

“FARUQI’S VISION OF A TAWHIDIC WORLDVIEW”*

By
M.Kamal Hassan
ISTAC,IIUM

“Modernization failed because it was Westernization, alienating the Muslim from his past and making of him a caricature of Western man.” (Tawhid, pp.2-3)

1. Colleagues’ Reminiscence of the Personality of al Faruqi

- A. He was indefatigable, a bundle of enormous energy, who seemed like a relentless whirlwind. His profession was also his vocation, he was a man driven by scholarship and faith. He was one of the great multi-taskers of his time: writing, speaking nationally and globally, running the Islamic studies program, recruiting students from across the Muslim world, establishing major Muslim organisations and a think tank, the International Institute of Islamic Thought. You never knew where he might be at any given moment. He would hop on a plane to Amman, to Kuala Lumpur, deliver a speech or advise a government official and be back in the States the following day for his class. His energy and passion could also make him seem enigmatic. Isma’il was urbane, fluent in multiple languages, at ease in discussing Western philosophy or Islamic thought, Bach and Beethoven, and Western and Islamic art. He was exceptionally charming, warm, and considerate but could also be outspoken and combative in professional contexts on issues that mattered to him. This was evident at times at professional meetings and encounters in his positions, some would say his defense of Islam, as well as in his criticism of some Muslim rulers. He was a strong outspoken critic of European colonialism and Israel’s occupation of Palestine and of Orientalism. Perhaps the most humorous to some graduate students (but to some department faculty upsetting) but serious to Isma’il and others was when, like Martin Luther, he posted his theses on Christian belief in the Department of Religion. He challenged those professors of Christianity whose thinking and teaching were influenced by belief in the triumph of the Secular City, the need for radical reform in Christianity, and the Death of God theology to a debate in which he would defend Christian orthodoxy!...an immeasurable Isma’il al Faruqi legacy has endured, one that stretches across generations and across the globe... (John L. Esposito, “Memories of a Scholar and a Mujahid” in Imtiaz Yusuf (ed.) *Islam and knowledge: Al faruqi’s Concept of Religion in Islamic Thought*. 2012. London: I.B.Taurus, pp. 24-25, 29.

*Keynote address delivered at the International Conference on The Legacy of Isma’il al Faruqi on 22nd October 2013 Page 1

- B. Looking into the vista of history, one finds two distinct characters emerging in sharp focus: one, of people who are satisfied with the status quo, choose to swim with the current of time and consequently adopt, pursue, and promote the dominant paradigm of thought, polity and culture; and the other of persons who challenge the status quo, come up with critiques of the dominant paradigm, seek to find out new alternatives and thus become harbingers of change. Those in the latter category may be small in numbers, apparently weak and powerless, even haunted and persecuted; yet ultimately it is they who set the agenda for the future and become catalysts for civilizational change; reshaping human thought, society, culture, and history.

Brother Isma'il al Faruqi belonged to this second group of people. He emerged on the firmament of Islamic scholarship in the early 1960s and gradually made his impact as an intellectual of high acumen, one who was firmly anchored in the classical and contemporary sources of Islamic thought and culture, and, along with that, had acquired critical understanding of Western philosophy, the methodology of the social sciences, and mastery over major fields of comparative religions and history – a rare combination indeed. He was a dispassionately articulate speaker and also wielded a powerful pen: qualities that enabled him to put his ideas across with great force, clarity, and vigor. His speeches and writings have, because of their academic rigour, scientific precision, rational augmentation, literary flavor, and overpowering passion, influenced two generations of youth and seekers after truth. He made his mark as a scholar, a teacher, a thought leader, a man with a vision and mission. Looking back on his varied contributions, I regard him as one of the architects of contemporary Muslim resurgence, particularly in America and the West. (Khurshid Ahmad, "Isma'il Al Faruqi: As I Knew Him", in Imtiaz Yusof (ed.) *Islam and Knowledge*, pp.32-42.)

As the way out of the current predicament of the Muslim Ummah, his prescription was simple and straightforward. He emphasized the need for total change, but the key to this process is da'wah, education, and more importantly, the "Islamization of Knowledge" (khurshid, p.40)

"The roadmap that brother al Faruqi spelled out had as its vital ingredients 'Islamization of Knowledge', character-building, reform, and the reconstruction of institutions of family, economy, society, and polity in accord with the principles and precepts of the *Shari'ah*. *Da'wah* at all levels and all sources of power, spiritual, moral, material should be harnessed in the service of this mission and goal. While the strategy for change he advocated was multi-dimensional, as spelled out in *Tawhid: Its Implications for Thought and Life*, the last few years of his life were more pointedly

dedicated to the intellectual revolution that could be the catalyst for total change. Hence the fervent appeal that he made to Muslim intellectuals published posthumously in the American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences, is worth recalling:

We have an extremely important task ahead of us. How long are we going to content ourselves with the crumbs that the West is throwing at us? It is about time that we made our own original contribution. As social scientists, we have to look back at our training and reshape it in the light of the Quran and the *Sunnah*. This is how our forefathers made their own original contribution to the study of history, law and culture. The West borrowed their heritage and put it in a secular mould. Is it asking too much that we take knowledge and Islamize it?" (Khurshid, p. 41)

2. The need to articulate the meaning and significance of the *Tawhidic* worldview

The need to articulate the meaning and significance of the *Tawhidic* worldview in the context of contemporary socio-political realities and challenges is a religious obligation of the scholars and thinkers of the *Ummah*. In the past the *mutakallimun* (scholastic theologians) felt the need to explain and defend the creed of *Tawhid* in light of the religious, philosophical or intellectual challenges of their respective times. In the first half of the 20th century, when the Muslim world was facing the challenges of two major world ideologies, capitalism on the one hand, and communism on the other hand, great Muslim revivalist thinkers and reformers such as Abu'l A'la Mawdudi, Muhammad Hamidullah, Mohammad Natsir, Syed Qutb, Mustafa al-Siba'l and Muhammad al-Mubarak were in the forefront to expound the meaning and implications of the worldview of *Tawhid* in response to the ideological challenges facing the Muslim communities then.

In spite of the intellectual articulation and elaboration of the concept of *Tawhid* by the above intellectuals, there were those modernist Muslim intellectuals in the 70s, such as Nurcholish Madjid in Indonesia who insisted that the *Kalimah al-Shahadah* in fact opened the way for secularization rather than Islamisation of society in a big way by his claim that the

Kalimah meant that only Allah (SWT) was absolute. On the other hand, for some Sufi thinkers the goal of *Tawhid* is perceived and understood in terms of the longing of the *ashiq* (lover of God) to be united or absorbed into the *Ma'shuq* (The Beloved), and the *Kalimah* "*la ilaha illa'Llah*" is interpreted to mean "there is no existent being (*mawjud*) except Allah".

Today, in this era of competing worldviews when the Qur'anic worldview is being challenged by a variety of religious and nonreligious worldviews -- the secular humanist, the agnostic, the atheistic, the Christian, the Hindu, the Buddhist, the pantheistic, the postmodernist, the Liberal Islamist, the transcendent unity of all religions, the feminist, etc., the ability to present the worldview of *Tawhid* in ways that addresses the current issues posed by the competing worldviews becomes even more urgent, particularly when facing the new and complex internal challenges such as the Liberal Islam Movement and the Neo-Modernist trends of religious thought.

In the context of the deepening civilizational crises and the turmoil in many Muslim countries, it is our contention that the need to apply the worldview and paradigm of *Tawhid* now is more urgent now than before. There is no doubt that *Tawhid* is the most fundamental and most important concept in Islam, and contemporary history has shown that many Muslim reformist or revivalist attempts to establish the complete way of life based on the worldview of *Tawhid* in Muslim countries have met a variety of obstacles to make the efforts ineffective if not failures. The tragedies and travails of Pakistan, Indonesia, Turkey, Egypt, Tunisia, Algeria, etc. are a stark reminder of this existential predicament. One of the intellectual challenges the Muslim Ummah is facing is to how to make our Muslim leaders and decision makers understand something so basic yet so open to a variety of perceptions, namely the comprehensive, holistic and integrated implications of the Muslim belief and conviction that "There is no object of worship except the One and Only True God, Allah".

In the context of the revivalist elan of the 70s and 80s, the rare ability to advance, articulate and defend the worldview of *Tawhid* in a highly sophisticated English discourse in the context of contemporary Western philosophies which champion the superiority of secularity modernity, and the different appeals of world religions upon the young Muslim minds in the

80s of the 20th century, has been exemplified in a unique philosophical style and rationalistic discourse by one of the most remarkable and unforgettable minds and personalities of the later part of the twentieth century, namely the mind of the late Professor Isma'il Raji al Faruqi (*rahimahu'Llah*). His unique discourse on *Tawhid* was also the product of the most historic milestone in the modern history of Islamic thought, i.e. 1980 which was the advent of the new 15th century *Hijrah*, a new dawn of great promise and optimism, a new awakening seen by many Muslim leaders all over the world as heralding the renaissance of Islam, to assume the civilizational leadership of mankind after being dominated by modern Western civilization for more than three centuries. It is partly in light of such global Muslim hubris that the strident and assertive – sometimes combative -- philosophical style of Faruqi's reconceptualization of *Tawhid* has to be understood. In the preface of his book, Faruqi explains:

The third and last presupposition of this book is that the world *ummah* if Islam will not rise again or be the *ummatan wasatan* except through that which gave it its *raison d'être* fourteen centuries ago, its character and destiny through the ages, namely, Islam . It is the Muslim's conception of himself as the *khalifah* (vicegerent) of Allah *ta'ala* on earth that makes him the vortex of human history. Only as God's *khalifah*, and hence only in proper commitment to the vision of Islam, may man act responsibly in the totality of space-time. As such, the Muslim must interfere in the causal processes of space –time (the material, the psychic, the social and the spiritual) so as to redirect their course toward fulfillment of the divine pattern. As such the Muslim's interference into space-time will be to reconstruct, it not to abolish it or escape from it, as in Hindu-Buddhist spirituality. And in his reconstruction of it, it is not his "creative" will that the Muslim pursues, but the will of God. Finally, the Muslim's reconstruction is not an act of defiance and conquest as the Promethean West, but a responsible act of submission. Hence, the Muslim enjoys a triple protection: against his own capacity for exploiting for exploiting nature; against the arrogance of power if he succeeds; and against tragedy where helplessness and despair are of the essence, if he fails.

It is Islam's vision of reality that this book seeks to present for the instruction of Muslim youth. In it, the author hopes to take the youth further on the road of genuine self-reform, bringing up to date, as it were, the early ideational insights of the great reformers of the Salafiyah movement, Muhammad ibn 'Abd al Wahhab, Muhammad Idris al Sanusi, Hassan al Banna and others. The relevance of Islam to the various fields of human thought and activity is here analyzed and elaborated with the hope of its becoming the groundwork for reformative programs in each of these fields. No other

groundwork of Islam will succeed. The essence and core of Islam being *tawhid*, *Tawhid* is the name of the book as well as content of the relevance. (al Faruqi 1982: iii-v)

3. Al-Faruqi's Exposition of *Tawhid*

It is interesting to note that his exposition of the Tawhidic worldview is very different from the presentation and systematization of Syed Qutb and Yusuf al-Qaradawi who describes the characteristics of the worldview of Islam as consisting of the following: 1. Divine Origin and Nature (*al-Rabbaniyyah*), 2. Humanistic (*al-Insaniyyah*), 3. Comprehensiveness (*al-Shumul*), 4. Justly Balanced (*al-Wasatiyyah/al-Tawazun*), 5. Realistic (*al-Waqi'iyah*), 6. Clarity (*al-Wuduh*), 7. Integration of Fixed Principles and Values with the Mutable and Changeable (*al-Jam` baina al-Thabat wa al-Murunah/al-Mutaghayyirat*).

Tawhid: Its Implications for Thought and life (al-Faruqi,1982:10-27)

II. TAWHID AS WORLDVIEW

Traditionally and simply expressed, *Tawhid* is the conviction and witnessing that "there is no God but God." This seemingly negative statement, brief to the utmost limits of brevity, carries the greatest and richest meanings in the whole of Islam. Sometimes a whole culture, a whole civilization, or a whole history lies compressed in one sentence. This certainly is the case of the *kalimah* ("pronouncement") or *shahadah* ("witnessing") of Islam. All the diversity, wealth and history, culture and learning, wisdom and civilization of Islam is compressed in the shortest of sentences- *La ilaha illa Allah* (There is no God but God)

***Tawhid* is a general view of reality, of truth, of the world, of space and time, of human history and destiny. At its core, stand the following principles:**

A. DUALITY [the reality of creation but subservient to Him]

Reality is of two generic kinds, God and non-God; Creator and creature. The first order has but one member, Allah, *subhanahu wa ta'ala*. He alone is God, the Eternal, the Creator, the Transcendent. "Nothing is like into Him." He remains forever absolutely unique and devoid of partners or associates. The second is the order of space-time, of experience, of creation. It includes all creatures, the world of things, plants and animals, humans, jinn and angels, heaven and earth, paradise and hell, and all their becoming since they came into being. The two orders of Creator and creation are utterly and absolutely disparate as far as their being, or ontology, as well as their existence and careers are concerned. It is forever impossible that the one be united with, infused, co-

fused with or diffused into the other. Neither can the Creator be ontologically transformed so as to become the creature, nor can the creature transcend and transfigure itself so as to become, in any way or sense, the creator.

B. IDEATIONALITY [relationship based on man's knowledge and submission to God]

The relation between the two orders of reality is ideational in nature. Its point of reference in man is the faculty of understanding. As organ and repository of knowledge, the understanding includes all the gnoseological functions, such as memory, imagination, reasoning, observation, intuition, apprehension, etc. all humans are endowed with understanding. Their endowment is strong enough to understand the will of God in either or both of the following ways; When that will is expressed in words, directly by God to man; and when, as the pattern of God in creation, or "the laws of nature," the divine will is deducible through observation of creation.

C. TELEOLOGY

The nature of the cosmos is teleological; that is, purposive, serving a purpose of its Creator, and doing so out of design. The world has not been created in vain, or in sport. It is not the work of chance, a happenstance. It is created in perfect condition. Everything that exists does so in a measure proper to it and fulfills a certain universal purpose. The world is indeed a "cosmos", an orderly creation, not a "chaos". In it, the will of the Creator is always realized. His pattern is fulfilled with the necessity of natural law. For they are innate in the way other than what the Creator has ordained for it. This is true of all creatures – except man. Human action is the only instance where the will of God is actualized not necessarily, but deliberately, freely, voluntarily. The physical and psychic functions of man are integral to nature, and as such they obey the laws pertinent to them with the same necessity as all other creatures. But the spiritual functions, viz., the understanding and moral action, fall outside the realm of determined nature. They depend upon their subject and follow his determination. Actualization of the divine will by them is of a qualitatively different value than necessary actualization by other creatures. Necessary fulfillment applies only to elemental or utilitarian values; free fulfillment, to the moral. However, the moral purposes of God, His commandments to man, do have a base in the physical world, and hence there is a utilitarian aspect to them. But this is not what gives them their distinctive quality, namely, that of being moral. It is precisely their aspect of being fulfillable in freedom, that is, the possibility of being fulfilled or violated remaining always open, that gives them the special dignity we ascribe to things "moral".

D. CAPACITY OF MAN AND MALLEABILITY OF NATURE

Since everything was created for a purpose – the realization of that purpose must be possible in space and time. Otherwise, there is no escape from cynicism. Creation itself, the processes of space and time, would lose their meaning and significance. Without this possibility, *taklif*, or moral obligation, falls to the ground; and with its fall, either God’s purposiveness or His might is destroyed. Realization of the absolute, namely, the divine *raison d’être* of creation, must be possible in history, that is, within the process of time between creation and the Day of judgements. As subject of moral action, man must therefore be capable of changing himself, his fellows or society, nature of his environment, so as to actualize the divine pattern, or commandment, in himself as well as in them. As object of moral action, man as well as his fellows and environment must all be capable of receiving the efficacious action of man, the subject. This capacity is the conserve of man’s moral capacity for action as subject. Without it, man’s capacity for moral action would be impossible and the purposive nature of the universe would collapse. Again, there would no recourse from cynicism. For creation to have a purpose – and this is a necessary assumption if God is God and His work is not a meaningless *travail de singe* - creation must be malleable, transformable, capable of changing its substance, structure, conditions and relations so as to embody or concretize the human pattern or purpose, this at once true to all creation, including man’s physical, psychic, and spiritual nature. All creation is capable of realization of ought-to-be, or the will or pattern of God, or the absolute in this space and in thus time.

E. RESPONSIBILITY AND JUDGEMENT

We have seen that man stands under the obligation to change himself, society and environment so as to confirm with the divine pattern. We have also seen that he is capable of doing so, since creation is malleable and capable of receiving his action and embodying its purpose. It follows from these facts that man is responsible. Moral obligation is impossible without responsibility or reckoning. Unless man is responsible, and somehow and somewhere he will be reckoned with as far as his deeds are concerned, cynicism becomes once more inevitable. Judgement, or the consummation of responsibility, is the necessary condition of moral obligation, or moral imperativeness. It flows from the very nature of “normativeness”. It is immaterial whether reckoning takes place in space-time or at end of it or both; but it must take place. To obey God, i.e. to realize His commandments and actualize His pattern, is to incur *falah* or success, happiness and ease. Not to do so, i.e., to disobey Him, is to incur punishment, suffering, unhappiness, and the agonies of failure.

The foregoing five principles are self-evident truths. They constitute the core of *Tawhid* and the quintessence of Islam. They are equally the core of *Hanifism*, of all the

revelations that come from heaven. All the prophets have taught these principles and built their movements upon them. Equally, these principles are built by God into the very fabric of human nature, constituting an unerring natural religion or natural conscience upon which human acquired knowledge, as contrasted with revealed knowledge, rest. Naturally, all Islamic culture is built upon them. Together, as the core of *tawhid*, they have served as ultimate base for all Islamic knowledge, personal and social ethics, esthetics and Muslim life and action throughout history.

CONCLUSION

The essence of religious experience in Islam, we may say in conclusion, is the realization that life is not in vain; that it must serve a purpose the nature of which cannot be identical with the natural flow of appetite to satisfaction to new appetite and new satisfaction. For the Muslim, finality consist of two utterly disparate orders, the natural and the transcendent; and it is to the latter that he looks for the values by which to govern the flow of the former. Having identified the transcendent realm as God, he rules out any guidance of action that does not proceed therefrom. His rigorous *Tawhid* (or unization of divinity) is, in final analysis, a refusal to subject human life to any guidance other than the ethical. Hedonism, eudaemonism and all other theories which find moral value in the very process of natural life are his *bête noire*. In his view, to accept any of them is to set up other gods besides God as guide and norm of human action. *Shirk*, or association of other gods with God is really the mixing up of the moral values with the elemental and utilitarian which are all instrumental and never final.

To be a Muslim is precisely to perceive God alone that is, the Creator , and not nature or the creature as normative, His will alone as commandment, His pattern alone as constituting the ethical desiderata of creation. The content of the Muslim's vision is truth, beauty and goodness; but these for him are not beyond the pale of his noetic faculties. He is therefore an axiologist in his religious disciplines of exegesis, but only to the end of reaching a sound deontology, as a jurist. Justification by faith is for him meaningless, unless it is the simple introduction into the arena of action. It is there that he claims his best, as well as his worst. For he knows that as man, he stands alone between heaven and earth with none but his axiological vision to show the road, his will to commit his energies to the task and his conscience to guard against pitfalls. His prerogative is to lead the life of cosmic danger; for no God is there to do the job for him. Not only is the job done if and when he has done it for himself, but he cannot withdraw. His predicament, if he has any by nature, is that he must carry the divine trust to complete realization or perish, as a Muslim, in the process. Surely tragedy lurks behind

every corner in his path. But that is also his pride. As Plato had put it, he is “doomed to love the good”.

CHAPTER II

TAWHID: THE QUINTESENCE OF ISLAM

I. THE IMPORTANCE OF TAWHID

There can be no doubt that the essence of Islamic Civilization is Islam; or that the essence of Islam is *tawhid* or unization of God, the act of affirming Allah to be the One, the absolute, transcendent Creator, the Lord and Master of all that is.

These two fundamental premises are self-evident, not subject to doubt by those who belonged to Islamic Civilization or participated in it. And only very recently have missionaries, orientalist and other enemies of Islam subjected them to doubt. However, it is for us, Muslims, self-evident that Islam, Islamic culture and Islamic civilization to have a knowledge essence, namely *tawhid*, which is cap[able of analysis and description. Analysis of *tawhid* as essence, i.e., as first determining principle of Islam, its culture and civilization, is indeed the subject of this chapter.

Tawhid is that which gives Islamic civilization its identity, which binds all its constituents together and thus makes of them an integral, organic body which we call civilization. In binding disparate elements together, the essence of civilization – in this case, *tawhid* – impresses them by its own mould. It recasts them so as to harmonize with and mutually support other elements. Without necessarily changing their natures, the essence transforms the elements making up a civilization, giving them their new character as constitutive of that civilization. The degree of transformation may vary from slight to radical. It is slight when it affects their form, and radical when it affects their function; for it is the latter that constitutes their relevance to the essence. That is why the Muslims developed the science of *ilm al tawhid* and assumed under it the disciplines of logic, epistemology, metaphysics and ethics.

Allah ta ‘ala has said: “I have not created jinn and mankind except to serve me.....And to every people we sent a prophet to convey to them that they ought to serve Allah and avoid *al-taghut*... Your Lord has decreed that you shall serve none but Him. Serve Allah and do not associate aught with Him... Come, let me tell you what your Lord has forbidden you; namely, that you do not associate aught with him.”

These verses from the Holy Qur’an clearly indicate that the very purpose of man’s creation is the service of God alone. Only God is worthy of worship; only He is worthy of service. His “Face,” i.e., His sake should be the end of all human action. This is the

essence of the whole message of our Prophet Muhammad (S.A.W), which he could hardly express but in the words of God: "Come, let me tell you what your Lord has forbidden you; namely that you do not associate with Him."

That *tawhid* is the highest and the most important commandment of God is evidenced by the fact of God's promise to forgive all sin but the violation of *Tawhid*. "Allah will not forgive any associating of other gods with Him. Whoever associates aught with Allah, has perpetrated a very grave sin." Obviously, no commandment in Islam would hold without *tawhid*. The whole religion itself, man's obligation to serve God, to fulfill His commandments and observe His prohibitions would fall to the ground the moment *tawhid* is violated. For, to violate *tawhid* is to doubt that Allah is the One and only God. But to do so means to assume that other beings may share His divinity. This cannot be done without doubting the obligatoriness of Allah's commandment. For if two or more gods were possible, it is logically necessary that one should seek an individual relation with his creation or his dependents; that one should rise above the other in mutual completion. Such gods would be of no avail to men unless one was to destroy or subjugate the others, for only then could he be the "ultimate" being the definition of "God" requires. Only an "ultimate" source could stand as the final good, the final authority, and the final principle. Otherwise, the authority of a subservient god of a god with whom there may be other gods would stand always open to question. That is why Allah *ta'ala* said in the Quran: "If in them (heaven and earth) there were other gods than Allah, they would have fallen into chaos. Nature cannot obey two masters: it cannot operate in orderly manner and be the cosmos it is if there were two or more sources of authority, two or more ultimate movers.

Without *tawhid*, therefore, there can be no Islam. Certain, not only the *sunnah* of our Prophet (S.A.W) would be subject to doubt, and its imperatives shaken; the very institution of prophecy would fall to the ground. The same doubt which pertains to the plural gods would apply to their messages. To hold on to the principle of *tawhid* is therefore the cornerstone of all piety, of all religiosity, all the virtue. Naturally, Allah *ta'ala* and His prophet have raised observance of Tawhid to the highest status and made it the cause of the greatest merit and reward. He said: "Those who believed and mixed not their *iman* ("faith") with injustice, to them belong security. They are the the rightly guided." Likewise, it was related by 'Ubadah ibn al-Samit that the Prophet of Allah (S.A.W) SAID: "Whoever witnesses that there is no God but Allah, alone, without associate, and that Muhammad is His servant and Apostle, that Isa (Jesus) is the servant of Allah and His apostle, His command unto Mary and of His spirit, that Paradise and Hell are true, Allah would on that account enter him into Paradise." This hadith was reported in both Sahihs which also recorded the report of 'Itban that the Prophet said:

“Allah will not permit to be consigned to Hell anyone who witnesses ‘There is no God but Allah,’ seeking thereby nothing but Allah’s face.” The Prophet (S.A.W.) is also reported by Sa’id al- Khudriyy as saying: “when Musa (Moses) asked Allah to teach him a prayer to recite whenever he remembered or called upon Him, Allah answered: “Say, O Musa, there is no God but Allah,” Musa said: “O Lord, all your servants say these words.” Allah said: “O Musa, if the seven heavens and all they hold, and the seven earths as well, if all these were weighed against this word of “There is no God but Allah,’ the latter would outweigh the former.” It is also reported by al Tirmidhi that Anas heard the Prophet of Allah (S.A.W.) say: “Allah said: ‘O Man! Were you to come to Me with all the bags of the world full of your sins, but with the witnessing that you associate naught with me, I would come to you with those bags full of mercy and forgiveness”.

It is no wonder therefore that the Muslim is definable by his adherence to *tawhid* by his profession of its *shahadah*, by his observance of the absolute unicity and transcendence of Allah as the ultimate principle of all creation, of all being and life, of all religion.

II. DIVINE TRANSCENDENCE IN JUDISM AND CHRISTIANITY

Being the youngest world religion and stemming from the same Semitic roots out of which Judaism and Christianity and previously emerged, Islam had to relate itself to these religions. It regarded them as it did itself. They and it constitute successive moments of Semitic consciousness in its long march as the carrier of a divine mission on earth and hence as the vortex of human history. While it thus identified with Judaism and Christianity, Islam found fault with them and sought to correct their historical manifestation. The error most grievous to Semitic consciousness and hence least pardonable in the eye of God (Qur’an 4:47, 155) Islam identified as that of misconceiving the transcendence of God. Judaism and Christianity, it asserted, have made themselves guilty of it; not in their primeval form, in the revelations they received from God, but in their historical form, in the texts they accepted as scripture and in their expression of their faith for the instruction of men.

I. ISLAM’S CRITICISM OF JUDAISM

Islam charged Judaism with speaking of God in the plural “Elohim” throughout the Torah; with claiming that the “Elohim” married the daughters of men (Genesis 6:2,4); that Jacob and his wife stole “the gods” of Laban because they cherished them (Genesis 31:32); that God is a ghost whom Jacob beheld “face to face” and with whom he had wrestled and nearly defeated (Genesis 33:24-30); that God was father of the Jewish King (Psalms 2:7; 89:26 II Samuel 7: 14; I Chronicles 17;13, etc.); that God was father of their

nation in a real sense (Hosea 1:10; Isaiah 9:6;63:14-16)which does not become invalid even by their “a-whoring” after other gods (Hosea 2:2-13). Islam also charged that the relation Judaism claimed to bind God to “His People” straight jacketed Him into granting them favors despite their immorality, their hardship and stiffneckedness (Deuteronomy 9:5-6). A “bound” god , bound in any sense or degree, is not the transcendent God of Semitic consciousness.

II. THE OFFENSE OF CHRISTIANITY

The offense of Christianity against transcendence was even greater. Islam charge Christianity with extending the non-transcendent CONCEPT OF God’s “fatherhood of the Jewish King” to Jesus and giving it, besides its moral signification of compliance with God’s commandments, the de-transcendentalizing ontological connotation of unity of substance between God and Jesus. Indeed, Christian catholicity defined itself in terms of this “substantial” identity of Jesus with God, as distinct from plurality of their “personalities”, characters and consciousness. Obviously, the source of this new departure from transcendence of the divine being within the Semitic stream was not the Jewish inheritance of Christianity. This had given Christianity the concepts, not their connotation. Neither was gnosticism the source of that departure, whose argument “If he suffered, he was not God; if he was God, he did not suffer” was hurled against their fellow-Christians in defense of transcendence. The source must be the non-Semitic influence of the “mystery religions.” It was from this source that Christianity derived its “suffering god” who saves by dying and returning to life and whose “mana” or grace is imparted to the communicant through sacrament.

This anti-transcendence influence on Christianity at its formative stage was partly responsible for its success among non-Semites unfamiliar with the notion of God as “totally –other.” It is equally responsible for the misinterpretation of innocent Hebrew and Aramaic concepts current among Jesus’ contemporaries. “ *Barnash*” or “bar-Adam” meant a well-bred and hence virtuous person. But it acquired in St. Paul a mysterious metaphysical dimension. Any righteous person could claim what Jesus did, namely, “ I and my father (God) are one.” In the sense of total compliance with God’s will. Christians, however, took this to mean that Jesus claimed divine status. Whereas “ Kurie, D. Kurios, Mr Mari and Maran were among Semites attributable to anyone in authority, Christians took this attribution to Jesus by his Sematic disciples as evidence of their assuming him to be God. Finally, Christian theologians, taking all these elements for granted searched the Hebrew scripture for evidence of plural divinity. With typical intellectual clumsiness, Augustine, Tertullian and many others thought they found in the plural pronounce of Genesis, “Let us create man according to our image” (Genesis 1:28) the evidence for three persons in the deity! This has remained a Christian “argument” to

the present day, held by such a notable thinker as Karl Barth. Indeed, Barth shamelessly claimed that maleness and femaleness were intrinsic to the divine nature because Genesis had reported immediately after the above mentioned statement, "Male and Female created He them" (Genesis 1:28). Since the former statement ends with the term "image", he thought, the latter statement must be in apposition to the term and hence indicating maleness and femaleness as constitutive of the divine image!!! Christians have committed themselves to divine non-transcendence so resolutely that it has become with them an *idee fixe*, enabling Paul Tillich to declare sub specie eternities that the transcendent God is unknown and unknowable unless he is concretized in an object of nature and history.

Since this was the state of "God's transcendence" in Christianity, the language expressing it was equally improper. Although Christians never ceased to claim that God is transcendent, they spoke of Him as a real man who walked on earth and did all things men do, including the suffering of the agonies of death. Of course, according to them, Jesus was both man and God. They never took a consistent position and Jesus' humanity of divinity without accusation of apostasy and heresy. That is why their language is always confusing, at best. When pinned down, every Christian will have to admit that hidden God is both transcendent and immanent. But his claim of transcendence is ipso facto devoid of grounds. To maintain the contrary, one has to give up the laws of logic. But Christianity was prepared to go to this length too. It raised "paradox" above self-evident truth and vested it with the status of an epistemological principle. But under such principle, anything can be asserted and discussion becomes idle. The Christian may not claim that the trinity as a way of talking about God; because if the trinity discloses the nature of God better than unity, a greater plurality would do the job better. At any rate, to reduce the "Holy Trinity" to a status of *in percipi* is heretical as it denies *una substantia* as metaphysical doctrine.

III. DIVINE TRANSCENDENCE IN ISLAM

A world of difference separates Islam from Judaism and Christianity on this question. Islam declares the transcendence of God to be everybody's business. It asserts that God has created all humans capable of knowing Him in His transcendence. This is an innate endowment, a *fitrah* or *senses communis*, which all humans share. Its nature is that of a faculty with which humans recognize divine intimacy, unity and transcendence. Islam thus tolerates no discrimination *à la* handout between humans who may contemplate the Absolute in its transcendence and those who may perceive Him only through other gods or idols. Since recognition of divine transcendence is something innate of humanity and hence necessary, Islam attributes all departures from that norm to nurture and history. Forgetfulness, mental laziness, passion and vested interest, Islam explains, are

the causes of such aberration which is passed from culture from culture, and generation to generation that “There is no God but God” which the Muslim understands as denial of any associates to God in His rulership and judgeship of the universe, as well as a denial of the possibility for any creature to represent, personify or in any way express the divine Being. The Quran says of God that “He is the Creator of heaven and earth Who creates by commanding the creature to be and it is...He is the One God, the ultimate... (2:117, 163). There is no God but He, ever-living, ever-active (3:2). May He be glorified beyond any description! (6:100)... No sense may perceive Him (6:103)... Praised be He, the Transcendent Who greatly transcendent all claims and reports about Him” (17:43) In fulfillment of this view, the Muslims have been all too careful never to associate in any manner possible, any image or things with the presence of the divine, or with their consciousness of the divine; and in their speech and writing about the divine never to use except Qur’anic language, terms and expressions which, according to them, God had used about Himself in the Qur’anic revelation. (al Faruqi 1982: 26-27).

4. Al-Faruqi’s style

Faruqi’s treatment of *tawhid* is philosophical, elegant and with powerful logical arguments.

Powerful and original and sophisticated.

Contrasts *tawhid* with the claims of monotheism of other religions, and anthropomorphism.

Tawhid permeates Muslim culture, personality and society first through the concept of uluhiyyah, rububiyah; then via the channels of ibadah, ubudiyah to Allah, making taqwa to permeate all human actions to the comprehensive scope of the *shari’ah* and the holistic, totalistic message of Prophetic sunnah.

His knowledge of comparative religions enables him to compare Islamic monotheism with Indian religiosity and Hellenic religiosity.

1. In *Tawhid* as the principle of history, (p.40) the believers following The example of the Prophet and his companions seek to establish a new world order based on the ethics of righteous action. “Disturbing of the flow of

space-time, or transformation of creation, therefore, is expected of the *engage* Muslim...[if not] it is doomed as unethical egocentrism.” (40)

2. *Tawhid* as the principle of knowledge is the recognition that Allah, the Truth (*al-Haqq*) is, that the truth is indeed knowable, and skepticism which denies this truth is the opposite of *tawhid*. *Iman*, therefore, not just an ethical category, but is firstly a cognitive category. The unity of God implies the unity of truth. The translation of *la ilaha illa'Llah* is translated as “There is no God but God” could be better translated as “There is no object of worship other than the One True God”. The unity of truth also means the unity and harmony of the two sources of truth, revelation and reason. The capability to know the truth is made possible by the *fitrah* that is inherent in all human beings.
3. *Tawhid* as the principle of metaphysics (pp 58-69), presents a cosmology that is sharply contrasted with the Hindu and Christian cosmologies. Nature in the cosmology of *Tawhid*, using his words, is completely “prophanised” and “secularized”, that is, it is entirely God’s creation under the control and authority of only the One True God. It is a “Divine Manor” in which man as the “good land-tenant” has to develop as a theater for unfolding his ethical responsibilities via good management of his Master’s property. (al Faruqi 1982: 68)
4. *Tawhid* as the principle of ethics presents Faruqi’s conception of Islamic humanism differentiated from the humanism of the Greeks, Christianity, Hinduism and Buddhism; the concepts of actionalism, ummatism, universalism, life and world-affirmation. (al Faruqi 1982: 70-97)
5. *Tawhid* as the principle of social order presents the unique social system as distinguished from all other social systems.

5. Conclusion

By making *Tawhid* as the principle of the *Ummah*; the principle of the Family; the principle of Political Order; the principle of the Economic Order; the principle of World Order and the principle of Esthetics. Faruqi's completes the **scope** and **force** of *Tawhid* in human life, coloring all the above aspects with the transcendent ethics of *ubudiyah, khilafah, amanah* and *risalah, culminating in the Ummah, the social and political order of Islam. In his original, novel, elegant and philosophical style, Faruqi's book is indeed a major intellectual contribution in the contemporary discourse on Tawhid from a scholar who knew the philosophies and religions of his time very profoundly, thanks to his early education, and an intellectual activist of the highest caliber motivated by the spirit of jihad fi sabili'Llah. May Allah SWT bless him and his wife with the highest status in al-jannah and in the sight of Allah S.W.T.*

6. Al-Faruqi's Concept of an Islamic University (Article written by him and sent to Dr. Mahathir Mohammad on 25 March 1982. Dr. Mahathir Mohammad then sent this article to the Coordinating Committee for the Establishment of I.I.U.M OF THE Ministry of Education, headed by the Minister of Education at that time, Dr. Sulaiman Daud. The copy has been in my possession since 1990 and has not been made public until now.)

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ISLAMIC THOUGHT

323 BENT ROAD WYNCOTE, PENNSYLVANIA 19095 U.S.A.

TOWARD AN ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY

Shawwal 1401
August 1981

by:
Isma'il Raji al Faruqi

TOWARD AN ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY

1. ON THE NATURE OF AN ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY

A. The Raison d’Etre:

As an autonomous, financially-independent legal body or corporation of students and teachers totally dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge, the “university” is an Islamic invention. It spread throughout the Muslim World under the name of “madrasah” or “kulliyah” in the Third Century A.H. It was constituted as a waqf enjoying full legal personality. The mutawalli or manager of the waqf properties was accountable to the grand Shaykh of the madrasah and to the Supreme Justice of the land. Besides the lands and buildings used by the madrasah to house classrooms, workshops, faculty residences and student dormitories, the holdings of the waqf included many other properties whose income covered the university budget. The purpose for which the university was created as an autonomous waqf, and hence as the first corporate legal personality in Islam, was to satisfy the Islamic need for total dedication to the cause of knowledge and its pursuit as a fard kifayah of the ummah. It was thought that if the ummah was to be felicitous, some of its members ought to be freed from economic need and granted full autonomy over their efforts to seek knowledge for the sake of Allah (SWT) alone.

The legal personality and corporate autonomy of the Islamic university today must be the same as in the past. However, the Islamic university of today may be helped by a Muslim government to stand on its feet, as Nizam al Mull had helped the Nizamiyyah system of madrasahs in the past. This notwithstanding, the process should be incepted to bring about financial independence as soon as possible. Far more significant is the variance from its past predecessors which characterises the academic tasks of the Islamic university today.

The goals of the Islamic university today should be as follows:

1. The legacy of Divine and Human Learning
 - a. To understand and appropriate the truths of revelation conveyed and preserved in the Holy Qur'an and the Sunnah.
 - b. To understand and appropriate the knowledge developed by the legacy of Islamic learning in all fields.
 - c. To understand and appropriate the knowledge developed by mankind in modern times in all fields.
2. The Ummah and Its Problems
 - a. To understand and substantiate the causes and effects of Muslim decay.
 - b. To understand and substantiate the present realities of the ummah in all aspects of its existence.
 - c. To understand and substantiate the problems affecting Muslim life in all areas of endeavour.
3. The present Relevance of Islam
 - a. To discover and articulate the relevance of Islam to every field of human knowledge and action.
 - b. To translate the relevance of Islam into methodological precepts for the understanding and practical prescriptions for action.
 - c. To devise and establish plans for the ready use of present Muslims enabling them to solve their problems and actualize the values of Islam.
4. Islam and the World
 - a. To understand and substantiate the present realities and problems of non-Muslims around the world.
 - b. To discover, establish and translate into programs of decision and action the relevance of Islam to the present and future of non-Muslims.
5. Raising Islamic Muslims
 - a. To educate Muslim men and women and develop in them the intellectual and emotional capacities requisite for undertaking pursuit of the above-mentioned goals.

- b. To train Muslims in the arts of transforming themselves and humanity into instruments of the divine will, bringing about a fuller actualization of the divine purpose in history.
6. Legacy enrichment and Preservation
- a. To provide the necessary services enabling Muslim scholars and artists to articulate and express, respectively, the spirit and movement of Islam.
 - b. To record and to preserve the works of the Islamic spirit through history.
- B. The Content and Method of Islamic Thought
1. No polarity of intellectual and moral

The Islamic universities of the past regarded themselves as institutions endowed with intellectual as well as moral tasks at the same time. Development of the intellect as well as of the moral character of their students were goals which they pursued simultaneously. This double objective flowed directly from the Islamic perspective. The truth is one, and knowledge of it is one; just as God is one. Hence, intellectual of theoretical truth cannot be separated from moral or practical truth except in abstracto. In reality, the data which are object of theoretical investigation are themselves equally object of practical examination. The effect of the former, namely, understanding, and the effect of the latter, namely, evaluating or “appropriating”, constitute one goal, and the process leading to it is one and the same. Indeed, the very perception of the object is not possible without apprehension of its value. To know that this object is a fruit is to perceive the chemical, botanical, historical properties of it as well as its place in the ecological web or system of purposes of creation, and hence, of its value for plant, animal and human life. Man’s study of himself, of others, and of creation, must, if it is Islamic, include both the theoretical and axiological aspects. Only then will its acquisition constitute “wisdom” which is always a combination of the two kinds of knowledge – the theoretical and axiological.

Beginning in the Sixteenth Century A.C., this unity of truth and of knowledge of the truth was broken in the West because the rise of Western science came in defiance of the magisterium of the Church. In pursuit of liberating the sciences of nature from the oppression of the Church, Western man sought and found liberation of his own spirit. Church dominion was challenged and it declined further when the sciences of society adopted the methodology of the natural sciences. Again, the purpose was to liberate them from oppressive Church ideals. More recently, the humanities followed the same course; and the Church jurisdiction was reduced to practically nothing. The natural and social sciences monopolized the truth, claiming that only the scientific methodology they professed is objective, critically rational, and hence capable of yielding the truth. The humanities disciplines were the realm of taste, of opinion, of

personal subjectivity concerning which no disputing and no critical evidence was possible. Thus, Western universities began to claim that theirs was a purely intellectual operation, absolutely detached from moral considerations; that the student's intellectual achievement was separate from and independent of his moral character and conduct. Western professors gradually lost all interest in the personal vision, faith and conduct of their students.

Since this Western division of the sciences rests in final analysis on faulty epistemology, it cannot be followed by the Islamic university. And since it is the effect of a strife between the men of science and the Church, there is nothing in it for Muslims to emulate. In its purview, theoretical truth and moral value are inseparable. Its diploma must always be a certification of both. In developing the total person, the Islamic university seeks to guide both the intellect and the will. Thus, its social sciences, natural sciences and its humanities disciplines will present and examine data as well as their values. All will be equally subject to critical analysis on both the theoretical and axiological scales; and, when treated in this manner, all of them will yield truths of equal validity.

2. No Polarity Between Reason and Revelation.

The dichotomy of knowledge between 'ulum 'aqliyyah and 'ulum naqliyyah' is false. It began with al Farabi and was maintained and defended by the philosophers down to Ibn Khaldun, their purpose being to raise themselves and their activity above the mutakallimun, and thus to justify themselves in society. In an age of weakness, later, the mutakallimun conceded the point and began to defend it themselves. Under Tasawwuf, the dichotomy became absolute, a logical necessity of learning as the Sufis conceived of it. Unfortunately, their view dominated the scene in the Muslim world for several centuries. Today, we are heirs to this bungling.

That knowledge is either naqli or 'aqli, implies that the truth which revelation had brought is not 'aqli, and hence irrational and dogmatic. This is inimical to the core and spirit of Islam. The latter holds that all claims to the truth are arguable, subject to evidence, and productive of yag'in or apodoectic certainty. Even the deniers of the main theses of religion have had their claims analysed and examined in the Qur'an, not summarily dismissed as evil. The Qur'an argued with their adherents, invited them to show their evidence. It castigated them as irrational, untoughtful or incoherent, when they failed to answer the data involved in the claims, for the truth differs from one discipline to another. But the "reasonableness" means the agreement claims is one and the same. This "reasonableness" means the agreement of the claim with the rules of logic or internal coherence with other knowledge; with the laws of metaphysics or correspondence with reality; or with the laws of axiology which are testable in the apprehension of value in experience.

The unity of Allah (SWT), and the consequent unity of truth and knowledge, demand no separation of reason from revelation. The empirical findings of the 'ulum

naqliyyah can only corroborate the apriori findings of the ‘ulum ‘aqliyyah. Certainly, discrepancies and contradictions between them will appear. But Islamic epistemology holds such to be temporary; i.e. capable of dismissal or composition with either repeated examination and testing of the empirical data, or repeated examination of the apriori dicta. Human knowledge is indeed susceptible to error, whether it is knowledge of data in nature, or of dicta revealed by Allah ta’ala. Correction in either case is never a correction of the data, but of the human, historical understanding of them. What is inimical to Islam and its epistemology, is to hold – like the theologians of other faiths – that contradiction between reason and revelation is ultimate, forever insoluble, because the one is rational and the other is not; because there are no higher principles of reason or of reality in terms of which the contradictions of reason and revelation can be composed. The other faiths have “dogmatic theologies” precisely because they need them as elaborations of teachings utterly unacceptable to reason or common sense. Such theologies affirm propositions which go counter to reason and shame it into submission. St. Paul called these affirmations “foolishness” because they stand beyond proof. Men are invited to accept them as a sort of wager over the unknowable, to use expression of Pascal.

To the question, Why did the Beneficent, Omnipotent God place us humans in such predicament where the most important truths of life have to pass as occult qualities, the dogmatic religions answer that the predicament is necessary however tragic it may be. Christians answer that the predicament is necessary for God to undertake the divine drama of salvation; and Hindus and Buddhists that it is an aberration which happened to the Absolute inexplicably.

In the Islamic university, therefore, the science of nature, cosmos and society are pursued freely, and their claims are followed wherever the evidence and the data may take them. This is done in the confidence, not that their course is separate from that of religion, jurisprudence, law, ethics, literature, but that they will never vary from or contradict them in ultimate manner. The same is true, vice versa; i.e., that revelation will never contradict the findings of the sciences without possibility of solution being ever possible. Being absolutely beneficent, absolutely reasonable, and absolutely just, Allah (SWT) is not a trickster God playing games; nor an impotent absolute to whom undesirable things happen.

3. No Polarity of Individual and Society

The division of the sciences of man into those which study the individual and those which study society, was initiated by Auguste Comte and developed in the Nineteenth Century. It was not merely a division of the data among specialists, a sort of division of labor. Rather it was the consequence of a theory of truth which regarded the social data as capable of “scientific” treatment, and those of the individual, otherwise. It was thought, but erroneously, that the former data were subject to critical examination, and hence capable of leading to the truth; that the latter were not and hence, that they were incapable of leading the investigator to the truth. The reason

behind this faulty assumption is that the social data are observable by sense, isolable from other data, quantifiable and measurable, not unlike the data of the natural sciences. On the other hand, it was assumed that the data of the individual are subjective, ineffable, not given to sense, falling within the realm of feeling and personal conscience. Hence, they are futile to dispute and impossible to prove. Social data were then defined by the social scientists to prove this assumption taken beforehand. Underlying their stand, was the assumption that only what is given to sense is verifiable and hence subject to the test of truth.

Thus, social data reduced deliberately to the external or visible behaviour of the group. Although the group is in fact made of individuals, yet only that individual behaviour which is consistent with the group is subject of social science, and so only in so far as it is part of group behaviour. The invisible (not given to sense) apriori data which determine overt or visible behavior pass the social sciences as “=X”, not subject to analysis or criticism. Deliberately, the social sciences refused to develop the tools of research and analysis required if the apriori data were to be included in the investigation.

Their mistake, or fallacy, was that of an undue reduction of the field of social knowledge. First, society does indeed include the apriori as well as the empirical elements in its make-up and behavior. Without first principles and values acting as first determinants and goals, there can be no social behavior at all. It is therefore a reductionist claim to think one can understand group behavior without them. The social scientist's view of society is therefore that of a truncated reality. Second, of all the reality of self and of the self's behavior, that which is of any significance at all is certainly societal, whether by determination of consequence are perhaps the sleeping hours of the night or the dreaming hours of the day, and hence irrelevant to the understanding of self. Indeed, it is even doubtful whether sleeping or day-dreaming do intact fall outside the societal mill.

Islam does not recognise the polarity of individual and society as legitimate. Accordingly, it does not acknowledge any need to divide knowledge into humanities and social sciences. All the disciplines which study man are one in their method and ultimate purpose. Their method is rational, scientific and critical without having to limit the data to what is sensory. Their ultimate purpose is to enlighten man about himself, to show him what of the divine pattern applies to him in a given situation, how its actualization may be brought about and accomplished. Hence, the disciplines in the Islamic university do not follow the divisions of the Western university. Division of the disciplines can follow only a division of the materials to be studied; and it can amount to no more than a division of labor. The professional schools (namely, medicine, pharmacy, dentistry, nursing and the allied health sciences; engineering, the applied arts, business and agriculture) teach the hows of action in their respective fields. Besides them, the disciplines are all rational, scientific, objective as to method. They are all ummatic as to their goals and objectives. The goals of humanity are what the

revelation has given. No discipline can escape from the burden of articulating them in the given situations, of specifying their relevance to every investigation of devising ways for their actualization, and of monitoring that actualization with a view to maximizing it.

II. THE MORAL FIBER

The strongest possible moral fiber and the highest possible runs through the Islamic university, ennobling every activity and every moment of its life. The Islamic university runs on the honor system in all its dealings with students and faculty. Tirelessly, this theme should be repeated everywhere and on every occasion that the Islamic university is an institution of a different sort, an unusual corporation founded solely on virtue and whose life and energy are all devoted to virtue. The purpose is to make virtue a second nature to all persons connected with the university. Living in a student dormitory, eating in a university dining hall, participating in extra-curricular activities all these provide so many opportunities to breed good manners and virtue, to ingrain them in the personality of the student. A code of conduct must be prepared, promulgated and enforced on the strictest terms.

To help the student live up to this high moral standard, he must be assigned to another student who has an advantage of seniority in age, class or experience; or who is a graduate of special training sessions organized precisely for that reason, as his responsibility. This is a desirable fulfilment of the hadith “Everyone is a shepherd, ra’iyyat in the university code of morals, along with assisting him to get oriented and solve his personal problems. This is a personal relationship, meant to complement the other relationships of ra’iyyat to ra’l in which the student may stand, such as the ra’iyyat of the dormitory, of the dining table, of the athletic team, the recreational activity, etc.

The Islamic university should institute uniforms to be worn by all students, faculty and administrators, which will be becoming, comfortable and fulfilling Islamic requirements. It should establish a code of physical appearance and enforce its observance by all.

Islam is the only religion in history which concerns itself with manners so strongly that it included them in the Scripture as God’s commandments. The Prophet (SAAS) devoted a great portion of his effort to teach his companions (RAA) the new manners of Islam. He was the best exemplification of those manners. “My Lord has disciplined me; and He disciplined me well”, he used to say. Noble manners and moral disposition are the Muslim’s distinctive life-style, his culture and refinement, his humanity. To be a member of the Islamic university must mean to belong in the company of the pupils of the Prophet (SAAS).

III. FACULTY-STUDENT CONTACT

We have already seen that Islamic education stands on two fundamental principles, namely, development of the intellect, and development of the will. Islamic education is the acquisition of both knowledge and virtue. While knowledge is pre-eminently acquired in the faculty-student meeting in the class room, and the student's reading and study in the library, virtue is pre-eminently acquired in the faculty-student meeting outside the classroom. The two avenues are not mutually exclusive and they overlap in many instances. The conduct of the teacher in the classroom is not expected merely to convey knowledge. It is equally expected to exemplify the ideal attitude of mind toward truth and knowledge which Islam professes. Humility before Allah (SWT) and constant awareness that one's knowledge is limited; enthusiastic openness to new knowledge and acceptance of new evidence; exacting scholarship and attention to detail; unbending will to perfection; sympathetic appreciation of the opposing point of view; insatiable intellectual curiosity; appreciation of sound argument and every good point made; scrupulous criticality of judgement; intellectual and emotional patience or hilm; unshakeable optimism in the ultimate victory of truth; indubitable faith in the eternal prevalence of Islam.

Moral virtue is equally expected to be exemplified by the faculty member of the Islamic university. He is to be the *uswah hasanah* for the student, as well as the *shahid* over the student's performance. This necessitates the entry of both student and teacher into relations and situations where moral values may be exemplified. Their contact therefore must not be limited to the classroom. Faculty and students are expected to live together on the university campus; to eat their meals together; to engage in meaningful discourse all the time. The Islamic university would institute for them social and recreational programs in which they participate together. If the faculty member is married and has a family, his home ought to be "open house" to students and colleagues one established afternoon or evening a week. No occasion should be lost for teacher and student to rub shoulders and brain together. Both should learn that the pursuit of knowledge is a higher order of brotherhood to look up to and desire to join, forever too be worthy of. The student, especially, should learn to respect and honor the teacher, to want to emulate him. The teacher's life, therefore, must be pure example, dedication to the cause of the university, and fulfilment of the divine imperatives.

IV. THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR

The colonial administrations have established throughout the Muslim World the academic calendar of the West. Although the colonial masters have gone away, yet their legacy in education continues. The Western educational calendar which begins in the fall and ends in the spring, leaving the whole summer free of academic work, was dictated by the climatic conditions of Northern Europe and its agricultural need to bring in the harvest at the shortest possible time. The season being so short and threatened with unpredictable storms, everybody had to be conscripted to help bring in the harvest –including the students and all children. Mechanization has rendered the system obsolete even in Europe. For Muslims to continue to observe it is evidence of shameless absence of pride and self-consciousness.

Likewise, the colonial administration has imposed upon us the Sabbath institution which we continue to observe even when we have changed their Sunday into our Friday. The Sabbath is originally a Jewish idea, inherited by Christianity through its foundation in the Bible. Islam does not countenance it at all. In its view, since total time is serious and the Muslim is expected to be engaged in his vicegerency of God throughout his life, every day is holy and no day is special. Yawm al Jumu'ah is the day when the congregational prayer is a fard. Once the salat is finished, the Muslims are expected to strike out in the world and seek Allah's bounty; that is, to work. The Muslim's sojourn on earth is too serious to be interrupted by holidays. Certainly, he is entitled to rest and to recreate himself everyday, or whenever he needs. But a holy day instituted to be spent in nothing or idle waste is a cynical defiance of the divine imperative.

The Islamic university will therefore have a calendar based on seven days a week, throughout the calendar year. Friday will not be a holiday, but a day with different programming than to the other days. The academic year will consist of three trimesters. Each trimester consists of 13 weeks of class meetings, followed by two weeks of reading period and with one week of final examinations. One week separates one trimester from another, enabling faculty and students to visit their families and prepare for the coming trimester.

The Islamic day begins with Salat al Fajr. Class meetings would be scheduled between fajr and zuhr. The afternoons will be devoted to reading and extra-curricular activities. Six days a week, there will be three class sessions of 90 minutes each. The advantages of the Islamic calendar are obvious: early rising and doing the most strenuous brain work right after the long sleep and rest of night; achievement of double the teacher-student contact time of the American university, and hopefully, trebling the achievement in learning.

V. THE SYLLABUS

At least for this generation of Muslims, the Islamic university is a novel idea. Until it has trained a full faculty, produced a library of new and adequate textbooks, and

established a tradition of scholarship, it must depend in its teaching on an established syllabus for every course to guarantee attainment of the required knowledge on the part of the student. A clearly defined syllabus will for sometime remain the best assurance against aberration of either student or teacher. The final examination must be based upon the syllabus and cover all its materials.

The syllabus ought to contain in outline all the materials to be taught in the course. It ought to include all the readings the student is expected to complete; and these should be classified as “essential”, “complementary” and “required for excellence”. In the absence of proper textbooks, the readings will consist of anthologies prepared ad hoc and giving the student the best available literature on the subject. These readings would be translated where necessary, introductions prepared for them, duplicated and given to the students to read. For every course of instruction, a committee of competent scholars ought to be assigned the task of drawing up the syllabus, bearing in mind the following requirements:

1. The theory of the discipline, including its principles and methodology.
2. The history of the discipline, its past accomplishments and its place in the history of knowledge.
3. The central concerns of the discipline; its problems and themes.
4. Islam’s position on the above-mentioned items, as given in or deduced from the sources (Qur’an and Sunnah) and the legacy of Islamic learning.
5. Critical analysis of all a/m items; systematic examination of the answers – western and Islamic – as to their present viability, as to the value of their contribution to the problems of humanity.

The first three requirements are relatively easy to satisfy. The professor teaching the discipline will have the answers and the literature elaborating them ready to hand if he has majored in that discipline. The difficulty lies in the fourth requirement; and without its satisfaction, the fifth requirement becomes impossible. It is hence in the preparation of the fourth requirement that the Islamic university ought to concentrate its resources which would be shifted to satisfaction of the fifth requirement as soon as the fourth has been adequately satisfied. Until this is done, it is possible to proceed with items 1, 2 and 3. In cooperation with the students acting as a group, the teacher might raise the questions of the fourth requirement and seek tentative answers to them from his general knowledge of the Islamic sources and learning tradition. In this, one teacher could be assisted by another (or more teachers) whose specialization falls within the realm of the Islamic tradition. In doing this, the students must be taught that the operation is tentative, that the answers are not final. This procedure may arouse in them the will to seek further knowledge through their own researches into the Islamic tradition. In this event, the fifth requirement may be attempted with humility. Pedagogically, it is not at all objectionable – rather it is recommendable – to make the student a co-researcher with the teacher. The only condition is that the teacher be more knowledgeable than the student and that he teaches him the “ethics”

of academic research and the desirability of articulating and re-crystallizing the relevance of Islam to our lives and problems.

VI. THE CURRICULUM

A. Distribution

1. The 'Alimiyyah Problem

The curriculum of the 'Alimiyyah program consists of four years: a "lower" or "intermediate" division of two years, and an "upper" or "senior" division of two years. To graduate in the 'Alimiyyah program the student would have to satisfy three kinds of requirements:

a. Islamic Requirements:

These consist of three disciplines:

"Islamic Sources: covers the Qur'an, the Hadith and their disciplines. In the upper division, source works in Fiqh and Usul al Fiqh may be added.

b. "Islamic Civilization" covers the principles of the Islamic faith in the first year; its comparison with other faiths and civilizations in the third; and its application to modern issues in the fourth.

General Requirements:

these consist of all the other disciplines taught by the university in the 'Alimiyyah Program.

c. Departmental Requirements:

These consist of the courses of study given in any department of the University in which the student wishes to major.

The three requirements are equal in value, each occupying one third of the total credits obtainable in four continuous years of attendance at the university.

2. The Faqahah Program

The curriculum of the Faqahah Program consists of three years of residence, distributed as follows:

One full years residence in the study of the major discipline

two terms' residence in the study of a minor discipline;

two terms' residence in the study of another language;

two terms' residence in the preparation of a dissertation.

3. The Hikmah Program

The curriculum of the Hikmah Program consists of three years of residence beyond the Faqahah degree, distributed as follows:

One full year's residence in the study of the major discipline

One full year's residence in the study of a first and second minor disciplines associated with the topic of the dissertation.

One full year's residence in the preparation of the doctoral (hikmah) dissertation.

4. The Professional Programs

The curricula of the professional schools of the Islamic university would be determined by their respective faculties. However, all candidates entering the professional schools will have obtained the 'Alimiyyah degree granted by it.

B. Islamicity

The Islamic nature of the university affects the curriculum in two significant ways. First, it is the rationale for devoting one full third of all credits in the 'Alimiyyah Program to Islamic requirements. Since all students in the university are expected to graduate with the 'Alimiyyah degree before proceeding to graduate or professional schools, this training in Islamic studies will provide an adequate foundation of Islamic knowledge to all students. Besides a fair command of the Islamic sources and a working knowledge of Arabic enabling the student to seek further Islamic knowledge at will, the "Islamic Requirement" (through the course in Islamic civilization) provides the student with a college-level perspective on Islam, its history, principles and values, and its place in the history of mankind. It is hoped that this would immunize him against all alien ideologies, and enable him to experience Islam as the only viable and best option for himself and humanity.

The second way in which the Islamicity of the university affects the curriculum that every discipline taught at the university will have revised its theory and principles, its methodology and objectives, so as to make them accord with the methodology and purposes of Islam. The discipline will therefore constitute facets in an integral whole of Islamic knowledge, enriching the perspective of Islam and contributing in an Islamic way proper to that discipline to fulfilment of the divine purpose. The disciplinarian of the Islamic university will therefore perform his share in remolding creation so as to actualize the divine patterns proper in his area of specialization.

