir is pe turrah es idda' ka ke hum hain ehl-e-shaoor*

(Doubting the existing of God and acknowledging once own existence  
Ironic it is then the exclamation "We are thus the intellectuals")

*Duniya me be khabar hai jo Perverdigar se  
Shyed he zinda apne he ikhtiar se*

(He who is oblivious to the existence of God  
Perhaps is alive with his own will)

## The Clash of Civilization

Akbar's creative vigor is evident here, defending the negation of Islamic ontological argument. Modern western civilization, on the other hand, was subliminally claiming that there is no such thing as God, rather this universe comprises of matter alone. In addition to that Human consciousness recognizes only matter and the very knowledge about the existence of universe acknowledges this fact. Modern western civilization further asked if God exists then why millions who live on this planet can't see Him? Why their reason capacity cannot grasp the nature of Al-Mighty's existence?

Akbar argued to these questions posed by westerners in his poetry, like he asked that why don't those who deny the existence of God, look at various circumstantial evidences; For example, are they alive with their own will? Isn't this alone provides a hint for the existence of a Supreme bring? He also expressed his astonishment that if the modern man can acknowledge his own existence, then why can't he also think about how he came into being or is there a Supreme Being who is responsible for his creation?

Akbar also step forward to answer these questions in a philosophical and logical way by saying that the Creator can be sensed though ones heart (*Qalb*) but cannot be understood by mere using ones faculty of reason, and this inability is indeed a proof of existence of God, in itself. This is not Akbar's own analysis, but rather an extract of the sacred philosophy he adhered to, which asserts that the metaphysical reality can only be sensed with ones heart. This is the eye of our inner self, which Sufi saints have termed as 'Intellect'; contrary to which our reasoning ability adopts a different approach, and rather tends to analyze the information in bits and pieces, by dividing it and focusing on each bit in isolation. This is why the inferences extracted by 'Reason' alone are fragmented or partial, instead of being universal or complete as inferred by our Intellectual capacities. Our reason depends upon our physical senses (sight, sound, smell, touch, taste) and has its own significance and limitations.

## The Clash of Civilization

This eventually brings us to the question that why we see dominance of reason over intellect with in Modern western civilization? Akbar satirically commented on this dominance in one of his lines:

*Manzilon dor in ke Danish se khuda ki zat he  
Khordbeen or doorbeen tuk in ki bas awkat he*

(Very far from their intellect it is the Being of God  
They dwell rather till the working limits of microscopes or binoculars)

The second line of the above stanza highlights the epistemological foundation of modern western civilization along with its limits, which is very much different from the ultimate source of knowledge of its Islamic counterparts i.e. *Wahi*. This episteme of modern western ideology is also said to be founded on empirical evidences, i.e. that part of reality which is observable and can be tested via experiments, in a laboratory, done via scientific instruments. Henceforth Akbar argued that modern western civilization cannot grasp the reality of God until and unless it looks beyond the visible range of any microscope or binocular that can ever be created.

In other words, Microscopes helps in viewing the astronomical reality and on the other hand a binocular helps in looking at the atomic levels, which are not visible with the naked eye; however no matter how powerful these instruments or device can be they cannot transcend our sense of insight into the metaphysical reality, of this universe and Hereafter.

Akbar indeed attempted to explain all this 50 years before when Samuel Huntington was born, he further said:

*Mazhab kabhi science ko sijda naheen kare ga  
Insaan urrein bhi to khuda naheen ho sakte*

(Religion will never bow before science  
Even if he fly, man can't become god)

*Uloom-e-duniyavi ke beher main ghote lagane se  
Zaban go saf ho jati he dil tahir naheen hota*

## The Clash of Civilization

(Immersing in the sea of worldly knowledge  
You speak more eloquently though your heart don't chastise)

Modern science is the most significant hallmark of modern western civilization, which has defied religion so forcefully that it seemed like either religion would be annihilated or it would adopt the fundamentals of science. This was why Akbar exclaimed that religion shall never bow against science. The second line of the same stanza is even more interesting and profound in its meaning.

The most important manifestation of Modern science is technology, whose contemporary advancement is also exemplary. Technology which enables modern man to fly like a bird is considered one of his greatest achievements, so much so that ability to fly is now tagged as humanistic. But just for the sake of argument we would like to ask here that are humans meant to fly like birds (though they definitely can, or perhaps should depending upon the need)?

The world we see around has various life forms which can be categorized as Microbes, Aquatic life, Plants, Animals, Insects and Humans. If seen from a religious eye, humans are not even like plants, animals etc, let alone like angels, nor he is meant to become like any of these because he is *Ashraf-ul-Makhlooqat* (superior to all living things, even angels etc), from Islamic viewpoint of course. On the contrary technological advancements tends to make the modern brutally strong, fly like a bird, or tends to dive or swim underwater like a fish, etc. But we must ask, has he been created for this purpose?

Let's see what Iqbal exclaim about our purpose of existence:

*Momin Faqat Ahkam-e-Ilahi ka he pabund*

(A Muslim is bound to follow the will of Allah)



## The Clash of Civilization

The idea here is not to prove one philosophy wrong over another, rather to highlight the difference among the approaches and the drift, particularly for those so called intellectuals who have never been able to understand this disparity despite the 400 hundred years of naked history of the intellectual battle among advocates of science and religion. We will also not hesitate to declare such Muslims, particularly those who are tagged as intellectuals, as even more dangerous for Islam than its explicit enemies. This we say because such individuals compare religion and science on the surface instead of looking deep into their epistemological differences. The episteme of religion (namely Islam) as already discussed is based on *Wahi* whereas episteme of modern science is 'Empiricism', which has eventually started to dominate its religious counterpart, on which Akbar once exclaimed:

*Barh raha he kufar zulf-e-illam o maloom se  
Be-zaban he bazam-e-dil main shamma'-e-Iman in dino*

(Infidelity is spreading along with the curling locks of cause and effect  
Speechless is the fire of faith within ones heart these days)

It is the fundamental principle of modern science, to understand the 'Cause and effect' of any phenomenon. Within framework of modern western ideology, this principle tends to hold the natural laws responsible for every creation, and the same understanding is transcended to understand the functioning of the entire universe, so much so that the need of existence of a Creator is diminished (perhaps ignored). The intensity of Akbar's creative vigor is very much visible in the first line of the stanza quoted above. In Urdu poetry the symbolism behind the 'curling locks' doesn't require any explanation; which in turn has vibrantly and colorfully expressed an emblematic concept of scientific nature. To explain further, according to Akbar, an approving belief in the concept of 'cause and effect' is sufficient to deny the existence of God and doesn't raise the need to explicitly pronounce this denial.

## The Clash of Civilization

This analysis of Akbar's poetry unambiguously strips off the undue witty attire which Akbar's persona has been made to wear, and reveals rather the profoundness of his philosophical and intellectual dynamism found in his poetry. Here is another example:

*Uloom-e-duniyavi ke beher main ghote lagane se  
Zaban go saf hajati he dil tahir naheen hota*

(Diving in the sea of worldly knowledge  
Speech may get eloquent though ones heart is never chastised)

Akbar has yet again highlighted another modern dilemma which we would rather term as noise pollution; we see a lot many eloquent speakers today dwelling upon various subject though their narratives doesn't bring chastity to ones heart, let alone makes one wise. In the words of Iqbal:

*Kuch na kehne ke liye  
Chalti Rehti he zaban*

(To say nothing  
The tongue though keeps flubbing)

Western philosophy has greatly influenced our traditional concept of Man, his purpose of existence, and education or knowledge that he may acquire to achieve his purpose. This is not a meager change, rather has impacted our personal and collective lives to unimaginable proportions. Akbar saw it coming and used his creative patchwork to alert the social order or perhaps tried to make it a part of everyone's memory.

*Nai taleem ko kia wasta admiat se  
Janab Darwin ko Hazrat Adam (AS) se kia matlub  
Nai tehzeeb me bhi mazhabi taleem shamil he  
Magar youn he ke goya Ab-e-Zamzam mae main dakhil he  
Naqs taleem se ab is ki samujh na rahi  
Dil to barh jata he ajdad ke afsane se  
Sheikh marhoom ka kool mujhe yad ata he  
Dil badal jaen ge taleem badal jane se*

## The Clash of Civilization

(The education concerns not about the nature of man  
Neither Darwin was bothered about Adam AS  
Religious education is a part of the modern civilization  
Though its like alcoholic *Ab-e-Zamzam*  
Blemish education cannot help understand  
Mythical stories though help Intellect expand  
Late Sheikh once said  
Hearts can be changed by changing the nature of education)

Akbar started this stanza from Darwin's theory of evolution which was later converted into greatest conspiracy against the concept of creation of mankind<sup>78</sup>. This was although a scientific theory, but very quickly it got morphed into an ideological belief<sup>79</sup>.

It is needless of emphasis the dissimilarity between a theory and a belief, however sadly no one have ever been ready to understand the difference, nonetheless this theory on the contrary has mesmerized many.

The concept of creation of man by various gods in Greek mythology was rather less loathe-able than Darwinist's beliefs. Even Christian concept of declaring Jesus (AS) as son of God is polytheistic act in Islam, but less despicable as compare to the Darwinist science fiction; in Christianity humans are not at least considered as transcended forms of monkeys. Yet it is interesting to note that the towering influence of scientific thinking on almost all prevailing civilization was so authoritative that hardly any resistance surfaced which could rather argue with a philosophy which didn't only scraped the dignity of mankind but also besmirched the concept of God, the Divine Creator, expansively. Its greatest proof is in the fact that Darwin's

---

<sup>78</sup> "... the conflict between Darwin and God was manufactured by American creationists in the 20th century for reasons that had very little to do with science and religion and a great deal to do with politics and morality." For more details check the BBC documentary 'Did Darwin Killed God?', weblink: <http://richarddawkins.net/articles/3707>

<sup>79</sup> Social Darwinism. (2010, March 25). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 07:54, March 25, 2010, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Social\\_Darwinism&oldid=351923300](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Social_Darwinism&oldid=351923300)

## The Clash of Civilization

theories have been made part of compulsory curriculum of basic education in almost every nation, despite a history of resistance since many decades<sup>80</sup>.

At this point it is amusing to note that even the Darwin's framework contains serious logical and scientific flaws<sup>81</sup>, which are termed as 'missing links' by lovers of Darwinism, but despite critically analyzing these 'missing links' its believers prefer assuming that someday someone will discover these links, eventually completing the framework. However since the advent of Darwinism, these shortcomings, which we would rather call them, are still very much a part of the theory and up till now their number has only increased, particularly after emergence of genetic sciences<sup>82</sup>. Despite this fact its lovers still seems dedicated in a pursuit to find answers to 'impossible to answer the questions' (via empiricist approach), and don't even feel ashamed to use malpractices and present false proofs for that matter<sup>83</sup>.

All religions including Islam, appalled to this theory, but despite that, the secularized approach toward life which this theory has given birth to, even in Muslim countries is very obvious. There are hundreds of thousands of Muslims who attempted to find religiously compatible rationales to the same theory and even tried to dig out some verses and *hadiths* which apparently supported Darwinism<sup>84</sup>. Some Arab authors have also written books which even argued that Darwin came very late, and Moulana Jalaluddin Rumi (RA) presented the concept of evolution in this poetry even six to seven centuries

---

<sup>80</sup> Brock Barkley, "Poole Seeks to Bar Darwinism Out of Schools." Charlotte Observer, January 9, 1925, p 1. Weblink: <http://www.lib.unc.edu/ncc/evolution/documents/charlotteobserver1-9-25.html>

<sup>81</sup> 'Ten Major Flaws of Evolution - Revised, By Randy Alcorn'. Web link: [http://www.epm.org/artman2/publish/creation\\_evolution/Ten\\_Major\\_Flaws\\_of\\_Evolution\\_-\\_Revised.shtml](http://www.epm.org/artman2/publish/creation_evolution/Ten_Major_Flaws_of_Evolution_-_Revised.shtml)

<sup>82</sup> Ibid.

<sup>83</sup> "The Fraud of Evolution: How science cheats at proving its pet theory" By Marck Nash. From the March/April 2002 Trumpet Print Edition. Web link: <http://www.thetrumpet.com/index.php?page=article&id=589>

<sup>84</sup> 'Evolution in the Light of the Quran' by Ghulam Ahmed Pervaiz. Web link: [http://www.parvez-video.com/insight/islam/evolution\\_quran/index.asp](http://www.parvez-video.com/insight/islam/evolution_quran/index.asp)

## The Clash of Civilization

before Darwin was born, really? In this context verses of Rumi's poetry have been quoted in which he has emphasized on spiritual, intellectual or psychological evolution of mankind, and has said that there was a time when he (Rumi) was like animals, before that like plants, and even before that like life less stones lying dead on earth. In his words:

*I have experienced seven hundred and seventy mounds.  
I died from minerality and became vegetable;  
And from vegetativeness I died and became animal.  
I died from animality and became man.  
Then why fear disappearance though death?  
Next time I shall die  
Bringing forth wings and feathers like angels;  
After that soaring higher than angels-  
What you cannot imagine, I shall be that<sup>85</sup>.*

Recently we heard an Islamic scholar in Pakistan on television saying that Humans evolved from a microbe and when we wrote a column criticizing him, the respect scholar rather claimed that we might have misunderstood his viewpoint, which he again explained in a detailed article later on. Nevertheless this only indicates the level of impact this theory has made on the Muslims.

In this regards, Akbar's magnificence becomes evident when we see him standing steadfast against turbulent currents of secularization which ruthlessly eroded the epistemological foundation of Muslims. These currents although produced intellectually oblivious personalities like (Sir) Syed Ahmed Khan, but Akbar remained determined to highlight the inconsistencies and incompatibilities which Islam has with modern western ideology. He made an attempt to educate Muslims of his time about the traditional (Islamic)

---

<sup>85</sup> Translated by Isa Daudpota. Web link: <http://www.razarumi.com/2009/02/19/rumi-on-evolution/>

## The Clash of Civilization

concept of mankind, and why he has been created? And that these concepts are totally incoherent with Darwinist science fiction.

The impact which modern western civilization created on the traditional education system also alerted Akbar and made him to exclaim the incoherence. Just for the sake of argument here let us agree that the quality of education system in the subcontinent might have some loopholes; however we must acknowledge the fact that the foundation of this education system was on religious ideals (let us be clear that these quality issues had nothing to do with the nature of system's foundation, rather they were of operational nature). The process of modernization, instead of focusing on eliminating its shortcomings, rather attempted to replace the foundation of education system with a secularized version. A façade of Religious teachings was allowed only to hang in the corner. This historical change was highlighted by Akbar metaphorically when he said that *Ab-e-Zamzum* (water from a well, having a religious historical significance, in a holy site in Makkah) has been mixed in a Drink (alcoholic). This was the time when (Sir) Syed also came forward with his bandwagon of propaganda against the traditional system of education and tagged it as an obsolete collection of mythical stories; "The knowledge brought by our English master only deserves to be called as knowledge". It is difficult for us to guesstimate whether (Sir) Syed also acknowledge Darwinism, but we can say for sure that the system of education which he designed produced nothing but humans with brains as big as that of monkeys. Englishmen use to call such people as Baboon (a type of monkey), they later sanctified their slaves by removing the letter 'N' hence the word '*Baboo*' which became a part of our vocabulary, and even today this word emblematically classify the upper though intellectually oblivious class of our society. Today the modern generations of these *Baboo(n)s* unsurprisingly questions that 'where is the clash of civilization occurring'?

Akbar wasn't a story teller or a fiction writer; however his poetry is filled with such examples, like:

## The Clash of Civilization

*In se bibi ne school hi ki bat ki  
Ye na batlaya khan rakhi he roti rat ki*

(His spouse talked only about the school  
But never told where she has kept the dinner)

These two lines contain a complete plot of a story, whose prologue, which is between the two characters, has been explained effortlessly without a mention and the dramatization of the climax is also startling. The same dramatization is found extensively in Iqbal's poetry, whereas in the poetry of Mir Taqi Mir, Mirza Ghalib and various other topnotch poets of our history, we do come across a few examples; However other than Iqbal it is Akbar's poetry which contains a similar quality and quantum of dramatization. T. S. Eliot, who was a noble laureate in literature, once said that great poets are capable of summarizing the entire canvas of a story in a nick of time. This quality is much visible in the stated stanza from Akbar's poetry. This stanza comprehensively and explicitly portrays the state of affairs of a family with amazing dramatization. The sketch also indeed highlights the clash of civilization occurring within the smallest social entity of any society, namely a family.

It apparently seems like an ordinary story in which the wife begins a discussion about her job at school with her husband, who has just returned home from his work in the evening, forgetting that she also has to serve dinner for him. But when we see the same story in context of the family customs and traditions of subcontinent, then we begin to realize the profoundness of this social change. Akbar has explained the sensitivity and criticality of the situation in these lines, in the same context.

In the culture of subcontinent the role of man and women were defined and very much established. Men used to play the role of breadwinner (mainly) and the women took care of the home. The top priority responsibility of women was to take care of her kids and husband, and in the same context the etiquettes of serving food to men were of great importance, like serving

## The Clash of Civilization

food when husband returned from work and eating once the family head have feasted. These customs were falsified due to the influence of modernization.

Akbar's criticism however consequently made the thankless modernist condemn him, during his times and even later; unsurprisingly. He was accused for being against the modernization or advancement, enlightenment and his approach was tagged as conservative. However if we remain careful in analyzing the quoted stanza, then we would see that Akbar has never argued that why the lady has got herself employed, rather he has complained that about the economic activity overwhelming women to an extent that they have become oblivious of the traditional responsibilities, like even forgetting to inform her husband where the dinner is placed, let alone serving it for him. Further analysis hints toward a bigger social change which hasn't accrued by itself, rather due to the influence of the western way of thinking and western social order which has brought a different set of values and priorities with it. The traditional set of values, which demanded women to prioritize her husband's needs, is now replaced with socio-economic status, esteem and a sense of recognition, driving her priorities; with such intensity that she has even forgot her traditional responsibilities.

During the times of Akbar this social alteration was in its beginning phase, and perhaps Akbar wouldn't have guessed that in fifty years how the social order would have mutated. Today we are well aware of the fact that Akbar's concerns were not shortsighted and our level of concern should be much greater as the difference among our and western societies is almost diminished.

The extent to which Akbar went to highlight the incompatibilities among traditional and western values is visible in his following lines:

*Ishq ko dil main de jaga  
Ilm se shaeree naheen ati*



## The Clash of Civilization

(Find a place for passion in your hear  
Mere knowledge can't produce poetry)

*Khidmat-e-dil ho gae is ehd main juzo-e-shikum  
Kee-giye arzi naweesi sher khowani ho chuki*

Our readers would be surprised to know that Englishmen didn't even just brought their philosophy and military ambitions with them, but also a new concept of poetry which was known as '*Fitrat Nigari*' (Narrative on Nature). (Sir) Syed, Moulana Hali and their friends unsurprisingly leaned toward this new concept as well. Moulana Hali hastily wrote '*Muqadma Sher-o-Shairi*' (A case of Poetry), praising and admiring this new concept while scolding the traditional one, his following lines gives us a glimpse about their standpoint:

*Ye Urdu Qasid ka Napak Daftar  
Ufonat main sandas se he jo badtar*

(This filthy podium of Urdu messenger  
Worst it is then a stinking latrine)

The protestant approach<sup>86</sup> of (Sir) Syed Ahmed Khan was very much visible in his commentary of Quran and in the literary work of Moulana Hali. According to Majnoon Ghorakh Puri there are two example of literary apostasy in the history of literature, one is Graf Talstay and the other is Moulana Hali. Saleem Ahmed has further added here that retraction of Moulana Hali is even more deep rooted then Talstay. Any one who is interested in going into the details of this subject must not avoid browsing through the works of Muhammad Hasan Askari and Saleem Ahmed, who have actually even deconstructed the Spiritual, Intellectual and Ethical fabrics of Moulana Hali's personalities. Askari's article 'Bhala Manas Ghazal go' which critically analyzed the position of Hali is indeed an epic.

---

<sup>86</sup> For details please see: Protestant Reformation. (2010, June 15). In Wikipedia, Retrieved 10:16, June 21, 2010, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Protestant\\_Reformation&oldid=368196201](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Protestant_Reformation&oldid=368196201)

## The Clash of Civilization

In short, the influence of Hali actually induced naturalism in Urdu poetry, or in other words the essence of poetry, which was based on spirituality, was replaced with materialism. This is exactly what Akbar intend to highlight when he said '*Ilm se shaaree naheen ati*' or 'Mere knowledge (empirical) can't produce poetry'. Contrary to this, Urdu poetry was rather inspired by highest levels of traditional wisdom. Hali also use to be an exemplary poet in this regards and one could see him peeling toward the deepest layers of human soul, but things changed later on. Akbar foresaw this change coming and never hesitated to highlight it and presented his analysis.

*Hazrat-e-dil ho gae is ehed main jaz-o-shikum.* In other words our orientations switched toward our economic or material needs, and this happened to an extent that our spirituality became subservient toward our material requirements. This was indeed an evidence of onslaught of western way of thinking and eventual subservience of our traditional or Islamic approach towards the same. "*Keejiye arzi naweesi sher khowani ho chuki*" was Akbar's satirical comment on this situation. Iqbal later on seconded him, he asked "*Faisla tera tere hatoon main he dil ya shikum?*"

Akbar's follow lines are worth quoting in the context of this discussion:

*Ghar ke khat mein he ke kal ho giya chelum is ka  
Paneer likhta he bimar ka hal acha he*

Today we can replace the first word and reproduce the last line as follows:

*Jang likhta he bimar ka hal acha he, or  
Dawn likhta he bimar ka hal acha he, or  
CNN likhta he bimar ka hal acha he, or  
BBC likhta he bimar ka hal acha he ... etc*

*(Jang, Dawn, CNN or BBC etc writes that all is well)*

Here '*Ghar ka Khat*' is a metaphor for traditional medium of communication where as '*Paneer*' is for the western propaganda. Dexterity of western civilization to create propaganda is indeed artistic. Akbar sensed it, and

## The Clash of Civilization

symbolically articulated it with his creative vigor around 150 years ago. Akbar further said:

*Ye pas or woh pass na mojad na ahl-e-zar  
Akbar main jo chup gaye jo arma nikal giya*

In Akbar's viewpoint the news or columns which are published in newspapers or magazines have become a comprehensive representation of our collective competence, alone. Only if keenly analyze, this change indeed holds profound implications on our psychology, or has turned out to be an illness, which if we had diagnosed and cured a hundred years back then today we wouldn't have to deal with an army of pseudo intellectuals and writers, dancing on one leg, with the other one amputated, rather exclaiming to have four.

As we have already said that Akbar even discussed the contradiction among the two civilizations in context of domestic items:

*Hamara Khunjar bhi badnuma hai or in ki soi bhi he wo afat  
Ke saf bhi he, chamak bhi rakhti he, gol bhi hai or maheen bhi he*

*(Our dagger is revolting and their needle is even glorious  
That It is smooth, shiny, clean and delicate)*

*Go ke is me zara saqalat he  
Phir bhi biscuit se sheermal achi  
Gharb ki madah bhi he shark ki tehseen ke sath  
Ham piano bhi bajane lage ab been ke sath*

*Jese Jaisi zaroorat wasi he is ki chezain  
Yhan takhat he to phir kiya wan meiz he to phir kia*

Let us take a pause on Akbar here, as we now intend to dwell on the poetry of Allama Iqbal and then on the writings of Abu Ala Moudodi (RA). But in the very end we would not hesitate to quote what Akbar has to say for those who disagree that indeed there is any clash among civilizations.

*Kufr ki raghbat be hai dil main butoon ki chah bhi*

## The Clash of Civilization

*Keh-te jate hain magar mun se maaz Allah bhi.*

### Allama Iqbal (RA)

Allama Iqbal was one of the subcontinents greatest personalities. It wouldn't be wrong if we call him an extract of turbulent circumstances that started a few centuries before due to the conflicts among two notable civilizations. His ground-breaking poetry had the courage to portray the true social picture of his time and foresaw how the world would look like in the years to come. These qualities are indeed found exclusively among greatest poets cum revolutionaries. Iqbal's philosophical reflections are more visible in his poetry than in his prose. His philosophy fundamentally criticizes western civilization from religious and historical viewpoint, exogenously and endogenously; this criticism indeed summarized the nature of the reality he saw around.

After Akbar Ala Abadi, Iqbal's poetry is found to have comparative analysis of east and the west, and how Islam fundamentally differs from the modern western civilization; and perhaps this contrast also helps in lucid articulation of viewpoints of both. This makes Iqbal the first poet who forcefully countered the challenge posed to Islam by the western thought.

The fundamental question in front of Iqbal was of the relationship between western Ideological framework and Islam, and he spent his entire life answering this very question.

Entire collection of Iqbal's poetry is filled with comparisons among fundamental concepts of Islam and western ideology; however the collection of his work known as '*Zarb-e-Kaleem*' stands out among the rest. This collection is no lesser than a sword hanging on throat of western ideals, as on its every page we find examples of clash among the two civilization, however it is worth noting that under the title of this book Iqbal has not hesitated chose a subtitle "Declaration of war against the modern world". This indeed tells us about the enthusiasm and excitement with which Iqbal has written the poetry this book contains.

## The Clash of Civilization

It is important to note that declaration of war is something greater than a clash. Furthermore we must also not forget that there are indeed multiple civilizations in existence in the modern world, but since modern western civilization is having a dominant position among all, therefore this is what Iqbal has referred to when he said the 'modern world', against whom he has declared a war.

It is interesting to note that Iqbal has cleared his intention in this subtitle on the front page; one cannot and shouldn't expect loose balls from a poet of his stature. In our view he has done so as to alert the reader about the content which will follow. The clash was indeed a matter of life and death for the Muslims of the subcontinent during the time of Iqbal, and perhaps this is the only reason the subtitle "Declaration of war against modern world" has appeared on the title page, as otherwise the content would have spoken for itself.

We would like to once again remind our those readers who considers clash of civilizations a recent phenomenon or recently discovered phenomenon, that Iqbal did discuss about it through out his poetry, and he did so way back in early 19th century. But before we move forward let us find out whether Iqbal use to the term civilization or '*Tehzeeb*' for modern western civilization. It is important because some people think that modern western civilization isn't indeed a civilization, as discussed earlier, contrary to a few enlightened moderated minds, who thinks contrary rather, i.e. considers that there is no such thing as an Islamic Civilization, indeed.

When we browse through the poetry of Iqbal, then we find 28 occasions when Iqbal termed modern western civilization as a 'Civilization'. Perhaps this much testimonials would be sufficient to win the case in a court of law:

*Tumhari Tehzeeb apne khanjar se ap he khudkushi kare gi  
Jo shakh-e-nazuk be ashiana banae ga, na paidar ho ga*

(Your civilization will commit suicide with its own dagger  
The nest on a weak branch of tree wouldn't be durable)

## The Clash of Civilization

*In ko tehzeeb ne har band se azad kiya  
La ke kabbe se sanam khane be abad kiya*

(Their civilization have freed them from every bond  
From Kabba, they have now dwell in a wine-bar)

*Nazar ko khera karti he chamuk ehd-e-hazir ki  
Ye sna'i magar chote nagoon ki raez gari he*

*Kuch gham naheen jo hazrat-e-wa'z hain tangdust  
Tehzeeb-e-no ke samne sir apna khum karee*

(We are blinded by the glitter of modern civilization)

Etc.

Saleem Ahmed has termed Iqbal's following poem as Surah-Al-Ikhlās as Iqbal's poetry in his book 'Iqbal, a Poet'. This means, just like Surah-e-Ikhlās is considered an important verse of Quran from ontological point of view, this poem holds similar importance within Iqbal's collection, or perhaps this poem presents the dimmer of ontological argument of Iqbal's poetry. Our readers might have browsed through it many times before, but for those who haven't, it is recommended that they should check the brief explanation under each stanza for better understanding:

*Khudi ka sar-e-nihan La illa ha illal lah  
Khudi he taigh fasan La illa ha illal lah*

According to Iqbal, Innate desire of one's self is to believe in '*La illa ha illal lah*' (There is no God except Allah), which in turn act as a shield against the destructive capacity of ones ego.

*Ye dor apne Ibrahim ki talash me he  
Sanam kuda he jehan La illa ha illal lah*

Here Iqbal asserts that Prophet Abraham (AS) is the need of time today; in other words '*La illa ha illal lah*' is needed to be exclaimed at any place where Idol worship is a norm.

## The Clash of Civilization

*Kiya he to ne mata-e-ghoror ka soda  
ghareeb sod-o-zeyan La illa ha illal lah*

This means that the national honor and dignity has been sold for the sake of material benefit and it has been erroneously assumed that this benefit will remain forever, despite the fact that '*La illa ha illal lah*' is the only concept which can be said to have this immortality.

*Ye mal-o-dolat duniya ye rishta-o-pewand  
Btan-e-Wehm-o-guman La illa ha illal lah*

That is, all the worldly pleasures, bounties and our relationship with these are nothing but Idolatry misconceptions.

*Khurd hoi he zaman-o-makan ki zannari  
Na he zaman na makan La illa ha illal lah*

Our reason has started to worship the concept of space and time, despite the fact is nothing more than an illusion.

*Ye naghman gul-o-lala ka naheen pabund  
bhar ho ke khizan La illa ha illal lah*

The proof of '*La illa ha illal lah*' is not dependent on circumstances. What ever the situation may be it is obligatory on Muslims to remain in conformance with this concept.

*Agar but hain zammat ki asteeno me  
Mughe he hukm-e-Azan La illa ha illal lah*

Iqbal has warned in this last stanza that association with any faction is a risky business, as these movements have the capacity to corrupt ones ontological orientation, i.e. away from *Tauheed*.

That was the brief explanation; let us now probe deeply what message it hold for the readers.

## The Clash of Civilization

Commentators and Islamic scholars have explained that entire philosophy of Islam is summarized in '*Kalma-e-Tauheed-o-Risalat*' (There is no God but Allah SWT and Prophet Muhammad is the Last messenger of Allah). On the other hand Quran and Hadiths contains detailed explanation of every facet of this concept. For this reason Iqbal has used the concept of '*La illa ha illal lah*' as a benchmark, touchstone, or yardstick to evaluate the entire modern western civilizational experience.

The concept of '*Khudi*' (self) is fundamental to Iqbal's poetry and extracted from Islamic philosophy. But at the same time Iqbal is also aware of the fact that modern western civilization also has a concept which looks deceptively similar to the concept of '*Khudi*', which is also fundamental to the western thinking. In the first stanza of this poem Iqbal argues that the western concept of 'Self' as fabricated or at least partial, and has compared and highlighted its contrast with the Islamic version. Iqbal has insisted here that the concept of '*La illa ha illal lah*' is pivotal to the completeness of one's 'Self'; our 'self' alone may be as deadly as a razor sharp blade if not encapsulated or shielded by *Tauheed*, without which salvation (or spiritual survival) of any human being eventually becomes very risky.

After shedding some light on the concept of 'Self', discussion on term 'Persona' is indeed inevitable, which is the topic of the second stanza.

Persona, the glittering facade of modern western civilization, has been termed as an Idol by Iqbal and have emphasized on the Prophetic effort required to break its influence. A wrong cannot be undone by doing another wrong, apostasy cannot be countered with more apostasy, neither infidelity can be nullified by greater or lesser degree of infidelity; Iqbal rather insist that it is the faith in the Divinity which can alone break the influence of this plague instead.

The third stanza of this poem asserts on the ill-habit of evaluating the right and wrong on the basis of material or economic benefit extracted from a



## The Clash of Civilization

particular act. In other words one must do only those things which reap him such a benefit, this concept has a profound philosophical background for those who can see, discussion on which is beyond the scope of this book here. In short, it is the idea of economization of moral values<sup>87</sup> which Iqbal intends to highlight.

During the time of Iqbal this was a subject of philosophical debate, today ironically this is very much a part of our political reality. But still Iqbal is eager to warn people to not to sell their collective honor or dignity against mere material benefits. Further he asserts that it is Allah's words that determines what is beneficial for us and what is not, despite it doesn't reap us any material benefit.

According to a saying of Prophet Muhammad (SAW) that there is a vice in every Ummat, and in my Ummat it is wealth. This vice emerges when the worldly benefits become affectionate. Iqbal, in the fourth stanza of this poem, intends to acknowledge this very fact by challenging the emerging misconceptions (from Islamic perspective) and inviting people to adhere to what their Ideology demanded. It was necessary for Iqbal to do so because the tendency to inclined towards material benefits at the cost of from Islamic ideals was on the rise because of the pressing economic challenges faced by the Muslims were harder then ever before.

The concept of absoluteness of space and time and the philosophy behind it was also gaining influence over the thinkers of subcontinent during the time of Iqbal. Ontological aspect of this philosophy was totality in contradiction with that of Islam because it was an extract of empiricist approach i.e. nothing can be proven unless it is measured, observed or/and tested in a laboratory. Since that makes anything existing within the three dimensions of space and along the time axis, therefore existence of anything beyond the limits of space and time was unproven hence denied. This was the time when

---

<sup>87</sup> An action is considered right if it yields an economic benefit and vice versa. Hence the famous phrase 'End justify the means'

## The Clash of Civilization

colonialism was at its peak; henceforth this philosophy was making a significant impact on everyone's thinking under colonial rule. In other words the need to believe in God was being questioned with increasing pace, with an eloquence never seen before. This was no lesser than erection of an Idol.

Islamic philosophy although don't negate the concept of space and time, though it's importance is ranked secondary to the authority of Allah SWT, Who is not dependent or bound to follow the physical laws of this universe; instead in Islamic paradigm it is believed that these laws are rather subservient to the will of Allah SWT. Allah SWT does what he wills. Contrary to this, western philosophy rather insisted on the absoluteness of what was empirically provable, which was forcefully challenged by Iqbal in the fifth stanza of this poem.

The sixth stanza then challenges yet another suspicion, emerging during those times, that liberty or supremacy of Muslims over the subcontinent was rather correlated or proportional to the correctness of their faith. This liberty and supremacy later shattered into submission of imperial forces, eventually sparking suspicions against the validity of their belief in *Tauheed*; this was indeed a glimpse of empiricism penetrating into the religious paradigms of Muslims of subcontinent. Iqbal reminded Muslims in the sixth stanza that this assumption is anything but true, and asserted that what ever the circumstances may be Muslims shouldn't, at any cost, consider doubting '*La illah ha illal lah*'.

In the last stanza, Iqbal is cautioning Muslims to be careful while associating with any group, sect, school of thought, race, nation, tribe, or even an organization etc. The time of Iqbal was engulfed with the fabric of nationalism and racism, whose weaving or reinforcement could also linked with western paradigms. Though one might argue that threads of this phenomenon were present amongst the people of subcontinent even before, however western thought strengthened their foundations and provided a philosophical framework to nurture the stated 'isms'. Iqbal thus intended to

## The Clash of Civilization

highlight this menace, and emphasized that Islamic paradigms are void of any such distinctions which results from being associated with a particular faction or nation. Therefore Muslims should avoid becoming part of the vision of any organization, group or sect etc, whose ultimate vision is even minutely divergent from that Islam.

This infinitesimal section of Iqbal's poetry gives us a clear idea about the astounding magnitude of the difference that exists among the different facets of modern western ideological framework with that of Islam, and how each of it is found to be in direct contradiction of the Islamic ontological argument of *Tauheed*. If that's true, then where else would it lead us instead of a clash with our counterparts, unless we or they stop insisting on our respective belief system?

After dwelling on the planes where the tales of an ontological encounter is narrated by Iqbal's, let us now jump toward the battle grounds of epistemological foundation of the Ideologies where a fierce opposition is observed by the Poet of the East. Let us be very clear that this opposition is not on the levels of cultural tidbits, but rather on the foundling principles or at heart of the opponents, without which any civilization or Ideology cannot exist, let alone survive. Let us now check out some examples:

*Danish-e-hazir hijab-e-akbar ast  
but parast-o-but froosh-o-but grast*

The above stanza, which is written in Persian, means that the modern framework of knowledge is the greatest barrier, curtain, or veil between the Divine Creator and mankind, and rather this framework advocates manufacturing, marketing, let alone worshipping of Idols.

*Hum samajhte the ke lai gi fraghat taleem  
Kiya khabar thi ke chala aae ka ilhad bhi sath*

*Ghar me Pervaiz ki ke shireen to hoi jalwa numan  
Le ke aie he magar teisha farhad bhi sath*

## The Clash of Civilization

*Sheda-e-ghaiyab na reh diwana mujood ho  
Ghalib he ab aqwam par ma'bood-e-hazir ka asar*

*Taleem maghrabi he bohat jura'at afreen  
Aik shazish he faqat deen-e-marwat ke khilaf*

These lines from Iqbal's poetry highlights and analyzes the foundation of modern western framework for knowledge, and are quite explanatory. In simple words Iqbal has explained here that the foundation of western epistemology is on empiricism, and in this regards the following stanza summarizes his viewpoint:

*Mehsoos per bina he alam-e-jadeed ki  
Is dor main shisha aqaed ka he pash pash*

(The foundation of modern framework of knowledge is on mere senses  
The structure of our belief system has been shattered like a glass)

The two lines of this stanza are not just lines rather armies of two civilizations standing against each other. Iqbal has clearly cautioned Muslims here that by remaining under the influence of empiricism, which is the ultimate source of knowledge in western civilizational model, you cannot avoid the risk of corrupting your religious beliefs, and the reason is very clear. Islamic religious beliefs transcends beyond the realm of space and time, and requires any Muslim to believe in things he cannot observe from his sensory organs, thus a Muslim in turn have to rely on the knowledge imparted to him from *Wahi*. The concept of *Wahi* has absolutely no room within the empiricist framework of modern western civilization, therefore its inhabitants eventually have to ignore, reject, let alone ridicule such religious belief.

*Taleem-e-pir-e-falsafa maghrabi he ye  
nadan he jis ko hasti ghaib ki talash*

(The guiding principle of the western education asserts  
Naive is he who search for a Divine Being)

## The Clash of Civilization

Iqbal, in the above stanza, is highlighting that from modern western epistemological viewpoint, one who searches for a God is an idiot, ignorant or a fool; if that's the viewpoint on the existence of God, then the belief on the Day of Judgment, Heaven and Hell would be dealt in a similar manner as well. Now Imagine what implication would such a negation would be on any society of believers, their moral values, their concept of good or bad, their criteria of appreciating things, etc, in short the entire outlook of life would gradually shift toward western ideals.

We must note one thing that information acquired from the sensory organs and filtered through 'perception filters' has of no value in it self, rather the conclusions drawn or decision taken by our reasoning ability, after processing this information, in turn has the potential to add value in our lives. But the dilemma is that the quality of these decisions or conclusion depends upon the quality of information used. A computer also produce results, only as good as the information fed in. In Iqbal's viewpoint the knowledge available via western epistemological framework is termed as a great veil or barrier between human advancement towards the purpose he has been created, hence quite worthless. If Iqbal is correct then our hypothesis of fierce encounter among the two civilizations would also be proven likewise.

Iqbal used the pretext of a stanza of Mullah Arshi's poetry to comment on the outcome of western concept of knowledge, he said that we might have to sow another seed of our own epistemology as the seed of western epistemology has manifested in a way that we can only feel ashamed of it.

*"Takham-e-digar bakuf areem-o-bakarum za nu  
Kancha kashteem ze khajlat natwan kard dro"*

(This one, which is also in Persian, means we will altogether sow a new seed because we are to ashamed to reap whatever we sow before.)

This century old Iqbal's cry is one of the strongest of the exclamations raised against the subject, but we never ought to listen to it. Our deafness is a

## The Clash of Civilization

crime, let alone an attempt of apostasy, and many great names of our times can be found guilty of the same. Since the last century we haven't yet been able to explain to any individual or official that the epistemology of Islam is exact opposite of that of modern western civilization, and that we desperately need to preserve our epistemological foundations on the basis of Islamic Ideals. After Iqbal the only person who clearly understood this importance was Abu Ala Maududi (RA), who rather declared the modern education institutions as slaughter houses of our youth, due to their epistemological nature. Akbar Ala Abadi also agreed:

*Yoon Qatal se bachoon ke woh badnam na hota  
Afsoos ke firoun ko collage ki na soghi*

*(Murder of children wouldn't defamed him  
If pharaoh would have thought of creating colleges and schools)*

Anyone who even briefly browses Iqbal's poetry cannot avoid sensing the disparity Iqbal intends to highlight among the concepts of Intellect, reason and passion proclaimed by either civilization, often intensely at times.

One might ask whether this was due to some of Iqbal's personal musings or it has something to do with the disparity among Islamic or western epistemological foundations or even the entire civilizational experience.

A clear answer to this is that it has nothing to do with Iqbal's personal reflections, at al. We must note that modern western civilization has conceived its unique concept of faculty-of-reason or intellect which is very much in contradiction rather opposite to how Islam looks at it. For this reason Iqbal has also intensely criticized, even ridiculed and affronted the western version in his poetry, in the stated context. Against the western paradigm of reason and intellect, Iqbal presents the concept of Passion and love (in the least of its romantic dimension) as an alternative with such a fervent and ardent way, which is very much visible in his poetry. The question is why, why does Iqbal thinks so? Let us first see how then we will ponder on why.

## The Clash of Civilization

*Khird wakif naheen he naik o bad se  
barhi jati he zalim apni had se*

*Khudawand mujhe kiya who giya he  
Khird bezar dil se, dil khird se*

In the first two lines, Iqbal has launched a complaint against Khird (faculty of intellect), and then proceeded on expressing his inner conflict and the resulting condition, in the last two lines.

*Aqal Aiyyar he se bhais badal leti hai  
Ishq bechara na mullah he na zahid na hakim*

*Ah ye aqal-e-zayan andaish kiya challak he  
dard ke arfan se aqal-e-dil sharminda he*

*Aqal ko tanqeed se fursat naheen*

*Aqal go astan se door naheen  
Is ki taqdeer main huzoor naheen*

*Aqal be maiya Imamati ki sazawar naheen  
Rehbar-o-zan-o-takhmees to zaboone kar-e-hiyat*

*Guzar ja aqal se age ke ye noor  
Nishan-e-rah he manzil naheen he*

*Aqal ko milti naheen apne butoon se nijat  
Arif-o-Ami tamam banda lat-o-manat*

*Khuwar howa kis qadar adam-e-yizdan sifat  
Qalb-o-Nazar par giran aise jihan ka sibat*

After going through these lines, one would think that what would have left to say, but the following example is really takes us on the edge

*Ishq tamam mutsafa, Aqal tamam abu lahb*

Furthermore Iqbal exclaims the following:

*Tarap raha he aflatoon miyan-e-ghaieb-o-huzoor  
Azal se ehl-e-khird ka maqam he a'raf*

## The Clash of Civilization

The following then summarize the essence of western thought in one line

*Farang-e-dil ki khrabi khird ki ma'moori*

(Due to a Disease in westerners heart, the faculty of reason is being cultivated)

Muhammad Hasan Askari has discussed this issue in his book *Jadeediat*, which is a critical analysis on the flaws in the western thought, and has said that till the time of Plato, the difference among intellect and reason was very much visible, but after his student Aristotle this difference was forgotten, rather the faculty of reason was considered as supreme.

Let us look once again the difference among the two, the faculty of reason is capable of analyzing things via breaking them up into smaller parts, and that's why the understanding developed from the use of only this faculty is partial instead of the whole. This faculty is also limited to the information gathered from our sensory organs. On the contrary the faculty of intellect produces a wholly understanding by synthesizing and intuitively filling in the missing pieces of information.

After ignoring the difference among the two, and rather focusing on the use of faculty of reason only, the western thought became reliant on the use of sensory perceptions. Aristotle once said that human thoughts are like pictures, and the domino effect this concept led Greeks into a tradition of painting and sculpturing, and in turn various works of arts were produced in an unimaginable proportions. On the other hand Islamic civilization never ignored the importance of this faculty despite the turbulent circumstances it faced through out the history. The distinction among the two faculties, their functions and implications are very much present in the Muslim literature until the time of Iqbal. Iqbal thus argue only against the concept of intelligence advocated in the west, which in turn was on the verge of corrupting the concept of man in Islam and collective frame of knowledge of possessed by Muslims.



## The Clash of Civilization

Let us now have a look at a few more examples from Iqbal's poetry on passion, love and ardor.

*Zaman Aqal ko Samjhe howe he mishl-e-rah  
Kise Khabar ke junno bhi he sahib-e-Idraq*

*Dil-e-bedar farooqi, dil-e-bedar karrari  
Mes-e-adam ke haq me kimiya he dil ki bedari*

*Isq ki ik just ne tae ka dia kissa tamam  
Is zameen-o-asman ko bekaran samjha tha main*

*Dil ki azadi shehenshahi, shikum saman-e-mot  
Faisla tere hatoon me he dil ya shikum*

*Ishq ki taqdeem main Asar-e-rawan ke siwa  
Aur zamane bhi hain jin ka nam naheen koi*

*Qowat-e-Ishq se har past ko bala kar de  
Dahar main rasm-e-Muhammad (SAW) is ujala kar de*

The lines indicate that Iqbal considered the feelings of ardor and passion as emblematic to the concept of a complete man and the faculty of intellect, in the context of Islamic Ideological framework. Since importance of these feelings was increasingly being ignored during the times of Iqbal, therefore Iqbal used his creative vigor to its fullest potential to revive these emotions, by vibrantly highlighting contrasts among the two opposites. Furthermore Iqbal also considered the concepts of intellect, passion and ardor superior to the faculty of reason, and insisted Muslims by remaining steadfast on their traditional approach in this context.

Thus we can conclude that incompatibility among the two civilization is bluntly expressed by Iqbal during his time and it's available at our disposal, but it's our level of irremissibly ignorance which doesn't allow us to ponder on our individual and collective lives and realize that under whose influence have we shaped our present social order.

## The Clash of Civilization

If we want to detach ourselves from our traditional or Islamic framework of life, then be it!, let us openly declare so, but if we want to be called as Muslims then let us try not to be qualified as hypocrites. We need to stop fooling ourselves by hiding a rotting spirit of western ideological framework under a facade of Islamic values and traditions, instead this spirit out to be replaced with the one compatible to the outer façade.

### Abu Ala Maududi (RA)

Abu Ala Maududi (RA) was born on 1903AD. His first book was published in 1927, and during the course of his life he wrote around 120 books on various facets of Islam. Chronologically he was the third person who staunchly highlighted the incompatibilities of modern western ideals with that of Islam and how influence of these ideals were hollowing the already decaying body of Islamic civilization. He didn't just highlight this incoherence's, but also predicted the future of Islamic civilization in case if nothing would have been done to counter the foreign impact. He also indeed chalked out a plan on how Muslims should response to the most urgent need of the time, as we will see in while.

Unlike the poetry of Akbar and Iqbal, Abu Ala Maududi (RA) produced most of his work in prose form. The examples of his work which we will produce in this section of this book henceforth will not require much of an explanation, unlike it was required during the last two, and for this reason the author would provide his comments and elaboration only where necessary.

Like names given to human beings are important, so as their meanings, similarly names or terms given to ideas, concepts, nations, races, and even civilizations are important as well. Apart from the meaning of the name, its tone also tells us about the nature or persona to whom the name belongs. Further it tells us about the feelings of the person who has given these names, against the subject matter. In the same context if any body wants to have an idea about what opinion Abu Ala Maududi (RA) hold about modern western civilization, then he should look at the names he ascribed to this civilization, Such as:

- *Takhm-e-Khabees*<sup>88</sup>
- *Shajr-e-Khabees*<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> Tankeehat, page 45, 19th Ed

<sup>89</sup> Ibid

## The Clash of Civilization

We are not sure when these were crafted by Maududi (RA), however what we do know is that these names appeared for the first time in an essay "Sick forces of modern times" written by the gentleman, published in 1935 in a magazine called Tarjuman-al-Qur'an.

Another name Maududi (RA) gave to modern civilization was *Jahiliat-e-Khlsa*<sup>90</sup> (Extraordinarily Nescient).

The fourth name he gave to this civilization was *Batil* (Wicked).

These four names tell us three things very clearly about Abu Ala Maududi's (RA) thinking. Firstly, Maududi (RA) totally rejected the western civilizational model, and he never in his life, particularly from 1930 to 1963, bought the idea that we can bridge the gap between Islamic and modern western civilization, and find overlaps for that matter. Secondly, Maududi (RA)'s mindset and his standpoint against the modern western civilization are reflected clearly here, he simply ignored the formalities of expressing his thoughts about western civilization in technical and professional terms, although he was very much capable of doing so. Thirdly, the philosophical discourse in favor or against Modern Western or Islamic paradigms wasn't dear to him, rather his concern was their physical manifestation in the form of a civilization and in the same context he has discussed it on numerous of occasions.

It is important to note that Abu Ala Maududi (RA)'s compared Islam and west on civilizational levels instead of cultural or ideological levels, and he did that through out his life. Once he wrote:

*"In such circumstances the survival of Islamic civilization isn't possible. Any civilization is not evolved by imagining about its*

---

<sup>90</sup> Tajdeed-o-Ahya Deen, page 14 a& 16, 19th Ed

## The Clash of Civilization

*fundamental principles or concepts, but by practice only, and is nurtured accordingly".<sup>91</sup>*

On another occasion we find him saying:

*"The Heart [fundamental beliefs] is although considered very important part of the system, but only because it provides nourishment and vitality to other parts of the body. If some parts of the body are amputated, disconnected from the body or are have rotten due to any reason, then how come the heart would survive with remaining sick parts? Or even if it does remain alive then what can one really expect from it?"<sup>92</sup>*

Abu Ala Maududi (RA) wrote these symbolic lines in 1937, but even in 1963 his concerns never diminished. The relationship of body and heart is metaphorical to the relationship between civilization and ideology. In this context role of education was of critical importance to nurture or recover the amputated or rotten parts of our civilization, in this context he insisted that

*"Despite you teach your child in home that there is just one God and Muhammad (SAW) was his final prophet, and Qur'an was the final book revealed by Allah SWT, but unless the curriculum developed around the Islamic ideals is not taught in schools, colleges and universities, you shouldn't expect that an Islamic civilization can ever be raised by any means. Rather survival of what is left now (of Islamic civilization) is also at stake".<sup>93</sup>*

Furthermore on another occasion he further expressed his concerns about the cancerous influence of western education system:

---

<sup>91</sup> Tankeehat, page 279 - 280

<sup>92</sup> Tankeehat by Abu Ala Moududi, Chapter: "The Disease and its cure", page 297

<sup>93</sup> Speech Transcript: 'The Role of knowledge and research in civilizational confrontations', page 24 and 25

## The Clash of Civilization

*"They (westerners) have imposed their education system on us in a way that keys to our bread and butter are now hanging on the exit doors of their educational institutions, i.e. anyone who intends to earn his bread must get education first from these institutions. Due to this pressure our every succeeding generation has move toward these educational institutions with increasing zest, where they learn all the ideas and their expressions whose essence is in direct contradiction with that of ours. Despite all this they never succeeded in converting (any Muslim into a Christian or totally secular person) not even a single person among hundreds of thousands; however they indeed succeeded in not letting Muslims to preserve the typical and traditional Islamic ways of thinking, prioritizing, and making choices, along with the moral character of ninety eight percent of the population. This was the biggest loss, which they have made us bear, as they even devoid us of our roots and replaced them with that of an alien civilization."*<sup>94</sup>

Abu Ala Maududi (RA) was thinking on these lines when circumstances were turbulent only a fraction of what they are now. Today when we see foundations of Muslims Civilization being attacked from all sides like vultures plucking meat from a dyeing animal, it is being exclaimed by various intellectual circles that there is no such thing as a clash among civilizations going on. Such intellectuals were also found during the times of Maududi (RA), and he also never hesitated to criticizing all those who intend to find pseudo compatibilities or similarities among Islamic and western civilizations, in one of his speeches he argued:

*"Some from the influential class of our society are trying to communicate that there is absolutely no difference among you (west)*

---

<sup>94</sup> 'Islamic system of life', page 452 - 453

## The Clash of Civilization

*and us (Muslims). Your civilization is like our civilization, and your culture is like our culture.*<sup>95</sup>

The influential class wasn't just talking the walk but rather carefully drafting an action plan as well during the time of Maududi (RA), and he wasn't also unaware about it. In the same speech he mentioned about a research which was being carried out to find out ways to explore overlaps among the two civilizations, in his words:

*"Another type of research is being planned in our country is a way that it will look like a research being done on Islam but rather its objective would be to create a new version of Islam rather, which will conform to the western paradigms. It will intend to forge Islam in a way that it will look like a version of western culture; this research cannot not benefit us by any means."*<sup>96</sup>

Today, perhaps the same lot of intellectuals is even caught insisting that the cartoons portraying Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), published in a Danish newspaper, should rather be termed as mere sketches. How would Maududi (RA) had commented on such situation if he would have been alive today? It is interesting to ask as we have already seen his stance from the names given by him to the western civilization, particularly during his time when the turbulence among Islam and west was comparatively much moderate. However today when the picture is much more clear and lucid, we can only anticipate Maududi's (RA) reaction.

The most important question faced by Muslims in the last two hundred years, perhaps, is on the nature of the relationship their civilization had with its modern western counterpart. Akbar's whole life was spent answering or elaborating this question. (Sir) Syed Ahmed Khan also faced the same question; however his analysis and the resulting answer was way different

---

<sup>95</sup> Speech Transcript: 'The Role of knowledge and research in civilizational confrontations'

<sup>96</sup> Ibid, page 17

## The Clash of Civilization

from Akbar's. If we try to find the focal point of Iqbal's philosophical discourse then we find the same question being tackled though out his work. The central theme in Abu Ala Maududi (RA) work was also the same. For this reason it is not a mere coincidence that we find him criticizing the approach taken by conventional Islamic scholars which was ignoring the influence of western thought and civilization on the lives of Muslims, and that they were also not very much interested in understanding the philosophy behind the modernized approach and dynamism of western civilization, or adopt the modal of Ghazali (RA) for that matter. Maududi (RA) once stated:

*"In real it was the work of Islamic Scholars, that they should have alerted themselves when the civilizational shift began, should have attempted to understand the principles or dynamism of the approaching civilization, and would have visited western countries to study their literature or knowledge base or philosophy upon which the western civilization is standing upon".<sup>97</sup>*

What Abu Ala Maududi (RA) expected from the intellectual class and the Islamic scholars during those times? Maududi (RA) wanted to create a unique version philosophy, psychology, sociology, all other forms of sciences, and technology all compatible to Islamic Ideals as otherwise it wasn't possible, in his view, that Islamic civilization could ever be made to progress without compromising on its unique Ideals. For this reason, he insisted on criticizing the western paradigms in a way that it would destroy the validity of entire experience of modern western civilization, and expected Islamic Scholars to take charge in this context.

It was obvious that such a daunting task wasn't possible unless any one would understand the western philosophy and its founding principles. Creation of a bibliography of those whose philosophical influence in turn created the entire modern western experience was also imperative, along

---

<sup>97</sup> Tankeehat, page 41



## The Clash of Civilization

with the study of the literature they produced in the last few centuries as well.

Abu Ala Maududi (RA) rather took this immense responsibility on his own shoulders and founded an Institution called 'Ma'raf-e-Islam'. Maududi (RA) stated the creative and research oriented objectives and purpose of this institution during its inauguration ceremony in Karachi:

*"1. The first thing that we want to do is to remove the mesmerism of western thought and philosophy of life from the minds of Muslims.*

*2. The second task is to develop Islamic alternatives in all fields of knowledge and arts in such a way that they become a source of progression towards an Islamic Civilization.*

*3. Third objective is to develop a curriculum in the same context which can be used to taught at schools as an alternative to western versions."<sup>98</sup>*

Maududi (RA) took the task on his shoulders rather which he expected from conventional scholars, and also criticized them when he got little or no response in return. Little surprise it is that during the course of his struggle conventional (read conservative) lot of scholars looked for ways to undermine his efforts and did succeed as well. Could this be the reason as Maududi (RA)'s discourse of the subject of clash of civilization remained unnoticed among numerous circles of our societies?

We have already discussed in the start of this book that civilizations actually differ with each other on four major dimensions, i.e. Ontological argument, Epistemology, Efficient Cause and Final Cause or Purpose of Creation. Abu

---

<sup>98</sup> Ibid - page 18, 19, and 25

## The Clash of Civilization

Ala Maududi (RA) also compared Islamic and western civilizations on these dimensions as well. Let us see a few examples here:

*"The fundamental theme behind religious thought is that the physical universe in totality, with all its constituents and rules governing their interaction, is subservient to a higher Divine Being who is superior from any of the constituents of this physical universe. On the contrary the modernists assumed that they would solve the equation of creation of this universe without considering the existence of any Divine or Supernatural Being. When western philosophical thought began its journey [many decades ago], despite their destinations being away from divinity, they preferred to take their naturalist approach along with the concept of God, but later on when journey progressed, the philosophy of naturalism took precedence over Supernaturalism or Divinity."<sup>99</sup>*

The modern western civilization committed treason against the religion by replacing the concept of worshipping God by concept of worship his own Ego. On this Abu Ala Maududi (RA) commented:

*"Mankind is worshipping his Creator autonomously, unconsciously, without using his will and is doing it just like it is done by an unintelligible, unconscious tree and a dead rock. In this context both creatures have no difference at all ... There is no greatness hidden inside the faculty of reason and ability to learn, rather they are tools to provide mankind to achieve his due greatness, and these tools have been given to him as a means to evolve from the state of autonomous worship to intentional or deliberate devotion to the Divine. On the contrary if mankind, instead of worshipping his only True Master, misused these tools and used them rather to worship those who are not his true masters, then this deed will demote him*

---

<sup>99</sup> Tankeehat, page 13 and 121, 19th Edition

*even below the stature of animals. Because, Animals are not deviant from their belief, man has become rather; Animals are not deniers, he has become rather; Animals are not infidels or polytheists, he has become rather; Animals remain at the stature they were created, man's animal side though remain where it should have been, but he never evolved [spiritually] the way he should have being a human, rather demoted himself toward being nescient. The tool which was gifted to him so as he may progress in being a human, he rather used it progress in animality. He invented binoculars to see beyond where animals could see, he invented the radio so as to hear beyond where animals could hear, he invented automobiles and locomotives so as to travel beyond where animals could reach, he invented animals to fly faster and higher than birds, he invented ships to swim faster than fishes, he invented devastating weapons and become even deadlier than animals, he invented means of luxury so that he may enjoy life more profoundly than animals, but despite all this advancement did he ever raised himself from the stature of animals? The natural resources which he has exploited via his faculty of reason and knowledge, is indeed only because his faculties and available resources are only subservient to will his Creator, just like it is for animals who use these resources though in a limited fashion. Henceforth via this approach mankind can never move beyond the status of autonomous worship like done by animals."<sup>100</sup>*

This is a very blunt comparison of ontological argument indeed. It is important to make it clear the Maududi (RA) wasn't against the use of knowledge and technology, and the use human reasoning faculties, but was rather against their misuse, or use against the purpose they have been created. His message is clear; mankind should use these faculties and knowledge base to evolve on his human dimension rather, which is not likely to happen amongst modern western ideals, in his viewpoint. To answer this

---

<sup>100</sup> Tafheemat, Vol-1, page 50 to 51

## The Clash of Civilization

question it is important discuss the concept of man which is fundamentally established in each civilization, compatible with its ideological structure.

For example from Islamic Ideological viewpoint, man is comprised of a soul, his ego and a physical body, who has been assigned by God as his vicegerent. Contrary to this, modern western ideology defines man only comprising of his physical self and reasoning capacity, who is a product of millions of years of evolutionary process as proclaimed by Charles Darwin. Maududi (RA) has also commented on this disparity:

*“In material sense a man (or a woman) is a very lowly being; however the respect which has been given to him (or her) is due to the soul incarnated in him and the worldly authority ascribed to him by his Creator. Now if he (or she) doesn’t conform to the performance standards of his position and disobeys his Creator then eventually the divine forces will cease to support him, simply because he has disqualified himself from his actual stature. Subsequently his status would be as of a sculpture of sand, and once this happens, the Satanic forces will take him over, when so then only Satan and its subordinates will be his espouses and exponents. He will obey them and will be subjected to a fate similar to Satan.”<sup>101</sup>*

Let us now see how the gentleman compared the epistemological foundations of the two notable civilizations.

*“The entire civilizational framework of Islam is founded on Wahi and the teachings of Prophet Muhammad (SAW), whereas they (the westerners) are skeptical about it. They (westerners) have scraped*

---

<sup>101</sup> Founding Principles of Islamic Civilization, page 30 - 31

## The Clash of Civilization

*their religiosity and opted for a path which is only navigated by assumptions, observation and experimentations".<sup>102</sup>*

*"Darwin's theory of evolution, in order to establish the foundations of naturalism or materialism, played a crucial role via an organized and comprehensive academic scheme. This theory propagated the idea that the evolution of the most feeble creatures to the most complex ones have resulted from the process of natural selection, occurring without the influence of [divine] intelligence. Human beings and other creatures are not created by any Divine Being, rather those creatures which were roam around like insects gradually evolved into an intelligent humanoid via the principles of 'survival of the fittest', 'Natural Selection' and Mutation".<sup>103</sup>*

At another location Maududi (RA) explained in quite detail the philosophy behind the epistemological foundation of western civilization and how it impacted the transformation of their unique worldview along with its physical manifestation, he explains:

*"Materialism was dominating the western thought in nineteenth century. Vogt, Bochner, Czolbe, Comte, Moleschotte and other philosophers denied the existence of any thing but matter. Mill promoted experimentalism and utilitarianism. Spencer also, with full force, advocated the philosophy of evolution and idea of creation of the universe and life on its own. The developments in the field of Biology, Physiology, Geology and Zoology, progress in practical sciences and abundance of material resources inculcated, into the minds and hearts of the public, i.e. the idea that this universe hasn't been created by any Divine Being but rather it has come into existence on its own. This universe is operating on various laws on its own and without any intelligent intervention. This universe is also*

---

<sup>102</sup> Tafheemat, page 30 and 33, 19th Ed

<sup>103</sup> Ibid, page 17

## The Clash of Civilization

*progressing or evolving on its own and its machinery is performing its operations without the influence of Al-Mighty. Life isn't incarnated into Dead matter by any Being, rather dead matter become alive when it gets arranged in a disciplined fashion. Any emotions, feelings, consciousness, intelligence, etc are all product of such evolved forms of matter. Man and animals are all kind of machines which are operating on certain principles. The components of these machines perform according to the circumstances which have shaped these components. They don't have any freewill what so ever and their death is signified by the destruction of their internal discipline or release of the energy confined in there bodies. Senses of these machines are destroyed along with these machines. Once this happen then there isn't any chance that they will raise again by any means what so ever.*

*This is the philosophy of science which has founded the western civilization. This civilization has no room to fear an omnipotent and omniscient Divine being, or any consideration for Prophet-hood and Divine revelations, or acceptance of any belief about life after death or accountability on the Day of Judgment, or any question of personal responsibility, or any realization of purpose of life or destiny beyond what animal instincts of man ascertains. This civilization is solely based on materialism, which is also void of any concept of fear of God, truthfulness, justice, ethics, loyalty, chastity, piety, benevolence, etc on which Islamic civilization is rather founded. Their ideology is in total contradiction with that of Islam. The path which it has taken goes in the opposite direction of what Islam demands. This civilization intends to violently destroy the ethical and cultural foundation of Islam from the roots, and the Islamic system of life cannot be built*

## The Clash of Civilization

*upon on the foundations on which this civilization intends to erect its individual's character and collective systems of live.*"<sup>104</sup>

Anyone who intends to go in depth of Maududi (RA)'s ideas about the concept of creation of life in Islam then the book "*Deeniyat*" written by the gentleman is highly recommended. Following would tell us about how Maududi (RA)'s thought about the disparity on the purpose of man's creation or the question of final cause, among the two civilizations:

*"Ethics in Islam is based on concept of success in the hereafter where as western model of ethics revolve around worldly benefits."*<sup>105</sup>

Abu Ala Maududi (RA) didn't just compared among the two civilization in a philosophical context, but has also narrowed down it to the levels of politics, nationalism, economics, concept of state, and even has gown far enough to discuss the issue of birth control as well. But before we go into such lengths let us see how Maududi (RA) analyzed the nature the encounter among the west and Islamic Civilization.

*"The modern western civilization has clashed with various other civilizations, some of which doesn't even wholly qualify. Some of the civilization however did qualify but didn't have the strength to resist and maintain their identity while getting exposed to the influence of the dominant one. Constituents of some were also not very different from the one which took them over; in short all such civilization accepted the influence of modern western civilization without any resistance; however the case of Muslims is different then all others, who posses a unique and comprehensive civilizational framework, which encompasses all domains of life from philosophical and practical aspects. Fundamental constituents of modern western civilization's are in total contradiction with its Islamic counter part,*

---

<sup>104</sup> Tankeehat, page 15 & 18

<sup>105</sup> Ibid, page 21

## The Clash of Civilization

*and due to this reason the two are found to be on a collision course on almost every step, eventually having a devastating impact on the religious and practical lives of Muslims.*"<sup>106</sup>

Maududi (RA) at another point expressed his ideas on degree of incoherence among the two civilizations:

*"Their Ideology [of modern western civilization] is opposite of Islamic Ideology. The path it has adopted goes in the opposite direction then taken by Islam. The foundation of ethics and culture as advocated by Islam is furiously countered by the modern civilization; the structure of Islamic civilization cannot be founded for even a moment on the fundamental principles of individual and social conduct advocated by modern western civilization. In simple words Islam and Modern western Ideology are two different vessels traveling in opposite directions, any individual can only stay in any one of these frameworks at the same time, and those who intends to be on both at once would obviously be ripped a part.*"<sup>107</sup>

Maududi's (RA) observations were based on historical facts. The downfall of Islamic civilization was exactly due to infusion of foreign and alien habits and ideals of other civilizations by the monarchs who ruled Islamic civilization just before its downfall. So it happened. The civilization which dominated the world with all its might began to tremble and eventually collapsed gradually over the periods of many centuries. In words of Maududi (RA):

*"Any person who study the history of Islamic civilization, will notice that till the time the Islamic character of this civilization was intact, its manifestation was also on the same grounds. But later when its Islamic character decayed and got corrupted due to the influence of other civilizations, then Muslims did all what was against the Islamic*

---

<sup>106</sup> Ibid, page 10, 19th Ed

<sup>107</sup> Ibid, page 18



## The Clash of Civilization

*concept of earthly life. They immersed themselves in luxuries and worldly pleasures, built huge castles, indulged in music, made sculpture and paintings, took interest in various other forms of arts, and the spendthrift for the sake of lavishness in their lifestyle they adopted, wasn't compatible to Islamic norms, at all, et al.*<sup>108</sup>

The subsequent disintegration of Islamic civilization is documented on the pages of history quite nakedly, which can only be seen by those who are not busy enough to have a look at it, or those who still feel the importance of learning history and realize the words of Edmund Burke that *"Those who don't know history are destined to repeat it."* Retrospectively we try to realize the magnitude of the downfall then we will only have to see where the Islamic civilization was standing before the downfall began. Maududi (RA) has also provided a glimpse of the Islamic Civilization in his writings:

*"The circumstances in which modern western civilization has collided with Islamic one are different than what prevailed during old times when Islamic civilization had clashed with other civilizations. Romans, Persians, Hindu and Chinese civilizations clashed with it when the intellectual and physical forces of the world were subservient to Islamic civilization. The spirit of Jihad and Ijtihad was very much alive. Muslims dominated the world from both the spiritual and material aspects and possessed a leading position among all other nations. At that time none of the other civilization could stand against them. Muslims impacted the lives, epistemology, ethics and habits, and cultures of other civilization because of their steadfastness on their own; others got transformed but any external influence was never strong enough to change anything within Islamic civilization. On the contrary the impact which Muslims had on others was revolutionary. Some non-Muslim civilization merged into the Islamic one in a way that their past identity got disintegrated, and some civilizations*

---

<sup>108</sup> Islami Tehzeeb, page 63 - 64

## The Clash of Civilization

*which were relatively stronger couldn't avoid getting influenced to an extent that even their core values got altered. But these are the tales of good times.*"<sup>109</sup>

The question which inevitable emerges in the minds of the concerned ones is how we can reconstruct the fabric of our civilization today as portrayed by Maududi (RA) in preceding lines? The answer to this question and the challenged challenges one would face in the process of reestablishing an Islamic Civilization has also been bluntly explained by Maududi (RA), in his views steadfastness to the practical implementation of the teachings of Quran as did by the companions of the Prophet is the only solution, he writes:

*"This (Quran) is not just a religious book as seen in the light of conventional theological viewpoint, so as its puzzles are solved in seminaries and religious schools ... This book is an invitation or a recipe of revolution, which brought a reserved and pious man (SAW) from his seclusion to stand against a world filled with infidelity. This book attracted, from every home, all the pious and devout souls like a magnet and united them under the flag-bearer of the truth. Every evil and trouble maker in every nook and corner was provoked to confront and encounter the truthful. At each step and at every stage during the lengthy and nerve cracking struggle it exposed the character of saboteur and taught about the plans of reconstruction. Now how is it possible that you can avoid any stage of confrontation between good and evil once you enter the arena of encounter between Islam and ignorance, i.e. while studying Qur'an and making an attempt practically follow each word of it. Indeed, it is beyond doubt that you will see the events like those took place in Makkah, Habsh and Taif, also you wouldn't avoid experiences similar to the encounters occurred in Badr, Uhad to Hunain and Tabook. You will*

---

<sup>109</sup> Tankeehat, With reference to Adbiat-e-Maududi (RA), by Prof Khurshheed Ahmed, page 40

*also face Abu-Jehl and Abu Lehb, hypocrites and Jews will also come in your way; in short you will face and encounter everyone who Companions of Muhammad (SAW) faced from the early stages of Makkah till the time when they took over the entire Arabian Peninsula. I call it the Quranic Experience, which is indeed one of its kind. The most intriguing part is, when you will move along the journey, you will find relevant verse of Quran meant to guide you at every stage of this experience, just as these verses were revealed to guide through a similar experience occurring 1400 years back. During such a time it is possible that the pilgrim might miss out some part of Quran due to his limited vocabulary, or limited capacity to understand, but it is not possible that Qur'an would excuse from presenting itself at any point when guidance is sought from it.*

*Then according to the author, the instructions of Qur'an, its moral teachings, its social and economic guidelines, and the principles related to every walk of life cannot be understood until and unless one tries to implement them in his life. A person who is not following this book practically in his personal life can never understand it; the same also applies on a nation and its respective institutes.<sup>110</sup>*

In the context of discussion we cannot avoid quoting Maududi's (RA) viewpoint on Jihad and its usage, according to him:

*"The objective of Jihad is to eradicate non-Islamic way of governance and replace it an Islamic one. Islam doesn't want to bring this change not in a few countries or regions but in the entire world. In the very beginning the focus of members of any Islamic organization should be to bring this change in the governments of their own countries; however their ultimate vision is no less than a global revolution. The Divine Truth renounces any geographical boundaries which mean if it*

---

<sup>110</sup> Tafheem-ul-Qur'an, page 33 - 34

*is accepted on one side of a mountain or a river then it will also be accepted in the same way on the other side. No piece of land should be left devoid in this way. Wherever mankind is suffering from injustice, atrocity and discrimination (in social, economic or political sense) Islam should reach there to help mankind. Quran's says, 'What is wrong with you that you don't fight for oppressed men, children and women, who pray to God for letting them escape from a village whose administrators commit atrocities on them' (Al-Nisa verse 75). A part from that, despite racial or sectarian divisions, human relations hold such nobility in them that no particular race or sect can emphasis on its own ideals unless its neighbors adhere to the same as well. For this reason it is inevitable for the Islamic organization that for the sake of preservation of their identity and general adaptation (of Islamic ideals), they don't just insist on establishing the Islamic government in just one region but should spread it far and wide as possible, till the capacities of its allies allows so. On one side, it will spread its ideals and philosophies in the world and on the other side, if it has enough strength, then it should rather fight to destroy the non-Islamic government and replace them with Islamic ones."<sup>111</sup>*

Let us have a look at another piece from Maududi (RA)'s writings which further asserts the importance the responsibility he highlighted above:

*"Let us be very clear that in Islam the time which is allocated for any Fard (mandatory form of worship, act or deed), cannot be used to perform any other Fard. It is mandatory to perform only that Fard during that time for which this time has been allocated. Any other act no matter how noble it may seem will be accepted in its place. For example, the month specified for fasting cannot be utilized for any other act or deed. Even if you give your entire wealth in the name of Allah, it will not equate the act for which the time for allocated. In the*

---

<sup>111</sup> Tafheemat, page 72 and 73

## The Clash of Civilization

*same way the time we are living today is meant to encounter the forces of evil, falsehood, injustice, corruptness, atrocity etc with all our capacities and spend all our energies to defeat them. Instead of that if we spent all day in fasting and stand all night offering complementary prayers (Nafil) then it will not be accepted and will not bring us salvation. Now you can understand yourself that since during the time of Fard prayers 'complementary prayers' are not accepted, then how we will be interrogated on the judgment day for indulging ourselves in worldly affairs and not utilizing our capacities for the triumph of good and suppression of evil during such times?"<sup>112</sup>*

Maududi's (RA) comments and interprets the cry of *Moazzin* (The person responsible to announce the invitation of prayer five times a day) with same vigor and intensity, which only reinforces the concept of *Fard* explained above, by manifolds, he explains:

*"The concept of Tauheed is not merely a religious belief ... rather it is a way of life which actually destroys the fundamentals which asserts sovereignty and dominion of mankind or any other being over the authority of Allah SWT, consequently raising a structure of life on entirely unique grounds. Today the world pay no heed to the cry of a Moazzin, which says Ashhad-o-unlailaha-illal-lah (I testify that there is no God but Allah), because the Moazzin knows not the meaning of this message, neither the public know what he is really talking about. However if the true meaning of this message is realized and which if the Moazzin also knowingly exclaims i.e. "I don't accept the sovereignty of any ruler or emperor, I don't accept any form of government, or constitution, or jurisdiction of any court of law, or any ones order, or any form of traditions or customs, nor I accept rights of any individual, or any state, or their esteem, or anyone's authority,*

---

<sup>112</sup> Zikra Digest, Ram pur, India, May 1977, page 56 and 57

## The Clash of Civilization

*more supreme than one Allah, other than Him I revolt to everyone, rebel against authority of any other being; then you can obviously understand no one can ever afford to pay no head to it. You won't have to make an attempt; the world would stand against to have a brawl with you. Once you raise such a voice, you would feel that the heaven and earth have now become your enemies, and all the beasts in the world are now descending upon you.*<sup>113</sup>

We can extract the following from the lines quoted above:

'*La-ilaha-illal-lah*', which is the principle behind the ontological argument of Islamic civilization, is so revolutionary that its mere expression ignites a clash and an encounter, and if that's not happening then neither the recipient of this message knows what its meaning is, nor the presenter of this message knows what he is talking about.

For some the clash of Islamic and western civilization is indigestible, on the contrary Abu Ala Maududi (RA) is asserting that the declaration of revolt hidden in the message of '*La-ilaha-illal-lah*' wouldn't be tolerable for most. It is interesting to see that Abu Ala Maududi (RA) has brought us into a battle field against the rest of the world, which would automatically happen once we cry out this catchphrase. Later in the same book, from which this statement has been extracted, he has quoted examples from the life of Prophet Muhammad (SAW), which confirms just this.

Maududi (RA) further refers to several forms of beast which would attack the one who has cried out against this catchphrase. Interestingly the mention of the same kind of beasts is also found in a poem of Saleem Ahmed called 'The new poem and the complete man', which according to Siraj Munir, represent the metaphysical ideas of Saleem's collection:

*Is ka shiqwa he tujh se ae khuda-e-behro bar  
Bar sar-e-pekar or mujh se udhore janwar*

---

<sup>113</sup> How an Islamic government is formed, page 27

## The Clash of Civilization

*Sar se jo insane ki sorat hain dhar se magar  
Sanp, azdahe, bherie, gadhe, bander, soer*

*Her tilismati bala ati he mun khole huwe  
Dor se urti huvi girne ko par tole huwe  
Is ke sar ko dekh ke dhoke main rehti he nazar  
Ae khuda-e-behr-o-bar  
Sir Muqadas, Pak, Bazm-e-Abo-Gul ki Roshini  
Jism Aanbar-e-ghlázat, past, bad fitrat 'wani'  
Ye to sub kuch he baja, lekin behd jan kani  
Aftraq-e-jism-o-sar ka karb bhi he dedni*

*Karb, rohani aziyat, roh peham ki jalan  
Aik Safar muham sa be jadah-o-manzil thakan  
Sir ki senat ho gae aise hi kuch rangeen par  
Ae khuda-e-behr-o-bar*

*Sir Muqadas, pak, ab-e-khuld se dhoya huwa  
Jism bad ahang, napaki me he khoya huwa  
Mazra' be hasli tafreeq ka boya huwa  
Jis ke har khoshe main ik afreat he soya huwa*

*Be dili, sad rang uktahat ki sangain be hisi  
Ye balaen or in me tera pura admi  
Sir se ba tak aap apne hi laho me tarbatar  
Ae khuda-e-behr-o-bar<sup>114</sup>*

*(The complain which I have with you Al-mighty  
Those in authority are half the man I am  
Human by face but the rest of their figure is of  
Snake, Python, Wolf, Donkey, monkey, swine  
Every creepy beast is approaching with its mouth open  
Flying high preparing to descend  
It head deceives our sight*

.

.

.

*Oh-Almighty*

.

.

.

*Oh-Almighty)*

---

<sup>114</sup> 'The New Poem and The Complete Man' by Saleem Ahmed, Page 15

## The Clash of Civilization

It would be dumbfounding for many to see Abu Ala Maududi (RA) exclaiming to such extent, such as declaration of '*La-illah ha illal lah*' (in its purest of sense) would provoke the world (non-Islamic) to wage war at you, heaven and earth will become your enemy and various beasts will also attack you as well; furthermore on Jihad he is saying that its purpose is to eradicate the non-Islamic forms of governance from the world, and any Islamic organization who have enough power, must also use it for that purpose. It is very obvious that westerners cannot be expected to be pleased by such lines, and some curious minds would also want to think that why Maududi (RA) wouldn't want to say things which would please their imperial masters, their respective intelligence agencies, like CIA, MI6 or Mossad; or say something which didn't contain a flavor of a clash among the two civilizations. The fact of the matter is that if Maududi (RA) would have, then it would have been something far from the truth and perhaps an undertone of hypocrisy rather.

Abu Ala Maududi (RA) was sentenced to death in his pursuit in triumph of truth and Saleem Ahmed got three nervous breakdowns while advocating his 'complete man', but that's what we one should be prepared of in such encounters.

Intellectual stature of Abu Ala Maududi (RA) can be estimated by his criticism on the trends of contraceptive procedures for birth control. This criticism, which was done nearly 50 years back, concluded that such procedures or policies would not just yield disastrous results for the Muslim but also for the western civilization. Today this seems quite true as the various western nations or those who have adopted such methods are now getting older, i.e. the percentage of younger generation is being reduced as compare to the older ones. This even includes European countries as there the birth rate has



## The Clash of Civilization

gone lower than 2% per year<sup>115</sup>, which is lesser than what is required to keep the nation's population from reducing<sup>116</sup>. According to Iqbal:

*Tumhari tehzeeb apne khanjer se ap hi khukushi kare gi  
Jo shakh-e-nazuk pe ashiana bane go napaidar ho ga*

(Your civilization will commit suicide with its own dagger  
The abode on a fragile stem would be unreliable)

In viewpoint of Maududi (RA) also this is one of greatest curse of God on western civilization, who is digging its grave with its own hands:

*"Allah has appointed two great devils on western nations which are pulling them toward their destruction. One can be called as devil of birth control, and the second one is the devil of nationalism. The first one is appointed on individuals and the second one on nations or states. The first one has corrupted the minds of people of these nations so much so that they have made arrangements for the extermination of their own generations via contraceptive techniques and birth control. This devil also tells them about the benefits of sterilization, how to kill one's own recreational ability, and also have made them so skeptical that they don't even hesitate to kill their own children [abortion]. This devil is making them the commit suicide with their own hands.*

*The second devil has stolen the ability of making right decisions and strategies from politicians and army generals of western nations. This devil is also igniting the flames of selfishness, competition, contempt, prejudice, greed and allurements. It is making groups among them*

---

<sup>115</sup> List of countries and territories by fertility rate. (2010, May 7). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 07:48, June 11, 2010, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=List\\_of\\_countries\\_and\\_territories\\_by\\_fertility\\_rate&oldid=360665867](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=List_of_countries_and_territories_by_fertility_rate&oldid=360665867)

<sup>116</sup> Espenshade TJ, Guzman JC, and Westoff CF (2003). "The surprising global variation in replacement fertility". *Population Research and Policy Review* 22: 575. doi:10.1023/B:POPU.0000020882.29684.8e

## The Clash of Civilization

*who are hostile and rebellious against each other. This is also a form of wrath of God. God is preparing them for a great suicide which will not occur gradually but spontaneously. All the deposits of explosive materials have been collected and emergency centers are established in every nook and corner. Only the climax of the whole fiasco is expected, when a spark will ignite in only one deposit of explosives, starting a chain reaction which will lead to such a destruction that no one in the history would have seen nothing similar.*<sup>117</sup>

Another glimpse on Abu Ala Maududi (RA)'s viewpoint on nationalism is reflected in the following lines, which were not published in Pakistan, hence only very few people must have gone through it:

*“There is no doubt that Islam and nationalism are two different ideals, rather belongs to two opposite mindsets, and it is near to impossible to unite them on the same grounds. Nationalism, in its purest sense, is an ideology in itself which even negates the Divine commandments, and also attempts to seize those dimensions of life from epistemological point of view, which the divine commandments intends to keep in its dominion. This urges a rational individual to make up his mind to submit his intellectual, psychological, physical and emotional capacities to one of these ideologies in such a way that once he has done so, he shouldn't think of looking at the other. It is beyond doubt that due to incomplete adherence to Islam Muslims have fought Muslims various times during history. Muslims have also encountered non-Muslims and have conquered many territories. If Muslims history is analyzed with fairness, we would see that Muslims have never been crazy about nationalism unlike westerners; Muslims also never treated the conquered ones they way westerners treat them. Spain was once conquered by Muslims which was later (after about 800 years) was taken over by Christians; anyone can compare*

---

<sup>117</sup> Tankeehat, page 68

*the modus operandi and results of both of these conquests. Palestine and Bait-ul-Muqaddas were also overtaken by Muslims and there was a time when they were conquered by others, who doesn't know the difference in these two conquests as well? Can you search for the reason for this difference? Can it be that Islam inculcated its followers with broad mindedness, righteousness and eradicated any racial or nationalist feelings from their hearts that it made kept them from treating the nations which they conquered in a way done by others; and the nationalist obsession, which makes a human being enemy of every other man belonging to any other nation, never emerges among them. We must look at such teachings of Islam with an open heart which raise its followers to such a stature. Why we shouldn't learn from the virtues and righteousness which was present among them? A human would be his own enemy if he is sick and doesn't take a medicine despite it is available, because it looks foreign to him.*"<sup>118</sup>

At another occasion Maududi (RA) again had fiercely criticize the idea of nationalism and how it is contractor with Islamic ideals of unity and brotherhood:

*"After getting inspired by western thought and civilization, Muslims are also chanting the mantras of racism and nationalism. Arabs are being proud of their Arabic characteristics; Egyptians are recalling their own history. Turks are finding their links with Changaiz Khan to highlight their Turkish identity. Iranians are also blaming Arabic imperialism for making Ali (RA) and Hasan (RA) as their Hero, instead of Rostam and Afsendyar. In Hindustan such people are also emerging who relate themselves with Hindu race, and those who intend to detach themselves from Ab-e-Zamzam (Holy water from a well in Makkah) and attach with Ab-e-Ganga (water of river Ganga in*

---

<sup>118</sup> Mahnama Zindigi, Rampoor, India, April 1962, page 20-21

*India), and those who intend to look for their role models in Bheem and Arjun. This is so because they have neither made an attempt to understand their own civilization, let alone the western one. The laws and the reality, which they govern, are hidden from such people. They are surface gazers and love to lick the vibrancies or bright looking feature on the surface. They are oblivious of the fact that those characteristics which are like life blood of western nationality are venomous for the Muslim one. The foundation of western nationalism is based on race, nations, languages and skin-color. Contrary to this a Hindu Muslim can be as loyal citizen of Egypt as he is of Hindustan. An Afghani Muslim would fight for Syria just like he can for his own country. This is because Muslims of one race and a Muslim of another have no reason for geographic or racial disparity. And in this context principles of Islam and west are two poles apart. The source of power in the west is the source of feebleness in Islam, and the life blood of Islam is deadly for the west.*

*Some erroneously believe that even after adopting a racist or nationalist way of thinking, Muslims can retain their spiritual bond which they have with each other. They do so by fooling themselves with a thought that both can go hand in hand, will not damage each other stature and we can reap benefits from both. This is nothing but nonsense and a marvel of lack of intelligent thought. Just like God didn't created two hearts inside one body, similarly two opposing ethnic or national identities cannot be held together on ones heart. This is so because the nationalist thought inevitably conceives a disparity among oneself and those who hold other nationalities. Islamic ethnicity on the contrary demands a Muslim to consider another Muslim of any other nationality as his own brother, and any non-Muslim as alien ... however it is better that we don't fool ourselves and shall take any step by realizing the fact that any*

## The Clash of Civilization

*nationalist thinking is contradictory to the call of Prophet Muhammad (SAW).<sup>119</sup>*

The writings of Abu Ala Maududi (RA) reflects two of his qualities which were audaciously present in all great personalities. One of which was his ability to predict the future on the basis of trends of times, and the second was the timeless relevance of his ideas. More specifically Maududi (RA) didn't only observed, testified and explained the clash of civilizations going on during his times but also explain how he foresaw this clash would gradually evolve and influence in future times. Let us see what he said more on the subject:

*"It is a grim fact that most of our religious scholars, either due to lack of understanding or lack of courage or perhaps due to the inferiority complex, have accepted the divide among religion and worldly affair which was rather imported from Christianity into Islam long time back. They might not have accepted this divide on theoretical grounds, but practically they have accepted the idea that political leadership or state governance should remain in the hand of secular class of society; despite knowing that continuous assault of this secular class will shrink the world for them even more. After accepting this, the religious scholars intently focus on mere two things: One is to vehemently guard the boundaries of their hypothetical religious state within which they doesn't tolerate any form of interference what so ever, and second is to maintain a pact with any secular force which allows the survival of their hypothetical state; despite how corrupt and unjust this secular force may be outside their assumed hypothetical boundaries. If indeed they get into such a pact with any secular force or authority, they not even support it fervently but also try their level best to keep this secular*

---

<sup>119</sup> The problem of Nationalism, page 47 and 50

## The Clash of Civilization

*authority established. They do so despite it leads to highest degree of moral corruption, infidelity, indignity and falsehood within the entire socio-economic and political order of the society or the nation, so much so that the entire religious foundation is shaken to an extent the even the limited religious zeal is lost, which they intended to preserve or expected to preserve via their vehement support to such a corrupt authority.*<sup>120</sup>

Maududi (RA)'s words reminds us of the comments of Iqbal which he perhaps uttered after observing something similar, Iqbal has rather put these words in the mouth of Devil in his blockbuster poem *Iblees-ki-Majlis-e-Shura* (The Devil's Council):

*Ye hamari sa'e pehum ki karamat he ke ajj  
Sufi-o-mullah malukiat ke hain bande tamam*

In the paragraph quoted above, Maududi (RA) didn't just commented on the influence of western imperialistic thought on Islamic civilization and how it reinforced the divide among religious and worldly affairs, but also commented on the psychology and intentions of those who rather accepted this divide. Maududi (RA)'s words are even significant for us in the contemporary scenario, let us now see how:

During the era of general Musharaf, we saw how he and his fellows twisted the definitions of what is right and what is wrong, let alone how they even played with the interpretation of Quranic verses as well. Our society indeed didn't accept that either; however this transgression wasn't condemned the way it should have been by the majority. We must ask that for what reasons the scholars who give rulings in favor of suicide bombings, also never challenged the moral or religious crimes committed by the government then and even today. Perhaps there be a good reason, which ignorant people like

---

<sup>120</sup> Rasael-o-Masael, page 499 - 500

## The Clash of Civilization

the author, are unable to comprehend. However from Maududi (RA)'s point of view such a silent acceptance of such venomous trends can even shake the very foundation of religion itself and those who intend to save their hypothetical religious state might not even be left with what they have with them today, the traces of the sacred.

Did any body expect how things would turn out after 9/11? Not those at least whom we are mentioning here.

The following comments by Abu Ala Maududi (RA) are though forty years old, however they further reflects the unwanted but profound or rather hypnotic influence of western thought over the minds of Muslims. These comments are as true today as when they were made:

*"Another disease which has emerged today and is continuously spreading as well, is the end of loyalties from a Muslim except for his selfish gains and his families. Islam, on the contrary, had previously replaced all such loyalties. However when the Englishmen came, they supplied large number of salaried soldiers from the locals and used them to conquer the same people to whom they belonged in the first place. Englishmen never had to bring large number of foreign troops. They rather found sufficient of them among the local men to conquer and then to run the affairs of this country. This was because there were no loyalties left what so ever, the last one which was of Allah and his messenger (SAW) was also taken from them. The only loyalty left at their disposal was against their egos, as this the only kind of loyalty which make a man do such things."<sup>121</sup>*

Maududi (RA)'s foresightedness and relevance of his writings are more visible and prominent today then it was 50 years back. But was he right? or those who want to remain oblivious to the fact that such a clash can even exists? or those who intend to remind people of their forgotten past? You decide.

---

<sup>121</sup> Monthly magazine Tajli Deoband, Feb - Mar 1967, page 44 - 45

### Syed Qtub Shaeed (RA)

The writings of Akbar Ala Abadi, Allama Iqbal, Syed Abu Ala Maududi has confirmed the degree and nature of clash among civilizations prevalent since more than a century. Akbar wasn't a religious scholar; however his philosophy or thinking was extracted from religion all in all. Akbar's got his initial education from a madrasah in Allahabad because this was customary during his times, rather it would be more apt to say that at the time of Akbar, prevalent mindset was very much Islamic and non-literate class of the society was also very much well versed with the teachings of Islam. For this reason perhaps we see Akbar comparing Islamic norms, Philosophy and its manifestation to be in clash with western ones, in an extraordinary rather epical way.

Iqbal also never claimed to be a religious scholar, rather despite his proficient knowledge of religious philosophy we find him consulting various scholars. When we read Iqbal, we get a fair idea that he must thoroughly read Quran and Hadith, which in turn helped him intricately explain the clash among the Islamic and western civilizations, and how both of them were (are) colossally incompatible with each other.

Abu Ala Maududi (RA), on the other hand, wasn't just an intellectual, thinker but also a commentator of Quran, which makes him even more qualified to explain the holy message of truth which Islam has brought for mankind, and how it looks at other religions and nations? He has used terms like *Jihalat-e-Khalisa*, *Batil*, *Tukhm-e-Khabees* and *Shajer-e-Khabees* for modern western civilization and has written about the ongoing clash among the Islamic and western civilization at various places in his book *Tankeehat*. It is also important to note that Maududi's ideas about this clash are not limited to a particular era, we see him talking about such a clash or encounter in 1930s and even in 1960s he seems to have held to the same opinion. This means that if someone today comes up with the references of Quran and Hadiths to prove that the clash among civilization is not prevalent during present times,



## The Clash of Civilization

then we would rather assume that his knowledge about Islam is much superior than Akbar, Allama Iqbal and even Abu Ala Maududi (RA), or rather he is an agent of western civilization or perhaps he is suffering from some form of mental illness. As far as our knowledge is concerned, we don't find any other individual more authoritative than Akbar, Iqbal and Maududi (RA) on the subject of comparison and clash among civilizations. Many would react in Denial, which is the most predictable human reaction, shouldn't surprise those who would agree with us, as in this world many people vehemently deny the existence of God, and will even do so when the facts are as visible as the sun on a clear sky at noon.

After browsing through the writings of the three gentlemen, it would be unwise to ignore Syed Qtub who wasn't just an intellectual and thinker but also a commentator of Quran like Abu Ala Maududi (RA). In context of discussion it is important to mention that Syed Qtub's writings also abundantly discuss the incompatibility among the two notable civilizations throughout his work. It is important for us then to ask how he looked at this clash and how he has commented on those who don't quite agree with such a prevailing and evident phenomenon of our times.

*"On such occasion some people, who are obsessed and with eyes are blinded by the glitter of westernization, would say that the perceived clash or uproar which results from steering away any easterner from his customary tradition is because he is a slave to those old-fashioned traditions which are not compatible with modern times."<sup>122</sup>*

This was the beginning, if we assume Mr. Qtub right on this then it would mean that the clash of Islamic Civilization with westernization isn't visible to only those who are blinded by its gleam. Another important thing to note in this phrase is the term 'easterner' which Qtub used instead of Muslims,

---

<sup>122</sup> Islam and modern materialism, by Syed Qtub - page 221, 4<sup>th</sup> Ed

## The Clash of Civilization

which indicates the stance of Qtub is not just limited to Muslim rather encompasses the entire eastern world.

*“West denies all Divine values and believes in only material gains ... in real westerners have directed all its attention on a civilization which wholly based on materialism; they are rather immersed in the same.”<sup>123</sup>*

How similar the thinking of Qtub is with the three intellectuals cum thinkers cum revolutionaries. Even during 1970, we find him asserting the fact that the west denies the concept of Divinity and anything related hence the clash among Islam is not partial but universal.

We have already seen what Iqbal, Akbar and Maududi (RA) has to say on the incoherence among the ontological arguments, epistemology, efficient cause and final cause between the two civilization. Let us now see how Qtub looks at each of these dimensions of civilization.

*“Communism is in accord with Darwinism in three ways ... Nature has been replaced with God consequently the existence of God is denied ... this is the materialistic idea which is prevalent in Europe. And this confirms that communism isn't something new but a derivative of modern western civilization.”<sup>124</sup>*

This blow was on ontological argument of western civilization, let us dwell on the question of epistemology, which is rather even more important as ontological argument is also derived from the epistemological foundations established in western civilization. We have already seen the viewpoint of Akbar, Iqbal and Maududi (RA), and now let see how Qtub have commented on the incompatibility which Islamic epistemological foundations have with its western counterpart.

---

<sup>123</sup> Ibid, page 447 – 451

<sup>124</sup> Ibid, page 108 – 109

## The Clash of Civilization

*“To comprehend the nature of reality we have only one resource available and i.e. of revelation sent on prophets. Other than that any thing is ignorance and corrupt.”<sup>125</sup>*

Further Qtub comments on the nature of western epistemology:

“Empiricism is a unique trait of modern times which has greatly influenced western intellectual framework ... the inferences extracted from empirical sciences were given so much importance ... that westerners took a blind faith on them ... but since the limit of empirical sciences can be extended as far as human senses can operate therefore westerners accepted all those facts which were found to be in these limits and denied any thing which was beyond that ... and they closed all the door toward enlightenment other than this empirical approach ... since the Divine being cannot be brought into a laboratory for testing [Na’ozobillah] therefore westerners inferred that they therefore don’t really need God and bluntly denied the existence of the Supreme Being.” (Islam and modern materialism, page 93, 94 and 95, 4<sup>th</sup> Ed)

Qtub was fundamentally interested in the subject of epistemology, and for that matter he thoroughly discussed the differences in Islamic and western thought, and for this reason a lots of examples can be quoted in this regards, but the point has already been made. The concept of creation is yet another dimension which distinguishes civilizations, as already discussed, let us see how Qtub has dwelled on this concept as well:

*“To say that there is no relationship between mankind and his creator, rather nature is responsible for the creation of life via subsequent evolutionary steps and nature itself defends life as well, is a appalling idea and only westerners can believe on any such thing. Western history, on the other hand, tells us that Darwin’s theory of evolution has brought immense revolution in the field of science and*

---

<sup>125</sup> "Quran and Science" by Syed Qtub page 50, 1st Ed

## The Clash of Civilization

*arts, which altered the way of [modernist] thinking, and none of the scientists couldn't avoid being affect from this theory.*"<sup>126</sup>

Further Qtub argued:

*"Every living or non-living thing was provided guidance from the Divine Creator, same happened with Adam (AS). He was bestowed with his unique appearance and human characteristics right when he was created. Darwinists who rather assert on the basis of the fossils found during various excavations, that animals have also followed the same pattern of subsequent evolutionary developments over the period of time, is just a unproved theory, not a established fact".*<sup>127</sup>

Lastly the concept of purpose of existence or final cause comes into picture, let us now see how Qtub has commented on the western version of this concept.

*"The material standards of any civilization must not be authoritatively positioned, because the material progress of western civilization is based on those resources which is discovered continuously by underdeveloped science."*<sup>128</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> Ibid, page 47 and 49

<sup>127</sup> Ibid, page 80 and 81

<sup>128</sup> Ibid, page 77

## 6 –

---

# The Radical Islam and the West

Arrogance is just like passion or love. Expression of both states of minds cannot be hidden from others. Arrogance of western world is its best examples as its fumes are belching even from its decaying corpse. This expression of arrogance is indeed benefiting Muslims as many of those who were unable to understand a lot about contemporary times and their role are now able to, by smelling these fumes of arrogance, as otherwise a large proportions of Muslims would have never been able to open their eyes to the developing trends.

Irshad Ahmed Haqani also indeed accepted the fact of clash among civilization in his column which he wrote on **14th Feb (20XX)**. In which he quoted George Bush speech, given on the 'state of the union' event, in which he said that eradication of Radical Islam is America's top priority. Just like the term 'crusades', which has also been mentioned by George Bush in some of his speeches, we must also look into the meanings of the term 'Radical Islam' as well as this will help us to look deep into the psychology which is deriving the west into a clash with the Muslim world.

Interestingly western world has invented various labels for Islam, like Political Islam, Mullahism, Wahabism, Salfi Islam, Radical Islam or Extremist Islam etc. The purpose is to highlight any such individuals who falls under these labels,

## The Clash of Civilization

who will be rather considered alien to the Islamic world once they fall under such a category. Furthermore this helps west to form hypothetical groups and bring them against each other, and allow their internal energies to be dried up via an internal conflict. This isn't something new as earlier western world has achieved similar results by categorizing Muslim as 'modernist' or 'developed'.

A part from the discussion, let us quickly highlight the significance of the terms 'developed' and 'underdeveloped' holds within modern western paradigm, and doesn't holds any significance within Islamic way of looking at the world. Perhaps Iqbal has also emphasized that if life and universe were created together then idea of modern or ancient is nothing but a product of shortsightedness. Let us not distract from the core discussion and comeback to the main point.

Within Islamic philosophical framework the terms of radical Islam and Political Islam are as alien and meaningless as the terms modernism or developed are. Their purpose of usage has been explain above rather, however it is important to look at the insight which this tagging frenzy gives us about the historical and psychological development of the western thought.

Looking into the history of western civilization, or more specifically of Christianity, reveals us that its message is all about altruism, moral and spiritual development of self. The message of Christianity has nothing to do with how collective lives of individuals will be governed, how the governments will be formed and how the constitution will be developed? etc. Former is known as *Tareekat* and the later is known as *shariat* in Islamic Philosophy. This was the reason why romans initially felt themselves to be at contradiction with Christianity, because romans had a Shariat, in their own framework, but didn't had any *Tareeqat*, and the case of Christianity was very much opposite to that of Romans. Due to this reason 'old testament'

## The Clash of Civilization

and 'new testament' were compiled and also the term Judeo-Christians emerged from the same historical trends.

The problem with western world, hence, is that it try to analyze Islam from the viewpoint of Christian history, and doesn't realize that in Islam *Shariat* and *Tareeqat* are all inclusive into an integrated whole, and Islam doesn't really have to look at any place else to solve problems like that of constitution or of state governance. For this reason, henceforth, there is no concept of separation of Islam (let us avoid calling it as a religion) with state, and the same concept is also unacceptable to those Muslims who are aware of the wholeness of Islam. For this reason only those among the Muslims can agree with the labels like radical or fundamental Islam, etc, who are not clear what Islam is all about and are also unaware of the history of Christianity.

Many Muslim perceive, erroneously, that west is against the belief system, forms of worships or moral values or Islam. This is not the case. Whether Muslims believe in one God or many, whether they believe or don't believe in Prophethood or Divine revelations, Whether they offer prayers, perform hajj or observe fasting, west has no objections on these ritualistic or mythical practices what so ever. The problem of west starts when ever they see Muslim asserting that Islam is a complete way of life and should be implemented on each and every facet of individual and collective lives. The west objects because Islamic concept of state and governance destroys the democratic system the west adores, which eventually changes the entire fabric of a society. Islamic economic concepts shakes the foundation of western capitalistic economic model which has taken centuries to develop into its present form; and its future becomes blurry altogether once fundamentals of Islamic model are put into practice. In short Islam hold within itself the capacity to alter or reweave the fabric of cultures and civilizations, and to takeover the charge of the creative forces governing the dominant art and literature even. Muslims might not be aware of this, but

## The Clash of Civilization

west is definitely very much conscious of the potential hidden inside Islam. One becomes aware of all the dangers and take desperate measures only when ones survival is threatened, and in this context west has all the reasons to be scared of what he calls the radical Islam, and why it shouldn't be.

### **Inferiority Complex of the Western World**

Sometimes, in order to understand a particular relationship between two groups you have to look at it from an entirely different angle. It often happens that as soon as you invert the perspective, like making a picture upside down, it gives you a new meaning, which is sometimes unimaginably unique from the former.

Some people say that west abhors or hate the Muslim world, it look at the Islamic Civilization as its enemy rather. But thats only half the truth. In real west is suffering from a sever inferiority complex in relation with the Muslim world, which is west expresses in a tone of superiority complex. This is the inverted perspective we just talked about. It is a common observation that Muslims are rather suffering from a inferiority complex which is so much obvious that it is needless to explain. Contrary to this the inferiority complex of the west needs to be analysed, uncovered, explored or rather exposed, and it can be most definitely proven that westerners, particularly their policy makers envy and feel jealous about Islam and Islamic civilization.

If the readers are in shock or are laughing at the point that is being made here, then the author can apologize and continue and insist on to proving the case brought forward by him. Let us not forget that during past eight to nine decades a dozen of thinkers, philosophers and historians, who have emerged in the west who have expressed their regret and mourn over the deploring or rather decaying state of western civilization. Friedrich Nietzsche once wrote that in comparison to old times today our civilization is producing men who can be seen as dwarf as compare to the people of old times. He has ridiculed western democracy in his writings in such a way that the reader begins to



## The Clash of Civilization

feel abhorrent to the term of democracy. The theme of Nietzsche later became the title of Oswald Spengler's book 'The Decline of the West', and since then we see various different thinkers and philosophers criticizing the western civilization on the same lines. Even Alvin Toffler has acknowledged this decline in his best seller book 'Future Shock' which is fairly recent as compare to the works of Nietzsche and Spengler; this book was even translated in more than 20 languages. Long time back before Toffler, Arnold Toynbee, who is one of the most profound historians of this century, had commented on the crisis of western civilization and presented its two root causes. Firstly, he said, the western civilization has **to discover a spiritual center for itself, and secondly this civilization has to end its love affair with the technological development.**

Alvin Toffler also agreed that the crises of modern western civilization has been originated from erroneous use of science and technology, however he asserts that this crisis cannot be solved by returning toward religion, rather scientific and technological advance in the right direction can help it solve. It is obvious that Toffler is no where near the stature of Toynbee, who has been recognized as one of the greatest personalities in the west and according to him western civilization cannot be saved without the help of spirituality.

If we look at the last thousand years of the relationship of Islam and Islamic Civilization with its western counter parts, then we hardly find a period when the west has put a hold to the conspiracies, have seized its propaganda against Islam, have stopped the looting of its resources, have abide from minor or major aggressions against Islamic world, but despite all this they have never been fully able to conquer the hearts and minds of the Muslim population in totality. It is the beauty and quality of Islam that it has always provided a psychological deterrence against the uninterrupted onslaught of the western civilization, despite its physical might and resourcefulness. If we assume that amongst the circumstances in which Islam and Muslims have

## The Clash of Civilization

been surviving since last thousand or so years, If westerners had to face the same circumstances just for mere hundred years then they wouldn't have been able to sustain them or rather have disintegrated into history. And from western viewpoint it is just the Islamic civilization who has been surviving their perpetual attacks, let it be physical, psychological, economic or ideological, apart from this not even a single civilization has been able to retain its original form which has been subjected to these attacks. West was successful in transforming them into carbon copies of themselves, let it be Japan, China, and even India. It is Muslims who have remained steadfast on their foundations and are still insisting on the same ideals. In comparison to the inhabitant of other civilizations, Muslims are also resistant to any physical manifestation of western ideals which can in turn take them away from their own traditional ways. Is this an ignorable historical fact? Isn't this fact has the potential to shock any observer? Isn't this fact can make the westerners Envy, begrudge or indulge in an inferiority complex? Such a feelings when mixed can engulf one in anger and exasperation, like it has already in George Bush, Tony Blair, and Pope Benedict. This enormous inferiority complex is being expressed on the lines of superiority complex. The physical might of the west is perplexed with spiritual might of its counterparts, which in turn is making it realize its' spiritual depravity and at the same time reawakening Muslims to realize their destiny as well. Iqbal once said:

*Musalman ko Musalman kar dia tufan-e-maghrib ne  
Talatun hae daryae se he gohar ki serabi*

However this is happening subliminally for Muslims, but on the contrary western authorities and its allies are trying to inject spirituality into their own materialistic civilizations by taking the stand against the Islamic Civilization. However the results are not just bipolar but multipolar indeed. But let us just look at two of the consequences. One is the rise of various Christian circles in America, and the other is a lot more interesting:

## The Clash of Civilization

It is quite a thought provoking point in history that a civilization which is resisting and surviving against conspiracies since a thousand years, still poses the capability to attract others toward itself on the basis of its founding principles and their physical manifestation. Today we hear Pope Benedict asserting that Islam has been spread by sword<sup>129</sup>. **If thats true then how come in the last fifty years hundreds of thousands of westerners has embraced or converted to Islam.** Have these individuals were forced or threatened for their conversion? It is also important to note that these converts not only includes ordinary individuals but also **many intellectuals or celebrities who cannot even be threatened or bribed in the first place.**

Humans get impressed by only those things which he doesn't poses. This means that those westerners who converted to Islam were least attracted to the material progress of the western civilization nor toward Christian version of spirituality, if the contrary would have been true then these individuals have reverted rather to Christianity. It is important to ask at this point that what in Islam is actually attracted them?

When we browse through the writings of those western intellectuals and scholars who have converted to Islam, we learn that Islam's ontological argument of Tauheed has appealed them profoundly, not just because of its spiritual content but also because to its intellectual and philosophical soundness. Retrospectively, the secular foundation of literature and art had created an intellectual crisis in a way that the knowledge which it produced was not integrated into a single whole. For example, about the origin of man

---

<sup>129</sup> This is yet another example of westerners or Christians approach toward understanding Islam in the light of the history of Christian religion. It is an ugly historical fact that indeed Christianity has been the only religion on the world which hasn't just been spread by sword by also by heinous torture techniques; the entire process of this forced conversion is known in the history by the Inquisition. It was through this cold-blooded means the entire Muslim population of Spain was either expelled or forcibly converted to Christianity from the period of 1492 till 1612.

For details: Spanish Inquisition. (2010, June 18). In Wikipedia. Retrieved 05:08, June 19, 2010, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Spanish\\_Inquisition&oldid=368731412](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Spanish_Inquisition&oldid=368731412)

## The Clash of Civilization

and its nature, different intellectual circles holds and propagates different opinions; on the contrary the concept of *Tauheed* not just integrate the definition and purpose of ones being and everything in the universe into a integrated whole, and subsequently knitting together the entire knowledge base of science and arts, by paradoxically categorizing this knowledge base into relevant hierarchies and classes.

The ordinary people of western civilization are relatively more fascinated with the concept of *Tauheed* when it manifests into the form of the family institution, instead of its philosophical or spiritual appeal. The foundation of this institution has severely shaken in the western civilization. Even those families which prevails today are way different from its classical form which prevailed in the past. Can't we infer that this has been due to the decline of spirituality within western civilization, and can't we also infer that inferiority complex can also transcend above the materialistic dimension?

Christianity calls itself the world largest religion, although this claim be easily challenged looking at the level of devotion of so called Christian population. But just for the sake of argument even if we consider it correct, still we will not be able to deny that there is no future of Christianity amongst the most developed classes of western world. Only 14 - 20% are found to attend religious gatherings<sup>130</sup>, but Despite a deplorable state of Christianity Islam in indeed spreading in western countries.

West is not unaware of such trends and indeed pose intense feelings which often erupts like it did when the term crusade slipped out of the George Bush's mouth, who perhaps intended to pollute the secularized minds with some religious inspirations, satirically. The abusive words used by Pope Benedict for Prophet Muhammad (SAW) also seemed linked to the same

---

<sup>130</sup> Survey: Religion in the world at the end of the millennium, by Gallop International.  
Web link: <http://www.gallup-international.com/ContentFiles/millennium15.asp>

## The Clash of Civilization

chain of events, he claimed that Muhammad brought evil in the world while discussing the religious state of affairs of the secular western world<sup>131</sup>.

We can site three examples of behavior of American media. These examples tell us about how the injection of religiosity into the westerners is being attempted:

The first example is of Fox News coverage of a death of an American Jew who went to Israel as a volunteer to fight against Lebanon and *Hizbullah* and got himself killed in action. This incident was projected with great enthusiasm and fervor by those who spend day and night ridiculing similar acts of courage exhibited by volunteers fighting against Americans and allies. They are unable to realize that how any individual belonging to any ideology can sacrifice his life without any concept of reward which he would reap subsequently. The westerners get impressed hypocritically when one of their own is found acting on the same lines. Doesn't this reflect their inferiority complex and subsequent frustration?

The second example would be the mention of the so called 'the third awareness' multiple times by George W. Bush in two months time. This third awareness is nothing but a religious revival of westerners and it has its own historical background.

The third example is about an inauguration of a religious school in North Dakota, reported by BBC on 19<sup>th</sup> Sep 20XX. This school, which is established by neo-cons, exclaims to develop and produce individuals which will not even hesitate to sacrifice their lives for the protection of gospel. The lady, who heads this institute, clearly accepted that this school has been inspired from the Madressahs established through out the Islamic world.

---

<sup>131</sup> Pope's speech at University of Regensburg (full text), September 20, 2006. Web link: <http://www.catholicculture.org/news/features/index.cfm?recnum=46474>

## The Clash of Civilization

Doesn't these examples depicts inferiority complex of western world?

The entire canvass of history is lying in front of us. The dynamism of Islamic civilization, its assertions, its vigor, its grace was in its uniqueness with other civilization. Mujdid Alf-e-Sani (RA), Illama Iqbal (RA), Abu Ala Maududi (RA), Muhammad Askari and many others have contrasted this uniqueness with other civilizations, notably the western one. Those who disagree with their analysis are agents of western organization, or too naive. Indeed west find itself drowning in a sea of inferiority complex whenever it sees Islamic civilization surviving despite all its efforts to subjugate her, however the west expresses her frustration by not excepting the reality rather by bursting into angst, ridiculing the state of existence of Islamic Civilization as evident from numerous instances.

## 8 –

---

### The Case of Hijab

Western opposition toward Veil is one of the classical demonstrations of the clash among the two civilizations. This opposition is decades old but have taken new turns recently. It is important that we do the autopsy of this opposition as it will help us learn hidden dynamics prevalent under the skin.

West has been using various terms against the tradition of veil since multiple generations like it was said as a sign of religious or societal oppression of women, domination of males, backwardness, narrow mindedness and conservativeness. These terms were used by modernists and advocates of western ideology whenever the veil was discussed, rather ridiculed. However recently a change in the approach or tonality of west took place and veil was rather seen and criticized as a symbol of discrimination and hindrance in the process of civilization and cultural unison. In a way the status of veil has received upgraded to a new status among the modernists, as previously it's was only ridiculed, and today it is aggressively opposed. **Recent bans on veiling in France, Belgium and other European countries confirm just this.**

Abu Ala Moududi used various terms to describe the western civilization like he called it *Batil*, *Jahaliat-e-Khalsa*, *Shajr-e-Khabees*, *Samr-e-Khabees*, etc, this wasn't without a reason. It is important to note that the collective consciousness of the west will remain limited till the domains of economics of sociology, or rather physical dimension of life, and in the same context

## The Clash of Civilization

modernist will finds themselves compelled to ridicule, rather oppose the trends prevalent in Muslim societies.

If we analyze we'll notice that many decades earlier those individuals, particularly Muslims, who relocated themselves in western societies, did so for economic reasons. They were cheap labor for westerners, and those foreigners (in the west) also enjoyed a 'resourceful' life in the west. These natives though had this thing in their mind that some day they will most probably return to their countries. For this reason, on one side, they find it appropriate to succumb to western values, of course temporarily. In addition to that majority of them didn't find it much relevancy in the idea of upgrading their educational or professional profiles for as well, perhaps only a few thought contrarily. Subsequently the ladies also choose not to veil themselves or if they did then they opted to remain indoors. Westerners only made mockery of veil in such circumstances.

Today, westerners are facing the next generation of these native Muslims who are rather very much different from their parents, of course not all, and unlike their parents they are unwilling to remain subservient to the western values or trends. They are highly qualified and competent individuals, with a vision for themselves. Among them the ladies who veil themselves cannot be said to do so due to the pressure of their husband, brothers or parents. These ladies are rather very much aware of the pros and cons of the choices they make for themselves, and the same ladies are also found advocating that veil is their own choice, and for them it's not oppression rather liberation. This makes their approach unique from that of their parents, and for this reason modernist also couldn't counter them the same way they did to the past generation.

According to Jackstraw **he finds it difficult to talk to ladies covering their faces as he cannot see their facial expressions.** Such a powerful argument isn't it! And it makes us wonder how Mr. Jack listens to radio, or talk on phone? Is Mr. Jack suffering from lack of imagination, hearing or perception?



## The Clash of Civilization

Even more interestingly we found Shahid Hussain, member of Darul-uloom of Britain, seconding Mr. Jack. Yvonne Ridley on the other hand found the reaction of Mr. Shahid as amusing and asked to whom his loyalty really belongs to?

## 8 –

---

### Tales of some Modern Crusades

Israel's aggression against Lebanon and the resistance given by *Hizbullah* has destroyed various myths about the status of Israel in the Middle East. It is on the record that Israel once claimed to eradicate *Hizbullah* from the face of this planet. America and England gave their permission as always to Israel to do anything it wanted to achieve its claim. And Israel indeed attacked Lebanon 500 times in a week, used 2.5 ton bombs, but the week turn out to be a single day and the whole encountered lasted for about 5 weeks. The conflict started on 12 July 2006, and continued until a United Nations-brokered ceasefire went into effect in the morning on 14 August 2006, though it formally ended on 8 September 2006 when Israel lifted its naval blockade of Lebanon.

The myth of Israel's status in the Middle East is due to the shameful incompetence of rulers of Arab nations and their so called army. In 1967 Israel nailed down not just one but four Arab armies. In 1973 two of the Arab armies fought against Israel but they faced humiliating defeat from Israel. These encounters gave birth to a myth that Israel is indeed invincible, and it is insane even to think of attacking Israel. This same myth lead to agreements like Camp David which was signed by Anwar Sadat. *Hizbullah* on the other hand destroyed this myth completely.

## The Clash of Civilization

Mossad, the intelligence agency of Israel, is considered even more effective than CIA, KGB or MI6. This is despite the fact that its international presence is not even equal to mere two percent of that of CIA. Despite this status, miserable failure of Mossad against Lebanon or *Hizbullah* in the said encounter is exemplary and nakedly evident. It is due to this failure that Israel hasn't been able to eradicate *Hizbullah's* posts from Lebanon, despite the technology and modern weaponry it has used. The areal and satellite surveillance of Israel has also failed in parallel to its Intelligence agency. This is all despite the fact that *Hizbullah* is mere equal to the hundred thousandth of the fraction of Israel's might.

On the other side *Hamas* is even tenth of the size of *Hizbullah* however its suicide bombing has shaken Israel from its core. Israel even assassinated their founders like Sheikh Yaseen and Abdul Aziz Al-Rantissi, but despite this colossal loss and its psychological and emotional impact, *Hamas* maintained their stature as before. There are no similar examples of passive resistance and organizational unity available in modern times.

The case of Iraq is also very much evident in front of us. Most of the Muslim world went hopeless when America and its allies attacked Iraq. However the things there turned out quite unexpectedly and a handful of Freedom fighters steered the scene away from where Americans wanted it to be. This is despite the fact that more than half of the population of Iraq is neutral and America is spending seven billion dollars annually in Iraq and has lost more than 7000 of his soldiers.

The scene of Afghanistan isn't much different either. If we look at Afghans in comparison with American and European armies, then we cannot avoid being baffled by the magnitude of the difference among the two in terms of sophistication of technology. Afghans are using the weapons which they used against Russians thirty years back. During that time it was assumed that Afghans defeated Russians due to the help they got from Americans, but who is helping them today against Americans? It must be realized that spirit of

## The Clash of Civilization

Jihad and martyrdom are the greatest weapon possessed by Muslims and no level of sophistication of technology or destructiveness of firepower can subdue this spirit.

### A Breaking News

If Americans had a News of similar proportions, which Muslims have at this point in time, it would have really sparked hundreds of hours of exclusive coverage on every news channels ... thousands of discussions of different lengths would also have been aired, and around a thousand interviews of experts, politicians, analysts etc would have become a part of memory of viewers ... all in a very short period of time. In addition to that, hundreds of documentaries of various lengths would have been made on the subject or been in the process of being produced. Last but not the least; this news would also have pushed Hollywood to start production of five to six mega budget movies.

So what is it?

Dear Readers! Americans and allies have been defeated by the freedom fighters/*Mujahideens* in Afghanistan. News of historical proportions, isn't it...!!!

A few years back, one fine day Americans learnt something similar ... that Russians have been defeated by *Mujahideens* in Afghanistan; and when the news came, it sparked a parade of discussions, columns, interviews, documentaries and feature films, et al, like we are anticipating that it would have been the case now ...

However despite knowing this, the behavior of Muslim Ummah is quite contrast and dumbfounding. They have a news of historic proportions, as already said, though it's not making a headline, not even in an evening newspaper... This could be the height of our journalistic incapacity and intellectual slavery of independent media, and the same is also true for the

## The Clash of Civilization

entire Muslim Population, perhaps. Telling it is ... we don't even know how to even celebrate triumph ... but why?

Some think that it's the unavailability of sufficient financial resources, though I disagree. The problem, my friend, is with our priorities and misconceptions. We know people who can spend millions, if not billions, to erect Madrassahs or Masjids, however if you ask for their support to establish an independent TV channel, then they might not even spare a rupees. *"It's not a religious activity, isn't it ... would it bring bounties in Akhirah?"*

It is questioned due to a common perception that mass media is a means to spread vulgarity and negativity etc; public clings to this perception despite realizing that media is indeed the most effective and efficient tool to manage and form perceptions or opinions. Ironically, concordantly, millions believes blindly that the 'picture (read distortion) of reality' shown by media is indeed 'Reality' and what it ignores either doesn't exist or is irrelevant. This fact is saddening with far reaching consequences.

Albeit the sorry state of print or electronic media in general, we do have some exceptions to talk about. Take *Al-Jazeera* for instance; doing a splendid job despite the rule of monarchist and dictators in the Middle Eastern countries it operates, where waking and radicalizing the population is more difficult then it seems. Al-Jazeera, however have accomplished the unimaginable, and we must ask how?

Al-Jazeera exposed the aggression of Israel, and it not only reported the details on bombings and attacks by oppressive force(s) (extra 's' for its supporting allies), but also revealed the human sufferings caused as a result, the pains and suffering of people whose family members have been martyred, how they has been treated by authorities ... it also reported the economic difficulties faced by them as a result, and eventualities on future of their children. Al-Jazeera uncovered these issues with such a detail that it was never done before, sparking a reaction against Israelis and Americans.

## The Clash of Civilization

If all the print and electronic media of Muslim world would have the spirit Al-Jazeera had, then the ball game would have been very different, knowing the fact that the American and Allies in Afghanistan have been defeated. Our media could have then played a pivotal role in uplifting the moral of the Muslim Ummah, and would have in turn achieved a psychological victory against the so called imperial masters.

Muslim Ummah has been a sufferer of inferiority complex since a long time; blind folded by a perception that we are deprived of resources, wealth, technology, etc, which is why western civilization have all the power and might ... but remain ignorant to the fact that an Ummah who can defeat two super powers in just twenty years, must have some extraordinary qualities.

People generally believe that Americans are fighting Afghans in Afghanistan, but that's not really the case ... in reality it's a war being won by 'Faith' against 'state of the art technology', on one side and on the other, triumph of 'intense desire to die for a cause' (read martyrdom) against 'world's greatest military might'; it is undeniably changing the face of the history forever...

Despite all this, Muslim Ummah is unaware of the glory, and ironically we don't even have a tool to wake ourselves from the slumber.

## 9 –

---

### A Ray of Hope

Iqbal said about a century ago:

*“Bujhi Ishq Ke Ag Andhair he (Its Pitch black darkness as fire of passion is no more)  
Muslman naheen rakh ka dher he” (Muslims are rather a pile of ashes, as they are no  
more)*

When he exclaimed these lines, Muslims were really ‘a pile of ashes’ amongst other nations. This was despite their population of 150-200 million, in other words every tenth person was a Muslim in the world back then; however today a lot has changed. Firstly Muslims cannot be called ‘ashes’, even if we would had to, then it would rather be a mountain of ashes instead of a mere pile. This is so because according to a report prepared by ‘Pew Forum’, an institute of American origin, the total population of Muslims has increased to 1.57 billion, a ten fold increase since Iqbals time, or in other words every fourth person in the world is a Muslim today. This report comprises of statistics of 232 countries, which further describes existence and influence of Islam and Muslims in the world as too critical to be ignored. It further states that among non-Muslim countries the population of Muslims is around 320 million. In Europe 3.8 million Muslims resides ... in Germany their number is around 1.5 million which is greater then the population of Lebanon. In china 22 million Muslims resides which is greater then the population of Syria. In Russia this number is 60 million which is greater then the population of Jordan and Libya combined. This report also states that 60% of Muslims lives

## The Clash of Civilization

in Asia, 20% in Middle East and northern Africa, and 15% live around Saharan Africa. That's too much for a pile of ash ... probably making the lines of Iqbal obsolete?

Indeed it has as when Iqbal said so, only 1½ of Muslim countries had gained independence, one was Afghanistan and half of Ethiopia; the rest of the Muslim population was under the rule of imperial forces of that time. However today there are more than 57 independent Muslim countries ... over and above, these countries today own 70% of the oil reserves of the world, 80% of the known gas reserves, and apart from that Muslims countries are also rich with other natural treasures.

Can we still term Muslims as a pile of ashes? Despite their colossal population in the world? Why any one would like to call 1.57 billion people a pile of ash? ... Let's pause and go back to Iqbal, who is rather concerned with the fire of passion primarily, which when extinguished produces a pile of ash ... is it really the case today, has the fire extinguished completely?

Let us be very clear that we shouldn't be judging Muslims by their quantity rather should do so by their quality. The fire hasn't extinguished completely rather there are clear evidences that it has started to spread. In other words, we must accept today that Muslims have some essence of excellence remaining, which is evident from defeat of Russia in Afghanistan in the last decade and today we can see America loosing the ball game in Afghanistan ... it's only a matter of confession from America's side, that it will be recorded as a fact in the course of history of mankind. This is such a great success that if Iqbal would have been alive today then his revolutionary spirit would have taken new leaps, he wouldn't have then complaint that fire of passion is no more and rather Muslims are like a pile of ashes. After looking at what Muslims have done to two Superpowers, he would have rather said:

*Jali Ishq Ki Agg woh noor hai  
Muslman naheen Jalwa-e-toor hai*



## The Clash of Civilization

(The Fire of Passion and the emerging radiance  
It's not Muslims rather a beacon of light)

This is not Iqbal, but these lines resembles to his thoughts ...

Let us now focus a bit more on Muslim demographics.

The present 1.57 billion of population will be close to 2 billion in 2025 and 3 billion in 2050. And if it kept on increasing then by the year 3000 it would be around 5 billion i.e. if today every fourth person is a Muslim then, very soon every third person would be a Muslim, and in a little while very second person would be a Muslim. However it is just not a matter of quantity which we should be noticing, the quality is what would make the difference, particularly when the spirit of religion is alive; and In order to confirm this, let's see compare it with other religions.

If we talk about Hinduism, million and millions of people are associated with it; however its existence is no more then in a form of a culture. On the other hand Christianity claims it self to be the largest religion of the world, however in reality it's nothing more then a part of history as true followers of Christianity are only a negligible fraction of the whole. Buddhism also has nothing to offer other then its 'frozen spirituality', and as far as Judaism is concerned then it's also being gradually evaporated from the face of this planet in term of its true identity. Contrary to this every aspect of Islam is alive in some form ... let us see how?

Assuming if among 1.57 billion people only 10% offer Salah then its about 150 million people, if half of the population still observes fasting then we are talking about 750 million people, Sir! As far as the matter of Pilgrimage is concerned, today it has exceeded to more then 3 million people per annum. And if we talk about things which are prohibited or allowed (*Halal* or *Haram*) then majority of the Muslim population abide to the said rules. Now if we ask, other then Islam which of the religion is alive today to this extent, then the answer is quite clear. Among the apostles or Non-Muslims, those who

## The Clash of Civilization

hate Islam, do so because they see it alive unlike other religions. Today Islam is not like mere a part of tradition, culture or part of history, for that matter, unlike other religions, it's a lot more than that ...

Sometime back the spirit of *Jihad* was also seemed very much lost, and there wasn't any hope of its revival either. However the spirit of Islam among Muslims was alive (read asleep) and the situation in Afghanistan catalytically awakened its spirit sleeping since many ages. The power of *Jihad* has even brought a superpower to its knees, and another one is very close to it. On the other hand, the spirit of *Hijab* was also close of being lost among Muslim societies; however until recently it has emerged as an international phenomenon. Mosques are also getting increasingly populated by youngster for the same reasons. These are all big and radical changes, if so then it's a little surprise that we call Islam being radicalized ;) ... guess what, half of the Muslim population is indeed comprises of youngsters. This is indeed another clear proof of Islam being revitalized.

Iqbal in just block buster poem *Iblees Ki Majlis-e-Shura* (The Devil's Council) has also depicted the same picture from the devil's perspective; following are a few lines from this poem, translated in English:

Thus lies in my hold the world's pomp and show,  
This earth, the Sun and Moon, the Sky's glow.

Shall see the East and West my game and roar.  
As soon I warm up Western nation's gore.

The pontiffs of church, the leaders of State,  
My one din's echoe for them a dread great.

To her a modern world if a fool espies;  
This culture's wine cups will someone break and sea?

The collars to whom the Nature has torn,  
The logic of *Muzdak* to them cant darn.

How can frighten me the Socialist lads,  
Since long jobless, confused and loafing lads.

## The Clash of Civilization

From that nation but I feel a threat grave,  
whose heart yet holds hidden embers of crave.

A few of them I espy in this nation yet,  
At dawn who take 'Wuzu' with tear drops jet.

He knows on whom hidden Times are bright,  
The Islam, not Muzdak is the future's fright.

I know this nation to Quran holds not,  
The old craze for wealth is the Momin 's thought.

In dark nights of East this point I behold,  
The sleeves of Harem Sheikhs no white hand hold.

I am but afraid that modern age needs,  
May not force this age to know Prophet's creed.

Beware! hundred times from the Prophet's Act,  
It guards women honour, makes man perfect.

A death knell to those who made the mar, slave,  
It ruled out kingship, no beggary it gave.'

It cleaned the man's wealth from' every stain,  
It made the rich trustees of wealth's wrong drain.

No bigger change could be of deeds and thoughts,  
This earth owns to Allah, to a king not.

His Law be kept hidden from whole world's eye,  
To my solace *Momin* lacks a faith high.

Let him be fastened in metaphysics lone,  
In his own meanings of the Koran's tone.

Whose call God is Great broke the world spell,  
That conscious man's night why not a bright deli.

Did the Christ died or alive from start?  
Are God's attributes His Part or apart?

Is the coming Christ Hindi Nasir's dad?  
Is he a *mujaddid* like the Mary's lad?

## The Clash of Civilization

Are God's words mortal or old like Him hence?  
Which sect of the *Ummah* will have riddance?

Are'nt now enough for Muslims of this age?  
His dogmas gods he found in his rummage.

From a practical life keep him away,  
Get all his pawns beaten in this nice way.

He's better a slave upto the dooms day,  
Leave the mortal world for others hey-day.

The verse and mysticism suits for his 'deen'.  
Which hides from his eyes life's vital scene.

In prays at dawn keep him rapt and grave.  
Make him zealot fan of tombs and graves.

I fear from this *Ummah* lest they awake,  
Being his faith's base, world account he would take.