Problems of Islamic Political Philosophy in Classical and Modern Texts[1]

Muhammet ÖZDEMİR*

Abstract This study examines the approaches of Islamic political texts to social and political issues, both in classical and modern ages. The classical texts can be classified in two different traditions; namely, those which adopt a Greek-style discourse, such as al-Fārābī's political works and those which prefers *al-fiqh* traditional and bureaucratic style, such as al-Māwardī's and Nizām al-Mulk's works. On the other hand, Islamic political texts of modern era entertain mainly reflexive and defensive strategies, presupposing an ideal age in the past as a point of departure and return. This is the case in al-Mawdūdī's and Sayyid Qutb's works. The thoughts of Niccolò Machiavelli, Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes and especially those of John Rawls are taken as analyzing criteria in this study. In the scope of epistemology and political philosophy, the Anglo-Saxon tradition has some corresponding cultural goods which can be appropriated for the political needs of modern Islamic societies. On that note, it appears that there are two main approaches in the political philosophy, namely "the conceptualistic approach" and "the experimental approach". The political works of al-Fārābī, al-Mawdūdī and Qutb employ the conceptualistic approach. While the works of al-Māwardī, Nizām al-Mulk, Niccolò Machiavelli, Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes and especially John Rawls use the experimental approach.

Keywords: Islamic political philosophy, al-Fārābī, al-Māwardī, Nizām al-Mulk, al-Mawdūdī, Sayyid Qutb, John Rawls, the conceptualistic approach.

---

* Associate Professor, İzmir Kâtip Celebi University Faculty of Social and Human Sciences Department of Philosophy. I also thank my colleague Ass. Prof. Haris Macic for his help with redaction and discussion of the text.
muhammetozdemir2012@gmail.com, ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0001-8465-1924
Makale Geliş Tarihi: 2 Ekim 2018. Makale Kabul Tarihi: 14 Kasım 2018.

Klasik ve Modern Metinlerde İslam Siyaset Felsefesinin Sorunları

Öz Bu çalışma, klasik ve modern dönemlerde, İslam siyaset felsefesi metinlerinin sosyal ve siyasi konulara yaklaşımıyla ilgilenmektedir. Klasik metinler, Fârâbî'nin çalışmaları gibi, Yunan tarzında kaleme alınmış metinler ve Mâverdî ve Nizâmülmülk'ün kitapları gibi, Fıkıh geleneği ve bürokratik tarzda kaleme alınmış metinler olarak temelde ikiye ayrılmaktadır. İslâm'ın modern siyaset felsefesi metinleri ise, Mevdûdî ve Seyyid Kutub'un eserlerinde görüldüğü üzere, reaktif ve savunmacı bir üslupla kaleme alınmış metinlerdir. Niccolò Machiavelli, Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes ve özellikle John Rawls'un fikirleri, analiz için kıstas olarak alınmaktadır. Epistemoloji ve siyaset felsefesi özelinde, Anglosakson gelenek, modern İslâm toplumlarının ihtiyaçları ile örtüşen bazı kültürel ürünlere sahiptir. Bu bağlamda, siyaset felsefesi geleneğinde iki temel yaklaşımın, "kavramcı yaklaşım" ve "deneysel yaklaşım" olduğu anlaşılmaktadır. Fârâbî, Mevdûdî ve Kutub, kavramcı yaklaşımı benimsemekte ve uygulamaktadırlar. Mâverdî, Nizâmülmülk, Niccolò Machiavelli, Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes ve özellikle John Rawls ise, deneysel yaklaşımı kullanmaktadırlar.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İslâm Siyaset Felsefesi, Fârâbî, Mâverdî, Nizâmülmülk, Mevdûdî, Seyyid Kutub, John Rawls, kavramcı yaklaşım.

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this article is to identify the problems of Islamic political philosophy by the way of examining and analyzing the texts, both classical and modern. This aim will be duly fulfilled when the difference in approach between Islamic political philosophy deeply rooted in Greek intellectual heritage and political thought which takes its source from mainly bureaucratic and legalistic *al-fiqh* tradition, is adequately presented, and when it is suitably shown that all modern Islamic political texts are closer to the former in intellectual frame. Greek-style Islamic political philosophy as instanced by al-Fārābī has very conceptualistic approach and therefore engages itself very little with actual political problems of the age. On the other hand, when we turn to the latter, probably best expounded in the works of al-Māwardī and Nizām al-Mulk, its positivistic approach and factual methodology is observed immediately. When it comes to modern Islamic political thought, it is evident that its approach and methodology owe a lot to the Islamic political tradition developed in the wake of the transmission of Greek science to Islamic world. In line with Francis Bacon's assessment of the general character of Greek philosophical thought, Greek-style Islamic thought also bears some unfruitful characteristics and can be deemed as rhetorical, polemical and even eclecticist. At the same time, this is the underlying feature of Ba-

con's view of Islamic philosophy as being unsatisfactory.[2] In fact, this is the basis of the contemporary claim that Islamic philosophy is lacking in authenticity as propounded by Roger Arnaldez in his writings. According to Arnaldez, only al-Ghazālī can be seen as an authentic Islamic philosopher.[3] This claim is correct when taken to mean that Islamic political philosophy or Islamic philosophy in general deals with social and religious problems originally configured by its Greek predecessors, and reflects itself in deductive logic and very imposing discourse. Similarly, modern texts dealing with social and religious problems of the Islamic world correspond to this tradition in style, and for this reason modern Islamic political literature harbors very conceptualistic discourse and falls rather far from the classical approach of Islamic *fiqh*. Conceptualistic and rhetorical discourse in question leads to misrepresentation of Islam as an inflexible set of ideas, impossible to be applied to the ongoing life and contemporary condition of man. Interestingly, classical Islamic philosophy and especially al-Fārābī's political theory or Averroes' rationalism are suggested as a solution for this problem.[4]

I will firstly describe and analyze both Greek-style Islamic political philosophical texts and legalistic texts which are mainly based on *al-fiqh* tradition and bureaucratic experience. Describing and analyzing modern Islamic texts, I will show the closeness between Greek-style discourse and modern Islamic political reading. This has an eclecticist method and does not produce any new knowledge. Afterwards I will discuss the conceptualist approach to the problems of social and religious life.

1. ISLAMIC POLITICAL THOUGHT IN CLASSICAL PHILOSOPHICAL TEXTS AND LEGALISTIC TEXTS

In Greek-style Islamic political philosophy, al-Fārābī's texts are most striking and his *Book of the Opinions of the Inhabitants of the Virtuous City* (*Kitābu Ārāi Ahl al-Madīna al-Fādila*) is well-known. Among the text mainly written in legalistic *al-fiqh* tradition al-Māwardī's book of *The Laws of Islamic Governance* (*al-Aḥkām as-Sulṭāniyyah*) is one of the most famous and seminal works.[5] Nizām al-Mulk's *Book of Government* (*Siyāsatnāma*) is one of the most known texts among those mainly written from bureaucratic experience. This tradition is known as *mirrors for princes*. Nizām al-Mulk's book followed al-Māwardī's in style, content and time.[6] By examining these three texts, I hope to arrive at a satisfactory conclussion at the end. Although al-Māwardī's and Nizām al-Mulk's books are essentially related to the political science, nevertheless the former contains the principles of political philosophy and the latter applies these principles to examples of political philosophy (ethical virtues).[7]

al-Fārābī's *Book of the Opinions of the Inhabitants of the Virtuous City* deals with theology, cosmology and political philosophy, and physics and psychology indirectly. It seems that al-Fārābī was inspired by the two of Plato's books this work.[8] Plato's *The Republic* and *Timaeus* were translated into Arabic before al-Fārābī and he is closely acquainted with both of them. Although al-Fārābī used the Republic and Timaeus, nevertheless it is evident from the content that his work is authentic in many respects. This is clearly the case when we turn to the Arabic manuscripts of these Plato's works.[9] It seems to be the case that al-Fārābī wrote a syncretic text, islamicizing some of the Plato's concepts and moreover, he supplemented some new concepts such as al-Mudun al-Fādel and al-Mudun al-Cāhel although these concepts do not really stand because these do not correspond to the actual state of affairs. As a matter of fact, al-Fārābī's work is accepted as a utopian book, just like Plato's *The Republic*.[10] In his book, there is no mention of the actual life and social problems of his age. al-Fārābī's work has metaphysical and social characteristics. No doubt that al-Fārābī's and Plato's philosophical intentions are very different, but their approach to the social life and the government are very similar.

Al-Madīna al-Fādila is concerned with *al-Mawcūd al-Awwal* (God) and His attributes. There are totally thirty seven chapters in the book, six of them belong to *al-Mawcūd al-Awwal*, but the rest of the chapters are also related to Him and His attributes.[11] After the attributes, the philosopher talks about cosmological descriptions, physical conditions of the world and psychology of man in order to connect everything to Him. Actually he wants to explain how the Muslim society can reach utmost well-being on a constant basis and for this reason his focus is on the human being. Just as in Plato, he also assumes that there must be an order in the universe and society because there is God.[12] All of subjects as *al-Nubuwwa*, *al-Raīs* and society are related to the God's existence and particular aim is to secure social and psychological happiness in this world.[13] Richard Walzer's reading of al-Fārābī is definitely so. According to Walzer, *al-Nubuwwa* and divination in al-Fārābī's philosophical system serves as explanation of his society's happiness.[14] Now we can safely say that the ideal state or *al-Mudun al-Fādel* is thought and constructed at the conceptualistic level by al-Fārābī. The other kinds of states such as *al-Cāhil*, *al-Fāsek*, *al-Mutabaddila* and *al-Dālla* are all only opposites of *al-Mudun al-Fādel* and all of them involve some faults and intellectual deficiency.[15] Evidently, these contrasts can be seen as conceptualistic constructs, and basically they have no real counterparts in the actual world around al-Fārābī. To put it simply, he is using these concepts without referring to the actual state of affairs of his political surroundings. This situation makes his philosophy of politics eclecticist in argument and imposing his ideals to the real world. I think that al-Ghazālī's objections in *Tahāfūt al-*

Falāsifah are aimed at this deadlock in this context. What I mean is that al-Fārābī both wants and insists on the point that Muslim should reach its highest well-being. According to al-Fārābī, his opinions which rely on only Greek-style argument are unique and need not to be tested in real social life.[16]

al-Māwardī's book of *The Laws of Islamic Governance* (*al-Aḥkām as-Sulṭāniyyah*) and Nizām al-Mulk's *Book of Government* or *the Histories of the Kingdoms* (*Siyāsatnāma* or *Siyar al-Mulūk*) are both similar to each other. Both of them are written mainly in bureaucratic and legalistic *al-fiqh* tradition. However, there is a small nuance between the two and it is related to the style of treating the topic. The former is written in legalistic *al-fiqh* tradition and the latter was written in bureaucratic style. al-Māwardī's work deals with administrative organization, including some political virtues and historical experiences. On the other hand, Nizām al-Mulk's work also deals with government regime with some virtues and historical experiences. This may be due to the fact that al-Māwardī was a *faqīh* (scholar of sharīa) and Nizām al-Mulk was a grand vizier (prime minister). For instance, while there is a chapter related to social rules of wine drinking in Nizām al-Mulk's book, al-Māwardī's book does not mentions any instances of everyday life.[17] As can be seen, there is a nuance between the two works and this nuance is slightly relevant to the religious norms of *al-halāl* and *al-harām*. I think that the next classical texts of politics in Islam, namely Ibn Khaldun's *al-Mukaddima,* which is written in bureaucratic and legalistic *al-fiqh* tradition and not in Greek-style.

There are twenty chapters (*al-bāb*) in al-Māwardī's *Book of al-Aḥkām as-Sulṭāniyyah* and all of them are related to the actual social life, suc as government, administration, law, economy, land and war. None of them is treated in relation to God, metaphysics or other nonphysical subjects. His work begins with the sub-heading of "Contract of Imamate" and discusses the sources of political power and the leadership. There are two ways gaining the power in the state, namely "by the election of those of power and influence and by the delegation of the previous Imam". Both of these can be considered as rather secular ways and they are not seen as religious issues in the book. Actually, in this work the Devine is not involved in the world because everything in politics is for human social needs and social reality is related to the Devine only principally. Shortly, *Book of al-Aḥkām* is concerned with the actual world, but that is not to say that it completely ignores its connection to the Devine.[18] As in *al-Madīna al-Fadila*, some considerations of moral virtues and characteristics can be found in *Book of al-Aḥkām as-Sulṭāniyyah* as well. In addition, in this text there is mention of political events in al-Māwardī's age in particular and the Islamic history in general. The main difference between these two works can be found in their dealing

with the same problems but with rather different approach; while al-Fārābī's approach is mostly idealistic, al-Mawardī's is strongly realistic. al-Fārābī's al-Raīs is the ideal human and is not in the world, but al-Māwardī's Imam is actual man who possesses particular administrative abilities.[19] I think that this difference is not peculiar to al-Fārābī's and al-Māwardī's work, namely that the former is utopia and the latter is legalistic. Instead of only utopian perspective, I can say that there is a difference between Greek-style texts about politics and the texts of *al-fiqh* tradition about politics in Islam. Greek-style texts are syncretic/utopian and the others are realist.

al-Māwardī's *Book of al-Aḥkām as-Sulṭāniyyah* deals with the governmental structure, which contains ministry (*wazirate*), judiciary (*al-kadā*) and wars (*al-hurūb*). The viziership comes in two ways, by delegation and by execution.[20] According to the author, these ways and other details of governmental structure are determined by the help of reason and wisdom, and additionally by historical experiences and the Holy Quran.[21] In comparison with Greek-style texts of al-Fārābī, this perspective is very empirical and it does not impose any concepts upon reader. al-Māwardī's work also treats some subjects of daily life, such as *zakah*, *ghaneeemah*, *kharaj*, *jizyah* or *hisbah*. All of them are related to the ongoing actual economical issues.[22] Accordingly, I think it is impossible to design policies without consideration of money movement in the state. This also applies to the modern democracy discussions about politics.[23] Shortly, *Book of al-Aḥkām as-Sulṭāniyyah* deals with the basic components of the governmental structure, by taking into account their existing aspects solely.

As for Nizām al-Mulk's book *of Government* or *the Stories of the Kingdoms* (*Siyāsatnāma* or *Siyar al-Mulūk*), it is the same with some differences aside, it can be said to be very similar to al-Māwardī's work. As mentioned above, al-Māwardī was a *faqīh* (scholar of sharīa) and Nizām al-Mulk was a grand vizier (prime minister). Both books have same characteristics in terms of their aims and approaches to issues and contents. However, Nizām al-Mulk's book contains some extra subjects (such as social conditions and norms of wine drinking, for example) and it adopts more enjoining discourse. In addition, while the historical experiences recounted in al-Māwardī's work are suitably limited to the Islamic history, the historical experiences in Nizām al-Mulk's work are extended to Sassanian and Greek figures, such as Rustam and Alexandre the Great, respectively.[24] Actually, there are some small nuances between two books mentioned above, but both are the same in regard to social and political issues. For instance, Nizām al-Mulk talks about al-Sultān, ministries, war, economy and judiciary in *Siyāsatnāma* veru similarly to *Book of al-Aḥkām as-Sulṭāniyyah*. *Siyāsatnāma* includes more details related to the daily social life and mainly relies on empirical investigation. The latter

is more developed in terms of content. But both are closer to the modern British utilitarian politics tradition than al-Fārābī's work and its Greek-style discourse.

2. ISLAMIC POLITICAL THOUGHT IN MODERN TEXTS

When it comes to Islamic political thought in modern times, it is necessary to take into account Islamic geography, Muslim thinkers and activists. There are many very different states in Islamic world, such as Turkey, Egypt, Pakistan, Iran, Malaysia, Saudi Arabia and India. Accordingly, there are many Islamic authors and activists, who are sometimes accused of terrorism or fundamentalism, such as Mawlānā Sayyid Abu'l-A'lā al-Mawdūdī (1903-1979), Sayyid Qutb (1906-1966) and Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini (1900-1989) and Necmettin Erbakan (1926-2011). All of them are important figures of political Islam in modern ages.[25] Among them, I will particularly focus on Abu'l-A'lā al-Mawdūdī's and Sayyid Qutb's political ideas. There are many scholars who dedicated some of their time to the political outlook of al-Mawdūdī and Qutb, in local or universal languages, such as English, Russian or Serbian.[26]

Both al-Mawdūdī and Qutb are known as charismatic Islamic scholars, authors and activists in the contemporary era. al-Mawdūdī and Qutb had rather comprehensive thoughts that extended from Medieval Islam to modern age, and proposed solutions to the problems of underdeveloped societies. Also they were social and political activists against modern imperialism.[27] Although their families were influential and relatively noble and they were studious and successful scholars, they suffered some social exclusion due to their radical ideas about social establishment.[28] There were many other people who paid the price for their views about society, such as Mahatma Gandhi in India, but the new global world commercialized them (Ghandi) or accused them of fundamentalism (al-Mawdūdī and Qutb). I think that al-Mawdūdī and Qutb do not possess thoughts and ways of activism, which can be considered in harmony with the modern capitalist world. al-Mawdūdī's *Jamāat al-Islāmī* in India and Pakistan, and Qutb's *Ikhvān al-Muslimīn* had some social and political characteristics that could not be reconciled firstly with Europeans and secondly with the United States of America. I think that the members of *Jamāat al-Islāmī* and *Ikhvān al-Muslimīn* were lacking in integrity in their fight (*jihād*) against imperialism, and that their comprehension of the nature of imperialism in general was drastically inconclusive, even before the reaction of foreign countries. I have reached this judgment from the studies about al-Mawdūdī's and Qutb's ideas in Turkish literature.[29]

Although al-Mawdūdī and Qutb's ideas contain some differences, many scholars see them as almost identical, because of their fundamental opposition to western modernism, and question their thoughts in the area of theology.[30] I think that al-Mawdūdī and Qutb's ideas are related to unfavorable social, economic and cultural life conditions in their societies, and that they use some of the Islamic concepts which belong to *al-fiqh* and *al-kalām* without jettisoning their historical connotations. In my opinion, we should approach the thought of the both thinkers in a different manner and focus on their methods and arguments. There is a dilemma in their texts, but it is not of theological nature. On the contrary, the issue is related to their approach to the actual and social reality. Both of them touch upon actual and social problems using historical concepts, and thus overlooking their correspondent reality. Shortly, they impose some of the historical concepts upon today's events. al-Mawdūdī's book of *Meseleler ve Çözümler* (*Issues and Solutions*) contains many issues which are related to the modern and Islamic medieval world, and referring to the Holy Quran elevates Islam to a utopian level, claiming that the sultanate is not Islamic, for instance.[31] Qutb's book of *Yoldaki İşaretler* (*Milestones*) recognizes the underdevelopment of Muslim society and claims that the only rightful generation in Islamic history is the generation of *al-Sahāba,* who were the faithful friends of the Prophet Mohammad (Peace be upon Him). And by doing so, makes them utopian men almost impossible to be followed.[32]

I think that both of them make the same mistake; namely, they idealize an Islamic concept or a utopian age and refute the human component of premodern Islamic history, which are not compatible with this utopia. Thereby, Islam becomes an idea above human and earthly level, very similar to the ideal world in Plato's rationalist idealism or to the ideal concepts in al-Fārābī's thought. Eventually, both rejected some of the Islamic historical facts and modern actualities. For example, al-Mawdūdī expressly accused of *shirk* (refuting the uniqueness/*tawhīd* of God) some of the sects of medieval Islam on the ground of their usage of the concept of *al-istimdād* (hope for Divine help).[33] al-Mawdūdī assumes that there is a problem of mentality when it comes to the correct meanings of terms used by Muslims and for this reason Muslim societies are powerless because Allah says that "you (Muslims) will be superior if you are [true] believers."[34] According to his thought, the modern Muslims are not true believers because they are not powerful, so they must be changed with *dawah*. I think that al-Mawdūdī exaggerates here, and overlooks religious scholars and their *dawah* efforts, and consequently disapproves all medieval Islamic sects in a groundless manner. One difference between al-Mawdūdī's and Qutb's thought can be found in their understanding and usage of the terms of *al-tawhīd* and *al-shirk*. To the former, these terms are related to Islamic religious faith (*iman*). As regards

the latter, these terms are also related to the modern extremism, such as nationalism and racism.[35] Nonetheless, both agree that the Muslim people's social ideology should be changed by revising pre-modern Islamic terms.

Roy Jackson's reading of al-Mawdūdī's political thought begins with the below passage:

As we have seen, Islam, in terms of 'din', is synonymous with the Islamic state: you cannot have one without the other. This was Mawdudi's central aim: to create the vision of a modern state that is informed within a framework of his paradigms of the Qur'an, the Prophet, and the Rightly Guided Caliphs. In many respects, he seems to be calling for a return to the Caliphate, but it is much more complex than that. The Islamic state was central because Mawdudi had little faith in individuals to live pious lives, and so they must be led by the virtuous…[36]

This reading is correct in a way, and also false in a way. It is correct from the point of view that it connects al-Mawdūdī's psychological background with his political thought. Nevertheless, it is false because al-Mawdūdī's thought has more complex implications than it is expressed here. Even though Jackson is aware of al-Mawdūdī's social project centered on the notion of "Jihad", which according to him is "more ethical in nature than social or political" (similar to Reza Nasr's interpretation which sees al-Mawdūdī's endevours as "something like Marxist movement against imperialism"), but he overlooks that the utopic state of al-Mawdūdī's thought is not a "theo-democracy or divine government".[37] I think that al-Mawdūdī's and Qutb's thought come close because of their social necessities, and their using of Islamic terms is not primarily concerned with theological dogmas as is the case in Christian political thought. They assume that medieval Islamic terms are closely associated with their social conditions. The western scholars find them dangerous and implicitly "fundamentalist" because both of them are eager to oppose "the West", especially on political platform. In reality, I propose that these Islamic thinkers do not confront the West, but merely look for the ways to westernize the Islamic world itself. In addition, my aim here is to show the similarity between political arguments of al-Fārābī's and them. This similarity can be seen in their treating Islamic politics by the use of universal concepts, which are actually utopic, and eventually their doing so leads to a utopic conception of Islam.

There is a common approach between modern Islamic political texts, whose content is similar to *al-fiqh*, on the one hand, and medieval Islamic Greek-style political texts on the other. This approach is constituted by drawing attention to the social facts and actualities using conceptualist idealism and by assuming that the social life and reality depend primarily and only on the

universalist concepts. al-Fārābī neglects medieval Islamic social problems and prioritizes Greek concepts to day-to-day events in his *Kitābu Ārāi Ahl al-Madīna al-Fādila* and *Kitābu al-Siyāsa al-Madaniyya*.[38] al-Mawdūdī and Qutb give primacy to the pre-modern concepts of Prophet Mohammad's (Peace be upon Him) age and prefer them to comprehending of modern social developments. For instance, al-Mawdūdī sloganizes the term of "*ijtihad*" (legal and social interpretation) and refutes the term of "*taklīd*" (following)[39] and paradoxically his method and arguments do not contain any progressive results. Both al-Mawdūdī and Qutb, by ignoring the daily life, do not correctly predict the reaction of sympathizers of *jihad* or anti-imperialist movement with regard to exposure to modern world. Thereby, although they possess strong historical and social memory, due to their wrongful approach the result was unproductive. I think, very similar to al-Fārābī's political thought, al-Mawdūdī and Qutb's political ideas are basically grounded in metaphysics instead of actual life. In my opinion, al-Fārābī was a historicist, and this fact is not due to its being deprived of the historicist perspective, but contrary to this, it is related to having the conceptualistic perspective only.

3. THE PROBLEMS OF THE CONCEPTUALIST APPROACH IN ISLAM

There are some modern researches that study the subject of *mirrors for princes* and the art of governance in terms of the similarities and relations between medieval Islamic civilization and medieval Christian world. In these studies, some of the most prominent medieval Islamic thinkers are coming to the fore, such as al-Māwardī in legalistic al-fiqh tradition or Nizām al-Mulk in bureaucratic tradition. When we turn to the medieval and modern Christian Europe we can see that some authors give priority to the social experiences and the political results, such as Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes.[40] Although utopias are absolutely important in the tradition of political philosophy -al-Fārābī's work being one of the most classical examples- but still it is impossible to create a new political order and to reach any fruitful political solutions contenting oneself with them.[41] Therefore, John Rawls, who is the most famous and effective theorist of contemporary liberal political philosophy,[42] firstly takes into consideration Aristotelian thought from Ancient Greek in his *A Theory of Justice*.[43]

The importance of Thomas Hobbes and John Rawls in my study stems from their being the first and the last ones in this tradition respectively; namely, Hobbes wrote the first text taking up a social contract theory. This perspective is also adopted by Rawls himself.[44] Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Immanuel Kant and some other authors and philosophers are the sources of inspiration in Rawls' political thought, be-

cause all of them are concerned with historical and the social experiences, and daily political results as well.[45] Moreover, Hobbes is concerned with the term of "experience" even in the natural sciences.[46] In the tradition of social contract and especially in the political philosophy of Rawls, the term of "experience" is something like a criterion of thought.[47] Following Robert Dahl, Rawls is therefore not a universalist and he points out that "there is no one universally best way to solve the problem of how to project fundamental rights and interests… In the absence of a universally best solution, specific solutions need to be adapted to the historical conditions, and experiences, political culture, and concrete political institutions of a particular country"[48] with the exception of "the original position."[49]

Rawls' political philosophy and his approach are useful and functional because this political thought and its approach have been created by the most developed society of the new world and he dissociated the terms of "reason", "rationality" and "justice" from every conceptualistic, untraceable and metaphysical criterion and interpretation. For Rawls, for instance, there is a difference between "the reasonable" and "the rational" and he prioritizes "the rational" since it is related to the general good. According to him, "the idea of reciprocity lies between the idea of impartiality, which is altruistic (as moved by the general good), and the idea of mutual advantage understood as everyone's being advantaged with respect to one's present or expected situation as things are".[50] The source of the idea of rational or the general good, or anything else applicable in social life does not firstly depend on some outside authority, such as God[51] or any other uncertain term or concept, such as "egalitarianism".[52] There is a difference between the terms of "need" and "wish" and Rawls dissociates the general good and need from all of psychological necessities and wishes.[53] For instance, in the context of queer theory, Rawls thinks that while it is necessary to oppose forced work-sharing or division of labor, voluntary intersexual work-sharing should not be opposed.[54] This psychological separation and the concretization of all social and political matters is very important for an open society and solving political issues. And this is not possible with the conceptualistic approach.

In modern-day Islam, by which I mean the totality of social and political events and appearances in the last two centuries in Islam, there is a need for a criterion of social life (original position), common goal and especially common language. Here Islam is not a faith, religion or anything else which involves Transcendental. Because the fundamental sources of linguistic variety are the events, I assume that the foundation of the communication and reasoning has to recourse to the events in order to have an access to common language. As Ari Daniel Levine puts forward in *Late Northern Song Chi-*

na, non-functional language situations are abused by rhetoric of politics.[55] The historiography of politics, reading techniques of political texts and the styles of using the political terms determine common approach to the social events and political developments. Even a cultural trauma can be related to the usage of the words.[56] For this reason and because England needed a common epistemological and social language in the 17th century, Francis Bacon was the first to express the priorities of events and actualities to the concepts, words and terms in his *Novum Organum*.[57] Secondly, Thomas Hobbes identified and defined the social and the political concepts in *Leviathan*.[58] I accept Rawls' theory of political justice with the exclusion of its populist or democratic extremism, because his theory is connected to the events only and abstains from any speculative metaphysics. As for al-Fārābī's books and modern Islamic texts that are related to the social life and the political philosophy, they are usually interested in metaphysical speculations and rarely in the social reality and the actual problems. Both the former -which is written in Greek-style- and the latter are only transporters of past realities to our modern-day and are not a product of practical intelligence. Here, there is a double alienation which contains both the historical and modern-day meanings, because of the conceptualistic approach of al-Fārābī's political philosophy and modern Islamic political texts.

For instance, the Marxist or the Feminist texts on political philosophy in Islam cause the one-way alienation which contains the historical meanings and which suits the aims of the colonialism. As for modern Islamic political texts, they cause two-way alienation, to the past and the now and render the mind helpless. Marxists, Feminists and Islamists in the Islamic world commonly share the conceptualistic approach to the social and political life. All of them possess a vocabulary which concerns a world outside the actual one. Some of them, by defending some of the Marxist or Feminist ideas justify Westernization and alienates from the real local problems, while the others, by defending some of the nationalist or Islamist ideas justify localization and thus also alienates from the real local events. However, al-Māwardī, al-Ghazālī and Nizām al-Mulk dissociates the concepts, words and terms from the actual life and real social facts and they start thinking and reasoning primarily with the particulars. Accordingly, in political philosophy particulars come first, and concepts, words and terms come second.

CONCLUSION

Political philosophy in Islam is mainly fulfilled by *al-fiqh* and bureaucratic tradition both in the classical and modern age. This is accepted and some-

times expressed by all philosophers of classical Islam (*al-falāsifah*), and even al-Fārābī. Nonetheless, it can be said that there are two false claims about the Greek-style Islamic political philosophy, which regard this philosophy neglected. According to one of these claims, Muslims should keep returning to the political and theological philosophy of medieval Islamic philosophers, in order to develop in modern era. In my opinion, this return does not represent a return to the past philosophical polititcal ideas, but it represents a return of modern-day Islamic political theorists to conceptualistic approach in interpretation of the political order. The second claim is that the development is only possible with the rationalism, and the basic Islamic sciences such as *al-fiqh, hadith* and *kalām* are both only didactic and against every kind of rationalism. Both claims are incorrect because they prefer to deal with the past in order to avoid the responsibility of dealing with present. Above all else, a third presumption may be true which states that Islamic philosophy in the classical age is not authentic in the field of practical or political philosophy. By the way, none of the modern Islamic political philosophy is authentic -especially theoretical *al-fiqh* tradition- because al-Fārābī, contemporary Islamic subject -even Marxist or the secularist subject- and the modern Islamic *faqīh* resemble each other in their conceptualistic approach.

The comparison of al-Fārābī's political philosophical text of *Book of the Opinions of the Inhabitants of the Virtuous City* (*Kitābu Ārāi Ahl al-Madīna al-Fādila*) and al-Māwardī's book of *The Laws of Islamic Governance* (*al-Aḥkām as-Sulṭāniyyah*) is productive from the viewpoint of empiricist aspects of modern Anglo-Saxon political philosophy of Thomas Hobbes and John Rawls. Additionally, the comparison of the classical Islamic texts and modern Islamic texts is inspiring in terms of the reasoning and main approach to the social and the political issues. In the recent times, Abu'l-A'lā al-Mawdūdī and Sayyid Qutb come to the fore when it comes to Islamic political philosophy, which is relevant to *al-fiqh* tradition and Islamic fundamentalism. Despite some differences among them, al-Fārābī's political thought is in harmony with the political thought of al-Mawdūdī and Qutb, because all three render some concepts, histories or figures utopic. Although there are historical, conditional and cultural differences among them, al-Māwardī's political thought is in accord with the political philosophy of Nizām al-Mulk, Machiavelli, Hobbes and Rawls, because all five move from particulars and experiment.

Starting off from Ancient Greek philosophy or Prophet Mohammad's (Peace be upon Him) age do not suffice to solve the social, politic or even theological problems today. When Francis Bacon opposed the conceptualistic and dialectical approaches of ancient times, the island of Great Britain and Continental Europe were overwhelmed by epistemological and political

issues very similar to contemporary Islamic societies. Al-Fārābī was a great philosopher in the middle age of Islam, but his political thought does not possess a useful approach to the social events and the political issues. Although there are some differences between two parites, al-Māwardī and Nizām al-Mulk's political thought is closer to contemporary political philosophy. Particularly in the political thought of Rawls, we know that the democracy is only possible with the common reason which relies on worldly particulars and events, and the conceptualist reason is in adequate. Because of the conceptualistic approach to the political issues, al-Mawdūdī's and Qutb's political ideas do not come in useful to modern Islamic societies. Common sense is primarily related to the historical and new experiments. I think that al-Māwardī, al-Ghazālī, Nizām al-Mulk and Ibn Khaldūn were aware of this epistemological fact (as Rawls), but al-Fārābī was opposed to this fact which al-Mawdūdī's and Qutb did not comprehend.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, Anis. "Mevdûdî", *Türkiye Diyânet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. İstanbul: TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2004. (https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/mevdudi, date of access: 11.09.2018).

Aksakal, Cihangir B. "Seyyid Kutub ve Müslüman Kardeşler", *Akademik Hassasiyetler Dergisi Journal of the Academic Elegance*. Volume: 2/3 (2015): 65-81.

Al-Fārābī, Abū Nasr. *Kitābu al-Siyāsa al-Madaniyya*. Tahkek: Ali Bû Mülhim, Beyrut: Dār ve Maktaba al-Helāl.

Al-Fārābī, Abū Nasr. *Kitābu Ārāi Ahl al-Madīna al-Fādila*. Ed. Albīr Nasrī Nāder, Beyrut: Dâr al-Mashrek, 1985.

Al-Māwardī, Abī al-Hasan. *Kitāb al-Aḥkām as-Sultāniyyah wa al-Wilāyāt al-Dīniyya*. tahkek: Ahmad al-Mubārak al-Baghdādī, Kuveyt: Mektebetu Ibn al-Kutayba, 1989.

Al-Māwardī, Abu'l-Hasan. *Al-Aḥkām as-Sultāniyyah the Laws of Islamic Governance*. Translator: Asadullah Yate. London: Ta-Ha Publishers Ltd., 1996.

Altun, Fatmanur. *Seyyid Kutub*. 3. Baskı, İstanbul: İlke Yayıncılık, 2006.

Arnaldez, Roger. "İslâm'da Felsefî Düşünce Nasıl Kötürümleşti?", in *İslâm Felsefesi Üzerine*. Translator: Ahmet Arslan, Ankara: Vadi Yayınları, 1999, 46-63.

Ata, Mahmut. Seyyid Ebu'l-A'lâ Mevdûdî'nin Siyasi Düşüncesinin Teolojik Temelleri. Master's Thesis, T.C. Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2006.

Adawī, Abd al-Rahmān. Badawī (Ed.), "al-Seyāsa", "al-Tīmāvīs", in *Aflātūn inde al-Arab*. Beyrût: Dār al-Andulus,1985.

Bacon, Francis. *The New Organon*. Ed. Lisa Jardine, Michael Silverthorne, New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Bilgin, Mehmet Fevzi. "Çevirmenin Sunuşu", in *Siyasal Liberalizm* of John Rawls. Translator: Mehmet Fevzi Bilgin. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2007, ix-xxiv.

Birışık, Abdülhamit. "Ebü'l-A'lâ Mevdûdî'nin Kur'ân Yorumunu Şekillendiren Temel Dinamikler". *T.C. Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, Volume: 20/2, (2011): 1-20.

Blaydes, Lisa-Grımmer, Justin-McQueen, Alison. "Mirrors for Princes and Sultans: Advice on the Art of Governance in the Medieval Christian and Islamic Worlds". *Very Preliminary*, (October 4, 2013): 1-30.
Bracken, Patrick J. *Trauma: Culture, Meaning and Philosophy*. London and Philadelphia: Whurr Publishers, 2002.
El-Câbirî, Muhammed Âbid. *Tekvînü'l-Akli'l-Arabî*. 10. Baskı, Beyrût: Merkezü Dirâsâti'l-Vahdeti'l-Arabî, 2009.
Ghazālī, Ḥuccat al-Islām Abū Ḥāmed. *Tahāfūt al-Falāsifah*. Preparer: Hekmat Hāshim, Mahmūd Dabīcū, Demashk: Dār al-Takvā, 2006.
Görgün, Hilal. "Seyyid Kutub". *Türkiye Diyânet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, İstanbul: TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2009, (https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/seyyid-kutub, date of access: 11.09.2018).
Gutas, Dimitri. "Arapça'ya Tercüme Edilen Yunanca Felsefî Eserler". in *İslâm Felsefesi Tarih ve Problemler*. Translator: İbrahim Halil Üçer. İstanbul: İsam Yayınları, 2013, 777-797.
Hanoğlu, İsmail. "Ebû Nasr el-Fârâbî'de Felsefi Antropolojinin Psiko-Metafizik Temelleri". *Diyanet İlmî Dergi*, Cilt: 52/1, (Ocak-Şubat-Mart 2016): 187-209.
Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan, or, the Matter, Form, and Power of a Commonwealth, Ecclesiastical and Civil*. Ed. Sir William Molesworth, Bart. London: John Bohn, 1839.
Jackson, Roy. *Mawlana Mawdudi&Political Islam: Authority and Islamic State*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor&Francis Group, 2011.
Karaküçük, Suna Arslan. "Excellent Society-Ideal Education: Educational Models in the Optimistic Utopias". *Journal of Education and Future*. Issue 1, (Year 2012): 119-132.
Kelly, Erin. "Editor's Foreword", in *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement* of John Rawls. London, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001, xi-xiv.
Kostıć, Ivan Ejub. "Sličnosti I Razlike U Političkim Mišljenjima Abul-Ale Mavdudija I Sajida Kutba" (Similarities and Differences in Political Opinions of Abul A'la Mawdudi and Sayyid Qut", Vol. IV (2), (Kom, 2015): 71-89.
Kutub, Prof. Seyyid. *Yoldaki İşaretler: İmanın İlkeleri*. Translator: Salih Uçan. İstanbul: Hicret Yayınları, 1980.
Levıne, Ari Daniel. *Divided by a Common Language: Factional Conflict in Late Northern Song China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, USA, 2008.
Mawdudı, Sayyid Abu'l-A'la. *Towards Understanding Islam*. U.K.I.M. Dawah Centre.
Menekşe, Ömer. "İslam Düşünce Tarihinde Devlet Anlayışı: Mâverdi ve Nizâmülmülk Örneği". *Dinbilimleri Akademik Araştırma Dergisi*, V/3 (2005): 193-211.
Mevdudi. *Meseleler ve Çözümler 3*. Translator: Yusuf Karaca. İstanbul: Risale Yayınları, 1999.
Mevdûdî. *Meseleler ve Çözümler 4*. Translator: Yusuf Karaca. İstanbul: Risale Yayınları, 1999.
Mevdûdî. Seyyid Ebü'l-A'la. *Kur'ân'ın Dört Temel Terimi: İlah, Din, Rab, İbadet*. İstanbul: Özgün Yayıncılık, 1999.
Nasr, Seyyed Vali Reza. *Mawdudi and the Making of Islamic Revivalism*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
Nizamülmülk. *Siyasetnâme Siyeru'l-Mülûk*. Trc: Nurettin Bayburtlugil. 6. Baskı. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2006.
Pıçak, Murat-Doğan, Bahar Burtan-Oğrak, Abdullah, " Abu Al-Hasan Al-Mawardi's Views on Economic Policies", *Current Research Journal of Economic Theory* 5/3 (2013): 56-65.

Pogge, Thomas. *John Rawls: His Life and Theory of Justice*. Translated by Michelle Kosch. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge and Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999.
Rawls, John. *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*; Revised Edition (2), Ed. Erin Kelly, London, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001.
Rawls, John. "Kamusal Akıl Düşüncesinin Yeniden Ele Alınması", in *Siyasal Liberalism*. Translated by Gül Evrin. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2007.
Rawls, John. *Political Liberalism*. Second Edition, New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.
Shapin, Steven-Schaffer, Simon. *Leviathan and the Air-pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life*. Princeton and New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1985.
Swanson, Jacinda. "The Economy and Its Relation to Politics: Robert Dahl, Neoclassical Economics, and Democracy", *Polity* 39/2, (April 2007): 208-233.
Vogel, Frank E. "Tracing Nuance in Māwardī's al-Aḥkām al-Sulṭāniyya: Implicit Framing of Constitutional Authority", *Islamic Law in Theory: Studies on Jurisprudence in Honor of Bernard Weiss*. Ed. A. Kevin Reinhart-R. Gleave, Leiden: Brill, 2014, 331-360.
Walzer, Richard. "al-Fārābī's Theory of Prophecy and Divination", *Greek into Arabic: Essays on Islamic Philosophy*. Cambridge and Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1962, 206-219.
Yılmaz, Mesut. Platon ve Fârâbî'nin Ütopik Devlet Anlayışlarının Karşılaştırılması. Basılmamış Master Tezi, Dicle Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2005.

NOTLAR

1 This paper is a revised and complemented text of the presentation submitted to "1. National Symposium on the Contemporary Political Philosophy" which took place at Middle Eastern Technical University on 20-21. September 2018.

2 Francis Bacon, *The New Organon*, Ed. Lisa Jardine, Michael Silverthorne (New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2003), LXXI, 58-59.

3 Roger Arnaldez, "İslâm'da Felsefî Düşünce Nasıl Kötürümleşti?", in *İslâm Felsefesi Üzerine*, Translator: Ahmet Arslan. (Ankara: Vadi Yayınları, 1999), 47, 50, 60.

4 Muhammed Âbid el-Câbirî, *Tekvînü'l-Akli'l-Arabî*, 10. Baskı, (Beyrût: Merkezü Dirâsâti'l-Vahdeti'l-Arabî, 2009), 347-351.

5 Frank E. Vogel, "Tracing Nuance in Māwardī's al-Aḥkām al-Sulṭāniyya: Implicit Framing of Constitutional Authority", *Islamic Law in Theory: Studies on Jurisprudence in Honor of Bernard Weiss*, Ed. A. Kevin Reinhart, R. Gleave (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 331.

6 *Ibid*, 331.

7 Ömer Menekşe, "İslam Düşünce Tarihinde Devlet Anlayışı: Mâverdi ve Nizâmülmülk Örneği", *Dinbilimleri Akademik Araştırma Dergisi*, V/3 (2005): 197.

8 Dimitri Gutas, "Arapça'ya Tercüme Edilen Yunanca Felsefî Eserler", in *İslâm Felsefesi Tarih ve Problemler*, Translator: İbrahim Halil Üçer (İstanbul: İsam Yayınları, 2013), 788.

9 To gain a better insight please refer to: Abd al-Rahmān, Badawī (Ed.), "al-Seyāsa", "al-Tīmāvīs", in *Aflātūn inde al-Arab*, (Beyrût: Dār al-Andulus, 1985), 85-170.

10 Mesut Yılmaz, Platon ve Fârâbî'nin Ütopik Devlet Anlayışlarının Karşılaştırılması, (Basılmamış Master Tezi, Dicle Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2005), 48-50.

11 Abū Nasr al-Fārābī, *Kitābu Ārāi Ahl al-Madīna al-Fādila*, Ed. Albīr Nasrī Nāder (Beyrut: Dâr al-Mashrek, 1985), 37-54.

12 İsmail Hanoğlu, "Ebû Nasr el-Fârâbî'de Felsefi Antropolojinin Psiko-Metafizik Temelleri", *Diyanet İlmî Dergi*, Cilt: 52/1, (Ocak-Şubat-Mart 2016): 194-197.

13 al-Fārābī, *Kitābu Ārāi Ahl al-Madīna al-Fādila*, 114-126.

14 Richard Walzer, "al-Fārābī's Theory of Prophecy and Divination", *Greek into Arabic: Essays on Islamic Philosophy*, (Cambridge and Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1962), 206-207.

15 al-Fārābī, *Kitābu Ārāi Ahl al-Madīna al-Fādila*, 131-136.

16 Ghazālī, *Tahāfūt al-Falāsifah*, Preparer: Hekmat Hāshim, Mahmūd Dabīcū (Demashk: Dār al-Takvā, 2006), 9-10, 12-13.

17 Abī al-Hasan al-Māwardī, *Kitāb al-Aḥkām as-Sultāniyyah wa al-Wilāyāt al-Dīniyya*, (tahkek: Ahmad al-Mubārak al-Baghdādī) (Kuveyt: Mektebetu Ibn al-Kutayba, 1989); idem, *Al-Aḥkām as-Sultāniyyah The Laws of Islamic Governance*, Translator: Asadullah Yate (London: Ta-Ha Publishers Ltd., 1996); Nizamülmülk, *Siyasetnâme Siyeru'l-Mülûk*, 6. Baskı, Trc. Nurettin Bayburtlugil, (İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2006), 142-143.

18 al-Māwardī, *Kitāb al-Aḥkām as-Sultāniyyah wa al-Wilāyāt al-Dīniyya*, 6-7; idem, *Al-Aḥkām as-Sultāniyyah The Laws of Islamic Governance*, 12-13.

19 al-Māwardī, *Kitāb al-Aḥkām as-Sultāniyyah wa al-Wilāyāt al-Dīniyya*, 5-6; idem, *Al-Aḥkām as-Sultāniyyah The Laws of Islamic Governance*, 12; al-Fārābī, *Kitābu Ārāi Ahl al-Madīna al-Fādila*, 127-130.

20 al-Māwardī, *Kitāb al-Aḥkām as-Sultāniyyah wa al-Wilāyāt al-Dīniyya*, 30; idem, *Al-Aḥkām as-Sultāniyyah The Laws of Islamic Governance*, 37.

21 al-Māwardī, *Kitāb al-Aḥkām as-Sultāniyyah wa al-Wilāyāt al-Dīniyya*, 30-31; idem, *Al-Aḥkām as-Sultāniyyah The Laws of Islamic Governance*, 37-38.

22 al-Māwardī, *Kitāb al-Aḥkām as-Sultāniyyah wa al-Wilāyāt al-Dīniyya*, 145, 161, 181, 231, 315; idem, *Al-Aḥkām as-Sultāniyyah The Laws of Islamic Governance*, 168, 186, 207, 337.

23 Jacinda Swanson, "The Economy and Its Relation to Politics: Robert Dahl, Neoclassical Economics, and Democracy", *Polity* 39/2, (April 2007): 210-211.

24 Nizamülmülk, *Siyasetnâme Siyeru'l-Mülûk*, 47, 77, 197, 205, 207.

25 Seyyed Vali Reza Nasr, *Mawdudi and the Making of Islamic Revivalism*, (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), vii, 3; Roy Jackson, *Mawlana Mawdudi&Political Islam: Authority and Islamic State*, (London and New York: Routledge, Taylor&Francis Group, 2011), 1-3.

26 Ivan Ejub Kostić, "Sličnosti I Razlike U Političkim Mišljenjima Abul-Ale Mavdudija I Sajida Kutba" "Similarities and Differences in Political Opinions of Abul A'la Mawdudi and Sayyid Qut", IV/2 (Kom, 2015): 71-89.

27 Nasr, *Mawdudi and the Making of Islamic Revivalism*, 49-50.

28 Jackson, *Mawlana Mawdudi&Political Islam: Authority and Islamic State*, 9-13.

29 Anis Ahmad, "Mevdûdî", *Türkiye Diyânet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, (İstanbul: TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2004), (https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/mevdudi, date of access: 11.09.2018); Hilal Görgün, "Seyyid Kutub", *Türkiye Diyânet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, (İstanbul: TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2009), (https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/seyyid-kutub, date of access: 11.09.2018); Fatmanur Altun, *Seyyid Kutub*, 3. Baskı, (İstanbul: İlke Yayıncılık, 2006); Mahmut Ata, Seyyid Ebu'l-A'lâ Mevdûdî'nin Siyasi Düşüncesinin Teolojik Temelleri, (Master's Thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2006); Cihangir B. Aksakal, "Seyyid Kutub ve Müslüman Kardeşler", *Akademik Hassasiyetler Dergisi Journal of the Academic Elegance*, 2/3 (2015): 65-81; Abdülhamit Birışık, "Ebü'l-A'lâ Mevdûdî'nin Kur'ân Yorumunu Şekillendiren Temel Dinamikler", *T.C. Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20/2 (2011): 1-20.

30 Kostić, "Sličnosti I Razlike U Političkim Mišljenjima Abul-Ale Mavdudija I Sajida Kutba", 71.

31 Mevdûdî, *Meseleler ve Çözümler 4*. Translator: Yusuf Karaca (İstanbul: Risale Yayınları, 1999), 74-76.

32 Prof. Seyyid Kutub, *Yoldaki İşaretler: İmanın İlkeleri*, Translator: Salih Uçan (İstanbul: Hicret Yayınları, 1980), 8-13.

33 Seyyid Ebü'l-A'la Mevdûdî, *Kur'ân'ın Dört Temel Terimi: İlah, Din, Rab, İbadet*, (İstanbul: Özgün Yayıncılık, 1999); Sayyid Abu'l-A'la Mawdudi, *Towards Understanding Islam*, U.K.I.M. Dawah Centre, 53, 56, 77, 81. al-Mawdūdī told here (81) that "One who shirks it is a sinner. His very claim to being a Muslim is doubtful."

34 The Holy Quran, surah of Āl-i Imrān, 3/139.

35 Kutub, *Yoldaki İşaretler: İmanın İlkeleri*, 99.

36 Jackson, *Mawlana Mawdudi&Political Islam: Authority and Islamic State*, 128.

37 *Ibid*, 146; Nasr, *Mawdudi and the Making of Islamic Revivalism*, 49.

38 al-Fārābī, *Kitābu Ārāi Ahl al-Madina al-Fādila*; Abū Nasr al-Fārābī, *Kitābu al-Siyāsa al-Madaniyya*; Tahkek: Ali Bû Mülhim (Beyrut: Dār ve Maktaba al-Helāl).

39 Mevdûdî, *Meseleler ve Çözümler 3*, Translator: Yusuf Karaca (İstanbul: Risale Yayınları, 1999), 163-164, 168-169.

40 Lisa Blaydes, Justin Grimmer, Alison McQueen, "Mirrors for Princes and Sultans: Advice on the Art of Governance in the Medieval Christian and Islamic Worlds", *Very Preliminary*, (October 4 2013): 1-30; Murat Pıçak-Bahar Burtan Doğan-Abdullah Oğrak, " Abu Al-Hasan Al-Mawardi's Views on Economic Policies", *Current Research Journal of Economic Theory* 5(3): 56-65, (2013): especially 63.

41 Suna Arslan Karaküçük, "Excellent Society-Ideal Education: Educational Models in the Optimistic Utopias", *Journal of Education and Future* 1 (Year 2012): 119-132.

42 Mehmet Fevzi Bilgin, "Çevirmenin Sunuşu", in *Siyasal Liberalizm* of John Rawls, Translator: Mehmet Fevzi Bilgin (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2007), ix.

43 John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, Revised Edition (2), (Cambridge and Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999), 9-10.

44 Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, xviii.

45 Erin Kelly, "Editor's Foreword", in *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement of John Rawls*, (London, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001), xii.

46 Steven Shapin, Simon Schaffer, *Leviathan and the Air-pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life*, (Princeton and New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1985), 80-109.

47 John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, 21, 23, 73 etc.; idem; *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*, Editor: Erin Kelly, (London, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001), 17, 83; idem, *Political Liberalism*, Second Edition, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 4, 25-26, especially 56-57; Thomas Pogge, *John Rawls: His Life and Theory of Justice*, Translated by Michelle Kosch, (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 55, 82, 84, 144.

48 Rawls, *Political Liberalism*, 325, footnote 21.

49 Rawls, *Political Liberalism*, 24.

50 *Ibid*, 48-51.

51 *Ibid*, 73.

52 *Ibid*, 81.

53 *Ibid*, 189, footnote 20.

54 John Rawls, "Kamusal Akıl Düşüncesinin Yeniden Ele Alınması", in *Siyasal Liberalism*, Translated by Gül Evrin, (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2007), 496.

55 Ari Daniel Levine, *Divided by a Common Language: Factional Conflict in Late Northern Song China*, (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, USA, 2008), 1-41.

56 Patrick J. Bracken, *Trauma: Culture, Meaning and Philosophy*, (London and Philadelphia: Whurr Publishers, 2002), 61, 87-90, 99-100.

57 Bacon, *The New Organon*, 79-80.

58 Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan, or, the Matter, Form, and Power of a Commonwealth, Ecclesiastical and Civil*, Ed. Sir William Molesworth Bart (London: John Bohn, 1839).