

Islam: Synthesis of Tradition and Change

B. H. Siddiqui

‘ ‘ T he ultimate spiritual basis of life, as conceived by Islam, is eternal and reveals itself in variety and change. A society based on such a conception of Reality must reconcile in its life the categories of permanence and change. It must possess eternal principles to regulate its collective life; for the eternal gives us a foothold in the world of perpetual change. But eternal principles when they are understood to exclude all possibilities of change which, according to the Qur’an is one of the greatest signs of God, tend to immobilize what is essentially mobile in nature.”¹ Islam is, *par excellence*, a religion of moderation. Extremism, either on the side of excess or deficiency of a thing, is alien to its nature. It enjoins upon us to follow the middle path in all affairs of life, secular or sacred. It is in this sense that the Qur’an calls the Muslims *ummatan wastan*,² a community of middle path. Such a community must strike a balance between tradition and change in reconstructing its culture, if and when required. The principle of middle-wayness ensures the identity of a culture in difference, its continuity in change and its unity in diversity on the one hand, and infuses a new spirit in culture, adds to its vigor, tightens its hold, increases its breadth and enhances its capacity for assimilation and adaptation to new conditions of life on the other. No culture can afford to be static or inert in “the world of perpetual change,” if it wants to remain an active force in the life of its adherents. Just as indifference to “social heritage” creates the feeling that we have no “roots” to establish our identity as a nation, so indifference to “social change creates the feeling that our roots bind us to a world very

The writer is former Professor of Philosophy, Government College Lahore.

different from that which surrounds us."³

Knowledge: Root of Culture

Islam lays much emphasis on the acquisition of knowledge. The Prophet (SAW) was asked to pray: "My Lord! Increase me in knowledge."⁴ He, in turn, "made the acquisition of knowledge incumbent upon every Muslim male and female."⁵ He further bade them to seek knowledge from the cradle to the grave,"⁶ for knowledge has a moral and social thrust and determines the complexion of the culture which distinguishes one social group from another. It shapes the world-view of a people and consequently the way it thinks, feels, and behaves. As the knowledge is, so will be the culture based on it. The nature of knowledge determines the nature of the culture it begets.

As the fruit of knowledge, culture is essentially a mental phenomenon. It exists in the minds of men in the form of knowledge and the attitudes it creates towards life and the world we live in. The social environment which it creates is the outer manifestation of this mental phenomenon. Every culture, ideational as well as its physical side, bears the stamp of the knowledge of which it is the product. Now knowledge, as rightly held by A. N. Whitehead, "does not keep any better than fish."⁷ In other words, knowledge never remains static, but always grows and moves ahead. When the scepter of knowledge, passing through the hands of religion and philosophy, came into the hands of science, it inaugurated an era of "explosion of knowledge," demanding urgent reconstruction of culture to cope with the needs of the time. Religion — revelations made to the prophets — as we know, epitomizes the culture of the ancient world of the infancy of humanity. The synthesis of religion and philosophy — revelation and speculative intellect — is the hallmark of the

culture of the medieval world of Islam, Christianity, and Judaism. Godless and wisdomless science, based as it is on inductive intellect exclusively, is the distinguishing mark of the secular culture of the modern world. Neither revelations nor speculative intellect has any place in the culture ushered in by science and technology. Having no transcendent element in it, it is secular and positivist through and through and so it is comparatively easy for it to adjust itself to the additions, alterations, and amendments made in the existing open-ended knowledge by the painstaking researches of scientists. Two educational theories, Progressivism and Reconstructionism, developed by John Dewey and Theodore Brameld for piecemeal and wholesale change in society, respectively, enable it to adapt itself to the fast changing needs of the time.

The Inner Intensity and Breadth of Islam

The monistic culture of Islam integrates reason with revelation, intellect with faith, and the temporal with the spiritual. It connects man, God, and society together into a single whole. There is no room for the separation of the profane from the sacred in it, as is the case with the dualistic culture of the West which gives to Caesar that which belongs to Caesar and to God that which belongs to God, for here, as nowhere else, we are responsible to God both for the profane and the sacred. The temporal and the spiritual side of life taken together constitute one single indivisible whole, falling within the all-embracing Law of Islam (*Shari'ah*). Now since Islam is a complete way of life (*Deen*), it is often said that it has no room for variety and change in its monistic culture. This gives a lie to the inner catholicity and liberalism of Islam as well as to its claim to universality, irrespective of time and climes. The all-

embracing Law of Islam, as is borne out by its long history of development, has never been static and immobile. It has sustained cultural varieties in different times and climes. It has made innumerable adjustments and even compromises as a result of its expansion in and out of Arabia and has "acquired a richness and depth of experience that has enabled it to meet challenges creatively."⁸

The assimilative spirit of Islam came into free play while its culture was still in its infancy. It lost no time in absorbing in its culture certain elements of Arab culture prevalent at that time to strengthen its roots in the native social milieu. With the expansion of Islam out of Arabia, its culture was further enriched by way of adjustments to local conditions of time and climes. However, the most important contribution to the development of Islamic culture was made by the imaginative Iranians. They "contributed such a palpable and sizable amount even to the capital stock of religious ideas in Islam that if we discount their influence," observes Fazalur Rahman, "historic Islam would hardly be recognizable."⁹ Their influence was so deep and wide that before long they "became the intellectual backbone of the Muslim empire."¹⁰ Even today most of the books included in the *Dars-e-Nizami* taught in the *madaris* of Pakistan, India, and Bangladesh are the work of Iranian scholars. "Iran, not Arabia," says Iqbal, "was the place where the intellectual energies of Islam found a creative channel."¹¹ What we call the culture Islam, he goes on, is but a synthesis of Semitic ideas and Aryan imagination. When we look at its *habitas* and *mores*, we come to know that it got its tenderness and irresistible charm from the womb of its Aryan mother, and its serenity and sobriety from the spine of its Semitic father, as

a matter of inheritance."¹² The contribution made by the Seljuq and Ottoman Turks and the Berber dynasties to the development of the culture of Islam, and even the influence of the Indian culture, is by no means negligible. With the expansion of Islam in Iran, Byzantium, Turkey, Spain, North Africa, Central Asia and India, "the graft of one culture upon another," called "culture-contact" or "acculturation"¹³ in the language of sociology, became a normal feature in the growth and development of its culture. This shows the amount of vitality, adaptability, and breadth which enables it "to meet challenges creatively." Islamic culture is not the product of the intellectual energies of any particular nation or country. The vast brotherhood of the Muslims spread all over the world has contributed in giving shape to it, with the result that "the Arab impulse," one can hardly disagree with Fazalur Rahman, "weakened in course of time, and in the outlying regions of the Muslim world, as the Muslim world expanded, it was not so much the original Islam but Islam at the second and third hand that made its impact."¹⁴

Medieval Islam: Integration of Islamic and Greek Learning

Islamic epistemology is fundamentally anchored in the unity of the human and the Divine sources of knowledge. It separates not reason from revelation and so all knowledge, with it, revealed as well as rational, is sacred. Even rational knowledge ultimately leads to the knowledge of the vertical axis of the universe. The Qur'an uses the word *ilm*¹⁵ for such knowledge, opposing it frequently with *zann*¹⁶ (conjecture) and *khirs*¹⁷ (guess) which are unable to see the signs of God in the *anfus*¹⁸ (inner selves) and the *afaq*¹⁹ (universe). Since truly objective knowledge is a synthetic construct of reason and revelation, "knowledge of Nature," as with

Iqbal, "is the knowledge of God's behavior."²⁰ It is on this knowledge that the culture of Islam is structured upon.

Coming now to the Middle Ages, we find that the thirst for knowledge of Muslims remarkably manifests itself in their avidity for Greek knowledge and wisdom. The Umayyid Caliphs left no stone unturned in procuring Greek works. The ferment reached its peak with the founding of *Dar-ul-Hikmah* (House of Wisdom), a translation bureau, in 830 C.E., by the Abbasid Caliph Al-Mamun in Baghdad, where the Syriac Christians and Jews rendered Greek philosophy, science and medicine into Arabic on a mass scale for Muslim scholars. But the bureau did not translate Greek literature into Arabic for it was full of stories about gods and goddesses, specially the great literary and poetic works of Homer and Hesiod,²¹ because they militated against the staunch monotheism of Islam. It was during this period that Greek philosophy, arithmetic, geometry, Euclid, optics, physics, astronomy, medicine, ethics, politics, and economics found their way into the Islamic curriculum, side by side with the religious disciplines. Also it was during this period that the Muslims invented a new science, *Ilm Al-Kalam* (philosophical theology) to provide a rational basis to what they believed as a matter of faith. The integration of the rational with the religious disciplines was a singular achievement of the medieval Islam. The *Dars-e-Nizami*, introduced by Mulla Nizamuddin Farangi Mahli (d. 1748) during the reign of Aurangzeb Alamgir (1658-1707), still in vogue in the *madaris* of the Indo-Pak subcontinent, is but a summary of the integrated curriculum of the medieval Islam, which now miserably falls short of the requirements of the Muslim community in the present age dominated by science and technology.

The medieval Muslims, as we have said above, turned to Greek science, philosophy, and medicine with unprecedented enthusiasm and paved the way for the social change the new learning was pregnant with, without doing violence to their cultural frame of reference. They synthesized Greek and Islamic learning, reconciled contradictions, if any, harmonized philosophy and religion, interpreted the contents of revelation in terms of reason, improved upon and even made valuable additions to Greek logic and philosophy and gave an inductive bent to the speculative Greek science. They particularly developed a new philosophical theology (*Ilm Al-Kalam*) to make room for intellectual satisfaction side by side with emotional satisfaction which religion has always bestowed upon its devotees. Their effects at harmonizing reasons with faith met with tremendous success and made a positive contribution to human progress. This was the period of the intellectual preeminence of the Muslims, of the creative dynamism of Islam, during which flourished men like Al-Kindi (d. 873), Zakariya Razi (d. 864), Al-Farabi (d. 950), Ibn Sina (d. 1037), Al-Ghazali (d. 1111), Ibn Bajjah (d. 1138), Ibn Tufail (d. 1185), Ibn Rushd (d. 1198), Ibn Khaldun (d. 1406), to name a few, who left their mark on the intellectual development of Europe.

Fundamentalism: Return to the Original Islam of the Qur'an and Sunnah

The inner intensity and breadth of Islam knows no bound. It possesses a wonderful capacity for assimilating new ideas and adapting itself to new conditions of life. This is one side of the picture. The other side of it is "that during the course of history," deplores Saeed Haleem Pasha, "the moral and social ideals of Islam have been gradually deislamized through the influence of local character, and pre-Islamic

superstitions of Muslim Nations. These ideals today are more Iranian, Turkish or Arabian than Islamic... the universal and impersonal character of the ethical ideals of Islam has been lost through a process of localization. The only alternative open to us, then, is to tear off from Islam the hard crust which has immobilized an essentially dynamic outlook on life, and to rediscover the original verities of freedom, equality and solidarity with a view to rebuild our moral, social and political ideals out of their original simplicity and universality."²²

The problem before us, then, is to purify Islam of the "degrading accretions of history" and reconstruct Muslim society in terms of the pristine Islam of the Qur'an and Sunnah. It is this inner urge that initiated a reformist movement, called revivalism or fundamentalist brand of reconstructionism in Islam.

Development of Fundamentalism or Revivalism

Fundamentalism set foot in the Indian sub-continent with the puritanical teachings of Shaikh Ahmad of Sirhind (d. 1624). He committed himself to purifying Islam of all heresies and innovations (*bid'aat*). He made no distinction between good and bad innovations. To purify Islam, he insisted, we must purge it of all innovations, good as well as bad. To approve innovations is to admit that Islam is not a complete way of life (*Deen*), in consequence of which sunnah would, in course of time, disappear and heresy would prosper. He insisted on speedy return to the pristine Islam of the Qur'an and *Sunnah* and thus brought about a general resurgence of fundamentalism. He bitterly criticized Ibn Arabi's theosophy and replaced his doctrine of *Wahdat Al-Wajud* (metaphysical monism) by an "ethical dualism" of *Shari'ah* values and Sufi techniques. Though an accretion of history,

he did not reject Sufism, but " gave it a new life and a new direction²⁴ of realizing *Shari'ah* values through Sufi techniques in practical life. He rejected *ijtihad* (individual judgment) even within the framework of the traditional four schools of *fiqh* (jurisprudence).

With Shah Waliullah of Delhi (d. 1763), the emphasis shifts from extreme to moderate fundamentalism. He waged war against bad innovations, but approved good innovations to meet the genuine needs of the society. With this in view, he insisted on *ijtihad* within the framework of the four orthodox schools of *fiqh*.²⁵ A daring example of his *ijtihad* was the translation of the Qur'an into Persian which aroused a storm of opposition against him. He also retained Sufism, like Shaikh Ahmad of Sirhind, in his program of fundamentalist reform and crowned his system with a definite Sufi interpretation of the universe."²⁶ The revivalist element in his teaching appeared with greater force in the persons of Shah Abdul Aziz, his eldest son, and Sayyid Ahmad Khan of Rai Bareli, one of his disciples.

In Central Arabia, Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahab (d. 1792) spearheaded the fundamentalist movement by concentrating on the notion of *Tauheed* (monotheism), in all its simplicity and purity. He was a spiritual disciple of Imam Ibn Taimiyyah (d. 1328) and a staunch follower of Hanbali *fiqh*. He not only criticized Ibn Arabi's notion of *Wahdat Al-Wujud*, but rejected Sufism altogether, along with the entire medieval Muslim intellectualism which, in his opinion, was the root cause of the general moral laxity and intellectual stagnation of Muslims all over the world. He preached *Tauheed*, the cardinal working principle of Islam, in all its simplicity, as enunciated in the Qur'an and practiced by the Prophet (SAW), and insisted on rebuilding Muslim

society on this dynamic basis. However, with all his revivalism, he openly confessed that no culture in the world can retain its vigor and hold without admitting a certain amount of change in it, in order to adjust itself to changing conditions of life. But the change, he insists, should be "organic." It should come right from within the culture in response to the genuine needs of the society.²⁷ He, therefore, strongly condemned blind *taqleed* (imitation) and insisted on the judicious exercise of *ijtihad*.

The reformist movement led by Abdul Wahab, popularly known as Wahabi movement after his name, soon spread far and wide. It aroused Muslim community both spiritually and intellectually and left its indelible mark on later reformist movements in the Muslim world. The Salafi (back to the practice of early elders) movement of Rasheed Rida (d. 1935) is an instance of its pervading influence in Egypt.²⁸

The revivalist or fundamentalist brand of Islamic reconstruction gave impetus to religious resurgence throughout the Muslim world. It launched a crusade against un-Islamic beliefs and practices that crept into Islam with the passage of time. It particularly purged Sufism and medieval Muslim theological thought of the elements that were repugnant to the spirit of Islam. Above all, it condemned blind *taqleed* and allowed relative *ijtihad* within the framework of the four orthodox schools of *fiqh*, in order to recapture the original spirit of Islam.

Modernism: Reconstruction of Muslim Religious Thought in the Light of Modern Knowledge

Sociologically speaking, reconstructionism in Islam has two different senses. It means reconstruction of Muslim society in accordance with the original spirit of the Qur'an and *Sunnah* in the one sense, and rebuilding of Muslim

society in accordance with the spirit of modern times in the other. It means fundamentalism or revivalism in the first case, and modernism or adaptation to new conditions of life (brought about by the explosion of inductive knowledge) in the second. Both the movements are essentially reformist, in nature, but the one looks to the past and the other to the present for guidance and inspiration. Fundamentalism grew from within Islam as a result of intensive as well as extensive "self-criticism" of the internal degradation of Muslim society. Modernism, on the contrary, grew out of the urge for change created by the transforming effects of science and technology upon the Muslim society. Fundamentalism was a device not only to meet squarely "the threat of internal corrosion," but also to combat effectively "the dangers to the integrity of the community from without," e.g., the onslaught of Western secular culture in modern times. It fights against the conservative placidity on the one hand, and the secular amoral rationalism of modernity on the other. In view of these two functions, Fazlur Rahman calls fundamentalism or revivalism "the philosophy of Muslim society in crisis."²⁹ As the philosophy of crisis, it is, in contrast to conservatism, "activist and dynamic"³⁰ and in a way seems to be "progressive"³¹ also. It is this characteristic of it that "tempts" even a modernist to accept it as a framework for his program of reconstructing the theological and legal thought of Islam in the light of modern knowledge.

Though "activist and dynamic," fundamentalism is, nevertheless, not other than conservatism or traditionalism. But it is conservatism with a difference. It makes a distinction between what is essentially and fundamentally Islamic in social heritage and what

is purely "an extraneous addition of history." Conservatism accepts as authoritative the whole range of orthodox beliefs and practices which have crept into Islam during the course of its development and insists on preserving it without making any exception. Fundamentalism, on the contrary, does not regard accretions of history as authoritative and wishes to rediscover the pristine Islam of the Qur'an and *Sunnah* by purging it of all extraneous additions of history. It seeks to conserve not merely the past, but what is intrinsically and essentially valuable in it. The modernist agrees with the fundamentalist on this point, but here their ways part. The fundamentalist wishes to reconstruct Muslim society in accordance with the original spirit of the Qur'an and *Sunnah* and revive the old social order in totality, ignoring completely the needs and demands of the age dominated by science and technology. The modernist, on the contrary, wishes to reinterpret the pristine Islam of the Qur'an and *Sunnah* in the light of modern knowledge and rebuild Muslim society in accordance with it to cope with the changing needs of the time. But despite this vital difference, both the fundamentalist and the modernist adopt the same strategy to achieve their respective objectives. They both condemn *taqlid* and insist on the need and urgency of *ijtihad* in unequivocal terms.

Development of Modern Muslim Intellectualism

Knowledge is a social and cultural affair. It is the very basis of anthropology and sociology and lies at the root of the world view which characterizes a culture. The knowledge that goes with modernity is the knowledge born of the eye. This knowledge is not a finished product. It is open-ended, based on observation and experiment as it is. It is in a state of continual flux and change, addition and

modification in the light of modern research, affecting directly individual attitudes, social behavior, cultural setup and politico-economic structure. This necessitates a constant broadening of our outlook to accommodate new facts and reconstruct our social heritage in order to keep pace with the changing time.

The first Muslim who caught the glimpse of this truth was Jamaluddin Afghani (d. 1897). He brought home his co-religionists and science is an ally, not an enemy of religion. He urged them to make arrangements for teaching science in *madaris* and reconstructing the medieval metaphysical Islam on an inductive basis. He further laid stress on *ijtihad* and broadened its scope to such an extent that it came to be synonymous with reforming the prevalent religion. But he imposed the condition of "collective *ijtihad*" in this regard. In *qiyas* (systematic analogical reasoning), he says, reason operates on the individual level, but in *ijma'* (consensus of the learned) other intellects are also with it which enhances the integrity of the intellect and lessens the possibility of error and omission.³²

Afghani is all out for modern knowledge, but he rejects outright ethnic and territorial nationalism of the West. Nationalism has a sociological and a political sense. In the essentially sociological sense, nationalism means a sentiment for a certain community of *mores* and *habitas*, "including language, which gives a sense of cohesiveness to a group." This nationalism is not averse to a wider loyalty to Islam. On the contrary, the two loyalties make an extraordinary powerful liaison, resulting in the sentiment of patriotism in face of a non-Muslim aggressor.

The primitive sociological nationalism, referred to above, was later converted into a

political ideology and transformed into an ethnic nation-state, claiming for itself absolute sovereignty on the one hand, and undivided loyalty on the other. This political nationalism openly clashes with the basic moral and social ideals of Islam. It cuts at the very root of Islam, not only by destroying the possibility of the unity and solidarity of the Muslim *Ummah* as "a spiritual democracy"³³ but also by relegating Islam to the position of a private creed, code, or ritual. Afghani perceived the danger inherent in it. With the ingenuity of a statesman, he sponsored a movement for the political unification of the Muslim *Ummah*, popularly known as pan-Islamism, which, he thought, would adequately answer to the challenge of ethnic-cum-territorial nationalism and also prove to be an "effective bulwark against foreign invasion and intrigue."³⁴ He may rightly be regarded as "the leader of a new awakening in the Muslim world" on the political level.

The intellectual modernism of Afghani was spearheaded with greater force of conviction and elaboration by Muhammad Abduh (d.1905), his brilliant Egyptian disciple. He goes far beyond Afghani in asserting that "Islam is not only not incompatible with reason, but is the only religion which religiously calls upon man to use his reason and investigate nature."³⁵ His chief merit lies in highlighting the role of reason in Islam, distinguishing it, at the same time, from that of revelation. Reason and revelation, he continues, operate at different levels and play distinct roles in life. The one grasps the temporal-spatial aspect of reality, the other its transcendent-spiritual aspect, and so they cannot come into conflict with each other. But this is not enough. What is further required, he goes on, is that they must actively cooperate in the overall human advancement. Afghani's humanism

gave more a this-worldly than an other - worldly turn to his thought.³⁶ Abduh strikes a balance between the two. The future of humanity depends neither on religion alone nor on science alone, but on both of them taken together. His burning passion is to restate the basic teachings of Islam in such a way as may open the door for the acquisition of modern knowledge in general and for the wholesome influence of new ideas among the Muslims in particular. The institution of prophethood having been concluded for all times to come, the Muslims have now to accomplish this task with the help of their own reason. "This argument, put forward in its first form by Abduh," writes Fazlur Rahman, is restated by Iqbal in philosophical terms,"³⁷ in his *Reconstruction*.

Afghani and Abduh both were theorists of the modernist brand of Islamic reconstructionism. Sayyid Ahmad Khan (d. 1898) did not rest content with mere theorization. In 1875, he established the first modern university in the world of Islam — Muslim University, Aligarh (India) — for teaching modern social and natural sciences, with the innovation of setting up a full-fledged department of Islamic Studies as well as providing a mosque in each hostel, in order to counteract the unwholesome influence of the Western secular science. He was so optimistic about this innovation that he thought that the products of this university will carry philosophy in their right hand, science in their left hand, with the crown of "no God, save Allah and Muhammad (SAW) is His messenger" on their head.³⁸ But this synthetic philosophy of education failed to deliver the desired good because of his giving an overriding authority to reason rather than to revelation, as well shall see presently.

The Qur'an, he said, is the "Word of God," and the universe which science studies in the

“Work of God,” and so they cannot be antagonistic to each other.³⁹ The argument is unassailable so far. But he grievously erred in setting himself to interpret the “Word of God” in the light of the “Work of God,” instead of the other way round, placing the secular science on a “somewhat higher pedestal than religion”⁴⁰ which earned him the nickname of *nechri* — a believer in nature rather than in God.

Sayyid Ahmad Khan further argued that the Qur'an makes recurrent appeal to reason and experience and so its basic teachings cannot be incompatible with reason. So far he is at one with Abduh. But here their ways part. Reason and revelation, of course, cooperate in Islam, but they operate at different levels and play distinct roles in life, says Abduh. With Sayyid Ahmad Khan, there is no qualitative difference between reason and revelation. There is no higher stage beyond reason where reason appears as fallible and defective as sense-perception is at the bar of reason.⁴¹ He, therefore, identified Islam with Nature and Nature with Islam. The only touchstone of a true religion, he insists, is its conformity to Nature and its compatibility with reason. To assert the autonomy of Nature and of the laws that govern it, he denied the efficacy of prayer (*du'a*), rejected the belief in miracles, and identified God with the First Cause of science. However, he is not an advocate of Natural religion, for he formally accepts the distinction between Natural religion and Revealed religion, despite his denying that there is a qualitative difference between reason and revelation. With reason as the overriding standard, he miserably failed to integrate the scientific world-view with the world-view of Islam. His attempts to harmonize science with religion resulted in creating more faith in science than in religion. To spearhead his

modernist intellectualism, he agrees with Afghani to broaden the scope of *ijtihad* to the extent of reforming religion, but he rejects his condition of collective *ijtihad* (*ijma'*) to achieve this objective which could minimize the possibility of error. Instead, he resorted to individual *ijtihad* at the cost of doing violence to the Islamic frame of reference within which modernization was to take place.

Endnotes

1. Iqbal, Dr. Muhammad., *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*, (Lahore: Institute of Islamic Culture, 1986) p. 117.
2. Qur'an: Surah Al-Baqarah 2: 143.
3. *The Report of (Indian) University Education Commission*, V. I (Delhi, 1950) p. 55.
4. Qur'an: Surah Taha 20: 114.
5. *Mishkat Sharaif*, Vol. I (Lahore, Al-Faisal Publishing Company, n. d.) p. 361.
6. Haji Khalifa, *Kashf al-Zunun*, Vol. I (Leipzig: n. d) p. 13.
7. Whitehead, A. N., *The Aims of Education* (New York: Mentor, 1958) p. 152.
8. Stoddard, D.C. Culhelli, M.W. Sullivan (ed), *Change and the Muslim World* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1981) p. 12.
9. Fazlur Rahman, "What is Islamic Culture," in Motamar Al-Alam Al-Islami's *Islamic Culture* (Karachi, 1964) p. 30.
10. Ibid, p. 30.
11. Mueeni, Abdul Wahid., (ed.) *Maqalat-e-Iqbal* (Lahore: Shaikh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1963) p. 120.
12. Ibid., p. 126.
13. "The term "acculturation" is widely accepted among American anthropologists as referring to those changes set in motion by the coming together of societies with different cultural traditions. This field of investigation is generally referred to by British anthropologists as "cultural-contact." The term "acculturation" is somewhat

- ambiguous. A persistent usage gives it the meaning of cultural assimilation or replacement of one set of "cultural traits" by another. Inconsistency is often apparent in the writings of American anthropologists with regard to whether the term is applied to results or to processes of change." D. L. Sills, *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*, Vol. I (U.S.A., The Macmillan Company and the Free Press, 1968) p. 21.
14. Rahman Fazalur., op. cit., p. 31.
15. Qur'an, Al-Namal 27: 40 - 42; 30: 56
16. Ibid., Ha-Meem Al-Sajdah 41: 23; Al-Nisa 4: 157; Al-Jathiah 45: 24
17. Ibid., Al-An'am 6: 117; 6: 149
18. Ibid., Ha-Meem Al-Sajdah 41: 53, Al-Dhariaat 51: 21
19. Ibid., Ha-Meem Al-Sajdah 41: 53
20. Iqbal, op. cit., p. 45.
21. Rahman, Fazlur., "Islamization of Knowledge: A Response" in *The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (Herndon: AMSS and IIIT, 1988) p. 3.
22. Iqbal, op. cit., p. 124.
23. Sharif, M. M., ed., *A History of Muslim Philosophy*, Vol. II, (Wiesbaden, Germany: Otto Harrassowitz, 1966) p. 876.
24. Rahman, Fazlur., *Islam* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1966) p. 202.
25. Sharif, M. M., ed., op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 1574-75.
26. Rahman, Fazlur., *Islam*, op. cit., p. 203
- Continued on page 72
27. Sharif, M. M., op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 1448-49.
28. Rahman, Fazlur., *Islam*, op. cit., p. 198
29. Ibid., p. 222
30. Ibid., p. 222.
31. Ibid., p. 222.
32. Masood, Dr. Khalid., *Iqbal aur Tasawwur-e-Ijtihad* (Islamabad: Mutbu'at-e-Hurmat, 1985) p. 39.
33. Iqbal, op. cit., p. 142.
34. Rahman, Fazlur., *Islam*, p. 227.
35. Ibid., p. 217.
36. Ibid., p. 216.

37. Ibid., pp. 220-21.

38. Cited by Ziaul Hasan., *The Deoband School and the Demand of Pakistan* (Lahore: Progressive Books, n.d.) p. 39.

39. Khan, Sir Sayyid Ahmad., *Akhri Mazameen* (Lahore: n.d.) p. 84.

40. Qureshi, Dr. I. H., *Education in Pakistan* (Karachi: Ma'aref, 1975) p. 68.

41. Sharif., M. M., ed., op. cit., p. 1601.