

**AN ANALYSIS OF ALI ABD UL-RAZIQ'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ISLAM AND STATE**

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
İSTANBUL ŞEHİR UNIVERSITY

BY

ÖNER YİĞİT

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

JULY 2018

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Political Science and International Relations

Examining Committee Members:

	DECISION	SIGNATURE
Assist. Prof. İsmail Yaylacı (Thesis Advisor)	<u>Accepted</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>
Assist. Prof. Mehmet Akif Kayapınar	<u>Accepted</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>
Assist. Prof. Muhammet Zahit Atçıl	<u>Accepted</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>

This is to confirm that this thesis complies with all the standards set by the Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences of İstanbul Şehir University.

Date 27.07.2018



I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and standards of ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and standards, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

First Name, Last Name: Oner Yigit

Signature 

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF ALI ABD UL-RAZIQ'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ISLAM AND STATE

Yigit, Öner.

MA in Political Science and International Relations

Thesis Advisor: Assist. Prof. İsmail Yaylacı

July 2018, 91 pages

This thesis examines the political ideas of Ali Abd ul-Raziq—an Al-Azhar scholar and a sharia court judge who was suspended from his duty and was stripped of his scholarly qualifications because of the arguments he expounded in his 1925 book, titled *Al Islam wa Usulul Hukm*. He argued that the concept of the caliphate as an institution was not compulsory in Islam, and hence it was not necessary to re-establish. He believed that the nature of the authority of the Prophet Muhammad was only spiritual. He maintained that neither the Prophet was a political leader, nor did he establish an Islamic state. Because of his ideas, Raziq is known as the “first Muslim secularist” or the founder of “Islamic Laicism.” In this research, I have analyzed Ali Abd ul-Raziq’s arguments and compared his beliefs with his contemporaries and some medieval Sunni Muslim scholars’ views such as Ibn Khaldun, Ibn Taymiyyah, Al-Mawardi. The goal of the thesis is to answer how Raziq’s arguments differ from the other scholars, and how he justifies his arguments. I have argued that the political context of the 1920s such as the abolition of sultanate and caliphate, the discussion over the abolition among Ottoman elites, the political context of Egypt as well as Raziq’s personal story shaped Raziq’s arguments. Based on a comparative analysis, I also show that while Raziq did not have authentic ideas regarding the concept of the caliphate, his ideas about the nature of the authority of the Prophet and his companions were non-conventional and perhaps too unorthodox.

I speculate that Raziq could have been a pioneer of a school of thought if he developed his ideas regarding why and how Islam does not suggest a specific political system.

Keywords: Ali Abd-ul Raziq, Islam, State, Caliphate, Religion



ÖZ

ALİ ABDULRAZİK'İN İSLAM VE DEVLET İLİŞKİSİ ANLAYIŞINA DAİR BİR ANALİZ

Yigit, Öner.

Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Yüksek Lisans Programı

Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi İsmail Yaylacı

Temmuz 2018, 91 sayfa

Bu tez bir dönem şeriat mahkemesinde yargıç olan El-Ezher Üniversitesi mezunu Ali Abdulrazık'ın siyasi görüşlerini incelemektedir. İslam'da İktidarın Temelleri, *Al-Islam wa Usul al-Hukm*, adlı kitabında savunduğu görüşleri nedeniyle görevinden alınmış ve kadılık unvanını 1925'te kaybetmiştir. Kurum olarak Halifelik makamının İslam'da zorunlu olmadığını savunmuş ve halifeliğin tekrar kurulmasının gerekli olmadığını ileri sürmüştür. Hz. Muhammed'in otoritesinin doğasının sadece ruhani olduğuna inanmıştır. Bununla beraber, Hz. Muhammed'in ne bir siyasi lider ne de İslam Devleti'ni kuran kişi olduğuna inanmıştır. Görüşlerinden dolayı Abdulrazık, "ilk seküler Müslüman" ya da "İslami Laikliğinin" kurucusu olarak tanınmaktadır. Bu çalışmada, Ali Abdulrazık'ın argümanları analiz edilmiş ve görüşleri Orta çağ Müslüman Sunni alimlerinin yansira Abdulrazık'ın muhaliflerinin görüşleriyle de karşılaştırılmıştır. Bu tezin amacı, Abdulrazık'ın argümanlarının diğer alimlerden nasıl farklılaştığını ve kendi argümanlarını nasıl savunduğunu ortaya koymaktır. Bu çalışmada, 1920lerde sultanlık ve hilafetin lağvedilmesinin, Osmanlı elitleri arasında mevzubahis lağvetme tartışmalarının ve Mısır'daki siyasi atmosferin yansira Razık'ın kişisel öyküsünün kendisinin argümanlarını şekillendirdiğini ileri sürdüm. Bununla beraber, karşılaştırmalı analiz sonucunda, Abdulrazık'ın hilafet kavramı konusunda orijinal fikirleri olmamakla birlikte, peygamberin ve sahabelerin otoritesinin doğası hakkındaki görüşlerinin oldukça alışılmışın dışında olduğunu gösteriyorum. Son olarak, spekülasyon yapmak gerekirse, Abdulrazık İslam'ın

özel olarak neden ve nasıl bir siyasal sistemi önermediği fikrini geliştirip delillerle ikna edici olabilseydi kendisinin öncü olduğu bir düşünce ekolü kurabilirdi.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ali Abdulrazık, İslam, Devlet, Halifelik, Din



PREFACE

I am grateful to many people whose support encouraged me to complete this thesis. First, I express my gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Ismail Yaylacı. Although I have interested in the religion and politics subfield since I was a sophomore student, his graduate-level course in religion and politics helped me to familiarize myself with the literature, concepts, and approaches in the subfield of religion and politics more academically and systematically. For this thesis, his reviews and comments helped me to improve the framework of the thesis and develop my ideas. I benefited a lot from his expertise in the field of religion and politics, and I am thankful to him that he accepted to supervise my thesis.

I thank Dr. Mehmet Akif Kayapınar and Dr. Muhammet Zahit Atçıl for accepting to be in my committee. I will always be grateful to the scholars in the Department of Political Science and International Relations at Istanbul Şehir University for accepting me as a graduate student after being away from political studies for two years. Courses I took from Dr. Hasan Kösebalaban, Dr. Hüseyin Alptekin, Dr. Şirin Duygulu Elçim and Dr. İsmail Yaylacı reinvigorated me to continue my academic journey.

I thank several close friends who made this work to be done in different ways. I appreciate my “bobo” friends who always believe in me. I have received their recommendation and endorsements whenever I need. I wrote much of the thesis while working on a project at Al-Sharq Forum. I am indebted to my directors and colleagues for their patience and understanding. Their question of “How is your thesis going on?” made me to progress in my writing. Friends in the office helped me to find sources, edit my script and even discuss the topic of the thesis with me.

Finally, I express my gratitude to my parents for always respecting my decisions and helping me to continue my dream. I am glad to see their support in throughout my studies. I will not let them down.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iv
Öz	vi
Preface	viii
Table Of Contents	x
List Of Abbreviations	xii
CHAPTERS	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Cultural Essentialist and Islamist Views of State and Religion	1
1.2. An Alternative View: Raziq’s Contribution to the Debate	3
1.3. Methodology and Resources	4
1.4. Some notes on <i>al-Islam wa- Usul al- Hukm</i>	5
1.5. Review of Literature on Ali Abd ul-Raziq	6
1.6. Organization of the Thesis	12
2. CONTEXTUALIZATION OF RAZIQ’S ARGUMENTS	14
2.1. Introduction	14
2.2. A Synopsis about Ali Abd ul-Raziq’s Life	15
2.3. Debates over the Separation of Sultanate and Caliphate	21
2.3.1. Abolition of Sultanate	23
2.3.2. Abolition of Caliphate	25
2.4. Attempts to Re-establish Caliphate in Egypt	27
2.5. Conclusion	31
3. ALI ABD UL-RAZIQ AGAINST THE CLASSIC THEORY OF CALIPHATE.....	32
3.1. Introduction	32
3.2. Temporary Solutions in Early Time	33
3.3. Classic Theory of Caliphate	35
3.4. Raziq’s Challenge to Classic Theory of Caliphate.....	40
3. 4.1 Nothing in Quran on Caliphate	43
3.4.2 No Verifiable Hadiths on Caliphate.....	45
3.4.3 No Consensus (<i>ijma</i>) on Caliphate	47
3.4.4. Roots of Caliphate: Coercion and Sword	48
3.4.5. Is Caliphate Necessary?.....	49

3.5. Ibn Khaldun and Raziq.....	51
3.6. Conclusion	52
4. NATURE OF PROPHET’S AUTHORITY AND STATE.....	54
4.1. Introduction	54
4.2. Mainstream Views of Political Authority and State in Islam	56
4.2.1 Medieval Muslim scholars’ Views	56
4.2.2 Contemporary Muslim Scholars’ Views	57
4.2.3 Leading Islamists’ Views.....	58
4.2.4 Western Scholars and Orientalists’ Views	60
4.3. Ali Abd ul-Raziq’s Response to Mainstream	62
4.3.1 Raziq’s Main Arguments	63
4.3.1.1 <i>Ambiguous state structure</i>	64
4.3.1.2 <i>Spiritual and temporal power</i>	67
4.3.1.3 <i>The Prophet or King?</i>	67
4.3.1.4 <i>The Prophet and coercion</i>	69
4.3.1.5 <i>Jihad</i>	70
4.3.1.6 <i>Abu Bakr as the first King</i>	71
4.3.1.7 <i>Scientific method</i>	72
4.3.1.8 <i>Secularism/laicism</i>	73
4.3.1.9 <i>Umma: Spiritual Union</i>	74
4.4. Intellectuals influenced by Raziq	75
4. 5. Conclusion	78
5. CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	80
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	86

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AHCUC	: Azhar's High Council of Ulama Council
LCP	: Liberal Constitutionalist Party
MB	: Muslim Brotherhood
TGNA	: Turkish Grand National Assembly
WP	: Wafd Party



CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Does Islam propose a state model and political system? Was the Prophet Mohammed a political leader? Did the Prophet form an Islamic state? Is secularism compatible with Islam? Is there anything as the separation of religion and state in Islam? This thesis focuses on a scholar's —Ali Abd ul-Raziq (1888-1966), an Egyptian former sharia judge and alumni of al-Azhar University— answers to these questions. What makes Raziq's arguments worth studying is that he is considered as the first "Muslim secularist" who tries to justify his position by giving references to Islam (Gazi, 2009). The central question of the thesis is how Raziq justifies his arguments about state-religion affairs in Islam. Why is he known as "secularist" and if so, how does he become a secular Muslim scholar? In this thesis, I will examine Ali Abd ul-Raziq's two main views that made him known as a Muslim secularist: The concept of the caliphate as a political system and the political authority during the Prophet Muhammad. I will show how Ali Abd ul-Raziq challenges the classic theory of caliphate and how he justifies a separation of religion and state. Before discussing Raziq's arguments, I briefly show how the relationship between Islam and state is understood by cultural essentialists and Islamist. By doing so, one can clearly see in the next pages see that in fact Raziq's arguments are exactly the opposite of essentialists and islamists' views.

1.1. Cultural Essentialist and Islamist Views of State and Religion

In the literature on Islam and politics, cultural essentialists or orientalist argue that Islam is unique, and there is an inherent distinction between Islam and other religions (Abdi, 2017, p. 30). According to their view, the reason why Muslim majority countries have problems with democracy, human rights, and freedom, and so on is that Islam is the religion of these communities. They have mostly argued that Islam does not have a church, and there is no a separation between state and religion in Islam. For instance, Bernard Lewis writes:

In Islam, religion is not, as is the case in Christianity, a sector or division which governs certain parts of life, while others escape its grip; the Islamic religion is concerned with life as a whole, exerting its jurisdiction, not in limited, but in global terms. In a society like this, the mere idea of a separation of the Church and the State is devoid of sense, in that the Church and the State, religious power and political power, do not exist as two distinct units able to be separated; they are one (Abdi, 2017, p. 30).

The literature has many studies where we can find various of the idea quoted above. However, in brief, the essentialists argue that the reason why Western countries have efficient democracies and high level of political freedom is that of the separation of church and state.

On the other hand, Islamists also hold similar arguments. For instance, Hasan al-Banna, Ebu'l A'lâ el-Mevdudi, Seyyid Qutb, Naquib al-Attas, Yusuf al-Qaradawi and other Islamists believe that "Islam is the solution," and that the Quran, the Sunna or other secondary Islamic sources are good enough to provide answers for all the needs of the Muslims. If one is to ask these scholars, "What do you think about secularism/laicism" to these scholars, perhaps they would generally argue that *a)* secularism is a Western-Christian product, *b)* it is the ideology of dictatorial regimes in the Middle East where has been used as a tool of for suppressing Muslims and, *c)* there is no separation between religion and state in Islam. Accordingly, what secularism or separation of state and religion means for Islamists is not something that to be supported, and it is not appropriate with Islam. For instance, Mawdudi accuses secularism as "atheism," Qaradawi defines it as "irreligious", and Al-Attas states that secularism does not have roots within Islam (Attas, 1978; El-Karadavi, 2013; Nasr, 1996).

It can be provocative to state that cultural essentialists and Islamists have something in common. They both argue that Islam does not separate religion and state. While essentialists believe in this argument to prize what western civilization achieved because of the separation of church and state, Islamists use this argument to make a distinction between Islam and Christianity. To Islamists, Islam should be materialized in state affairs

because Islam is the solution to everything. However, for cultural essentialists, Islam prevents Muslims to adopt western concepts and political systems.

1.2. An Alternative View: Raziq's Contribution to the Debate

Before discussing Ali Abd ul-Raziq's arguments, it should be stated that his contribution has been significant. Indeed, he re-opened a door to look at the debates with the eyes of the modern age. Whether his approach is called as "Secular-Liberal" approach (Abdi, 2017), or "Islamic Laicism" (Radhan, 2014) or "Muslim secularism" (Pankhurst, 2010), he had only one goal: Islam does not suggest an ideal political system. In 1925, he published a very controversial book, called *Al-Islam wa Usul al-Hukm* (Islam and the Foundation of Political Power), in which he argues that since Islam does not specify a political system for Muslims, and the caliphate was a historical concept that is not a mandatory in Islam. He, then, questions the whole political authority during the Prophet and argues that the Prophet's mission is only spiritual, and he was not a political leader. With such arguments, Raziq eventually justifies the separation of Islam and state. He simply argues that states or political authorities harmed religion, and historically, Islam had become a tool for political ambitions by caliphs/kings/sultans. According to Raziq, politics, state, power are all the topics of the world, which Prophet had no interest in them. Raziq did not use the word "secularism" or "laicism" even though scholars see him as "Muslim Secularist." He received much criticism for saying that Islam has nothing to say about an ideal state or a political system, that the caliphate is not a religious institution.

Today, it is hard to write an article or a book on the political history of the modern Middle East without mentioning Raziq and his contributions. Since he studied in the famous traditional school al-Azhar University, scholars have always wondered the transformation in the thoughts of Raziq. This study aims to present the views of Raziq who urges Muslims to think outside the box, in spite of his ambiguous arguments and assertive language.

1.3. Methodology and Resources

There has been considerable literature on how Raziq challenged the existing traditional views and how he opened a door for new interpretations to re-think about politics, state, regimes and state-religion affairs. In this thesis, I examine a scholar whose political ideas has seen as controversial in the modern history of Muslim political thought. I hope that this study may contribute to the literature on the history of ideas. In this study, I utilize a qualitative method, more specifically textual analysis. I critically evaluate the texts that have been written by and on Ali Abd ul-Raziq, and I also compare the existing information about Raziq to test their reliability. Because the topic is historical, almost all the references are from the academic books and journals.

The primary goal of this thesis is to show how Raziq differs from the mainstream scholars. To demonstrate that, I use a comparative approach, and I try to compare Raziq's views with the views of the Sunni Muslim scholars such as Ibn Taymiyyah, al-Mawardi, and Ibn Khaldun. I was able to read the primary texts of the three scholars that were translated into either English or Turkish. I will rely on the Turkish translation of Ibn Taymiyyah's *es-Siyasetü'ş-şeriyye* translated by Dergah Yayınları, the English translation of al-Mawardi's *Al-Ahkam as-Sultaniyyah* (The Ordinance of Government) translated by Ta-Ha Publisher and the English translation of Ibn Khaldun's *The Muḥaddimah* by Princeton University. Moreover, I also looked at secondary sources that were written on the medieval Islamic political thought such as Ann Lambton's *State and Government in Medieval Islam* and Erwin Rosenthal's *Political Thought in Medieval Islam* as well as Patrica Crone's *Medieval Islamic Political Thought*. Because the focus of this thesis is not the medieval scholars' interpretations, I will briefly explain what these scholars wrote on the topics that Raziq discussed. More specifically, I tried to focus on Raziq's contribution to the debates.

In fact, this thesis has several limitations. Since I do not know Arabic, I relied on the English and Turkish translations of *Al-Islam wa Usul al-Hukm* and the literature in the two languages. In this project, Ali Abd ul-Raziq's books, discussions of the scholars on

Raziq and his arguments will be the main source for this thesis. Indeed, the language barrier restricts me from engaging with some Arabic texts, but I believe that I have reached most of the secondary sources in Turkish and English that provide information about the Arabic texts. Some of the articles that I used in this research are from either Arab scholars or western scholars who know the Arabic language. For instance, several western scholars examine various Arabic books that discuss Raziq's arguments, *Arabic thought in the liberal age, 1798-1939* and *Islamic liberalism: a critique of development ideologies* (Binder, 1988; Hourani, 1983). These books help us to see how Arabic scholars react to Raziq's arguments. Of course, it would be an excellent opportunity to spend several months in the libraries of Egypt to evaluate Raziq's opinion pieces in *al-Siyasa* magazine, but I hope to do that in my future studies.

1.4. Some notes on *al-Islam wa- Usul al- Hukm*

The name of Ali Abd ul-Raziq is stated, in one way or another, in the literature of Islam and politics. It is noted that a good body of research on Raziq has been written in the Arabic language (Ali, 2009, p. 10). Although *Al-Islam wa Usul al-Hukm* was published in 1925 in Cairo, the full translation of the book into English is quite recent. Edinburgh University Press translated it into English in 2012 as "*Islam and the Foundation of Political Power.*" Previously, the book was translated into French in 1994, and Abdou Filali-Ansary has prepared both English and French editions. Before Filali-Ansary, Raziq's book was not fully translated into English. There were partly translations of the essays in the book by several scholars such as *Contemporary debates in Islam, Islam in transition* and *Liberal Islam* (Donohue & Esposito, 2007; Kurzman, 1998; Moaddel & Talattof, 2000). Moreover, Raziq's book was translated into several other languages such as Spanish, Italian, German, Malay, and Indonesian (Radhan, 2014, p. 12) as well as Turkish by Birlesik Press in 1995 (Abdurrazik, 1995).

Ali Abd ul-Raziq divides *al-Islam wa- Usul al- Hukm* (Islam and the Foundations of Political Power) into three sections. In the first section, he examines the concept of the caliphate.

In this chapter, he defines his understating of “caliphate,” and shows the opinions of the early scholars about the concept of the caliphate. In the second section, he examines the nature of Prophetic authority and discusses the structure of Prophet’s state. He asks several bold questions on the first page of the chapter, such as did the Prophet form a state, did the Prophet Mohammad appoint judges, was the Prophet a king? In the third chapter, to support and justify his ideas about the caliphate and the nature of Prophetic authority in Islam, he gives some historical examples of how the institution of caliphate was used across centuries. In this chapter, Raziq questions the religious authority of the first Caliph Abu Bakr.

Although chapters are approximately twenty pages long, the information Raziq tries to give is overwhelming. Some information can also be found in another section of the book. For instance, chapter one deals with the caliphate as a theoretical concept it also had historical information about the caliphs which Raziq also highlights once again in the third chapter. However, Raziq provides keywords and questions that he tries to answer on the top of all sections, which helps the reader to see what to expect.

The second edition if the book was not until Raziq’s death in 1966, it was republished in Beirut with a critique of the book by Mamduh Haqqi. In 1988, Muhammad Amarah published the full text of the book, which combined the studies done on Raziq’s arguments. Similarly, Wajih al-Kawtharani’s compilation in 1996 consists of Raziq’s book. Finally, several other editions were published between 1993 and 2005 in Cairo and Beirut (Radhan, 2014, p. 11).

1.5. Review of Literature on Ali Abd ul-Raziq

The name of Ali Abd ul-Raziq in one way or another stated in the literature of Islam and politics. It is noted that a good body of research on Raziq has been written in Arabic (Ali, 2009, s. 10). Although *Al-Islam wa Usul al-Hukm* was published in 1925 in Cairo, the translation of the book into English is quite recent. Edinburgh University Press translated

it in 2012 as *“Islam and the Foundation of Political Power.”* Previously, the book was translated into French in 1994, and Abdou Filali-Ansary has prepared both English and French editions. Before Filali-Ansary, Raziq’s book was not fully translated into English. There were partly translations of the essays in the book by several scholars such as *Contemporary debates in Islam, Islam in transition* and *Liberal Islam* (Donohue & Esposito, 2007; Kurzman, 1998; Moaddel & Talattof, 2000). Moreover, Raziq’s book was translated into several other languages such as Spanish, Italian, German, Malay, and Indonesian (Radhan, 2014, p. 12) as well as Turkish by Birlesik Press in 1995 (Abdurrazik, 1995).

I analyze several Arabic books translated into Turkish that examine Raziq’s arguments such as *İslam’da devlet mefhumu, İslamda siyasi düşünce tarihi* and *Laiklik ve Dini Fanatizm Arasında İslam Devleti* (Avva, 2011; El-Karadavi, 2013; Rayyis, 1995). These three scholars criticize Raziq for Raziq’s arguments about religion and state. They believe that formation of a Muslim state was in fact a part of the Prophet’s duty. While Avva argues that even if Islam does not explicitly propose a political system, it does not mean that Islam is only a heavenly religion. However, Rayyis and Qaradawi are critical, even scornful, about Raziq.

Other than several books and doctoral thesis, the English literature about Raziq generally gives brief information. In other words, his arguments have not been discussed in detail in the English literature. Typically, they write only a few sentences about Raziq such as Raziq was a classically trained scholar but became a liberal secularist, he was against the theory of caliphate, and he believed in the separation of state and Islam. Other than such information, Raziq has not been studied much and not known by the non-Arab scholars.

As far as this research is concerned, I have encountered only two books that Raziq is the primary focus in English literature. They are Souad T. Ali’s work *A Religion, Not a State: Ali Abd al-Raziq’s Islamic Justification of Political Secularism* and Luay Radhan’s, *Muslims*

against the Islamic state: Arab Critics and Supporters of Ali Abdarrazizq's Islamic laicism (Ali, 2009; Radhan, 2014). The two books are the Ph.D. theses that Ali and Radhan decided to publish. After Raziq's book, these two books are the ones that I mostly rely on. They are not only discussing Raziq's arguments, but they also historicize and put Raziq's arguments in a historical context and compare it with traditional sources. My thesis is a critical evaluation of the Raziq's book as well as an examination of the thoughts and information that the two scholars give in their studies.

By using textual analysis, Souad T. Ali examines how Ali Abd ul-Raziq is different from the Sunni Muslim scholars. She analyzes all the arguments of Raziq in each chapter and historicizes the context when he wrote the book. It should be stated that this book is not an argumentative text, but it should obtain credit for being the first full-organized study on Raziq in the English language. Therefore, the book's name itself shows that Souad Ali presents the central argument of Raziq: Islam is a religion, not a state. Ali states that the reason why the debate became controversial was that Ali Abd ul-Raziq was the "first Azhar-educated scholar with the rank of *'ālim* to declare that Islam is a religion, not a state; a message, not a government" (Ali, 2009, p. 4). Moreover, like Souad Ali, Luay Radhan also discusses Raziq in the concept of the separation of state and religion. To avoid confusion and philosophical discussion about the meaning of "secularism," Radhan uses "laicism" instead. He argues that Raziq was the father of "Islamic laicism" and Raziq showed that there could be an Islamic society without an "Islamic state." Perhaps, his main contribution is that he argues that Raziq's arguments also helped to distinguish "*Islamic Laicism*" and "*secular (non-religious) laicism*." He defines both laicism as following: "Whereas the Kemalist laicism of Turkey, for example, has had an anti-religious and dictatorial fundament, the Islamic laicists demand a pro-religious and democratic laicism based on a decidedly *Islamic* argumentation" (Radhan, 2014, p. 5). Similarly, another full study on Ali Abd ul-Raziq is a doctoral dissertation by James Broucek from the Florida State University. In his Ph.D. thesis, "The Controversy of Shaykh Ali 'Abd Al-Raziq," he tries to answer the question: why did Ali Abd ul-Raziq's work not

receive support from his contemporaries (Broucek, 2012)? By applying Eric Hobsbawm's "tradition is invented," he states that it was not because Ali Abd ul-Raziq was *too* unorthodox but because of the invented traditions of the past. Broucek argues that "new political theories like 'Abd al-Raziq's, often call for members of a community to reimagine their collective identity. Oftentimes, however, this new identity is presented not as a new form of community, but as an old one—the traditional, or original form of community. Innovators create revisionist origins stories of the community, which project newly-imagined forms of community into the past" (Broucek, 2012, p. 10).

Several scholars discuss Raziq while discussing more broad topics. Charles C. Adams, *Islam and Modernism in Egypt* and Albert Hourani, *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age 1789-1939* discuss Raziq in the context of Muhammed Abduh. They both discuss whether Abduh's ideas influenced Raziq or not. Adams shows that Raziq was one of the Egyptian intellectuals who was affected by Muhammed Abduh. He locates Raziq as "The position of Ali Abd al-Raziq belongs somewhere between that of his brother Mustafa and that of Taha Husain. Not so radical as the latter nor so skeptical in matters of religion" (Adams, 1968, s. 259). Hourani discusses Raziq's arguments in details and he discusses Muhammad Bakhit's criticisms of Raziq (Hourani, 1983, pp. 183-192). Hourani is mainly concerned with how the modern western ideas influenced the Middle East.

Leonard Binder is another scholar who gives a whole chapter to discussing Raziq and his arguments. In his book *Islamic Liberalism: A Critique of Development Ideologies*, as other scholars do, after addressing Raziq's main views, he compares several studies on Raziq, which are mainly studies of Hourani and Imara. In the final section, he argues that Raziq influenced rationalists and liberal scholars such as Muhammed Arkoun. (Binder, 1988).

Erwin J. Rosenthal gives half of the chapter to the discussion of Raziq regarding his arguments about the concept of the caliphate in his *Islam in the Modern National State*. Rosenthal discusses whether Raziq's arguments resembles to those of the Turkish

sociologist Ziya Gokalp, stating that they are radically different thinkers. For him, Raziq was more classically influenced scholar compared to Gokalp. Rosenthal states that Raziq whatever the merits or faults of his arguments, he provocatively opposed the idea of manipulating Islam for national or nationalist politics (Rosenthal, 2009, pp. 86-87). He compares Raziq's interpretations to those of the medieval scholars such as Ibn Khaldun and Mawardi (Rosenthal, 2009, p. 90). Rosenthal also criticizes Raziq for not showing credible sources to convince his readers that Prophet did not possess political authority. He states that "We must accept that Ali Abd al Raziq is in dilemma. By a sincere, devout faith in the truth enshrined in the Quran and Sunna, he accepts perfection in everything the Prophet said and did; by rational inquiry into history, he discovers the gulf that separates the rule of religion, represented by Muhammad, from the power-state of the caliphs" (Rosenthal, 2009, pp. 95-96).

Antony Black in *The History of Islamic Political Thought: From the Prophet to the Present*, gives a brief discussion of Raziq. He states that Raziq took a modernist path and argued against the Islamic tradition. Black sees Raziq's arguments as "astute and original," but he also asks: "Was Abd al-Raziq's interpretation of the Prophet's mission plausible?" (Black, 2011, pp. 331-332). In his *Reformation of Islamic Thought*, Nasr Hamid Abu Zayd discusses Ali 'Abd al-Raziq's book and argues that Raziq represents the liberal aspects of Abduh's discourse. He also states that while Raziq's ideas did not find support in the Middle East, they are widespread in Indonesia (Abū-Zaid, 2006). Bassam Tibi also discusses Raziq in his several studies. In his *Arab nationalism: between Islam and the nation-state*, Tibi states that Raziq established a harmony between Islam and secularism, which could be seen as an agenda for Islamic liberalism (Tibi, 1997, p. 227). In this book, Tibi discusses al-Husri's arguments, which he thinks was influenced by Raziq (Tibi, 1997, pp. 170-177).

Hamid Enayat states that Raziq was the most controversial figure in the debates regarding the caliphate. After explaining Raziq's main arguments, he articulates that "It

is possible that if the essential ideas of the book had not been dressed in such a provocative language, they would have been received differently by the orthodox establishment ..." ('Ināyat, 1991, s. 65). He states that because of the violent reactions of the orthodox Muslims, Raziq did not develop his ideas and could not reach more explosive conclusions ('Ināyat, 1991, s. 68). Mona Hassan deals with the history of the caliphate, but she also gives pages to discuss Raziq's arguments regarding the caliphate (Hassan, 2016, s. 225). She argues that Raziq was influenced by Turkish Justice Minister Seyyid Bey's speech during abolition of caliphate she argues that "In drawing clear lines between himself as the author and "them," 'Abd al- Rāziq positions himself as a European-inspired enlightened intellectual above and beyond the discursive tradition of Muslim jurists" (Hassan, 2016, s. 227).

There are several articles on Raziq and his arguments. Overall, they discussed him in similar contexts such as his family, his party engagement, studies and so on. Meir Hatina gives information about Raziq in discussions of state-religion transformation in Egypt (Hatina, 2000). Majid Fakhry, Fehmi Jadaane and Reza Pankhurst compare Raziq and several other Muslim scholars' views about the concept of "Islamic state." They devote a couple of pages to Raziq's arguments (Fakhry, 1954; Jadaane, 1985; Pankhurst, 2010). Fakhry believes that Raziq's work was the "most thoughtful and constructive attempt" that challenges the traditional view of "Islamic state" (Fakhry, 1954, s. 456). Fehmi Jadaane argues that Raziq thought that his inquiry was a "great service" to Islam but in fact, his ideas "did not evoke any positive responses among learned men of religion and religious law" (Jadaane, 1985, s. 34). Similarly, Pankhurst discusses Raziq in the sub-chapter of "Muslim Secularist" as the pioneer of "Muslim secularism" trend (Pankhurst, 2010, p. 833).

In Turkish literature, Raziq has been studied by several scholars such as Mehmet Görmez, Mehmet Azimli and Talip Türcan (Azimli, 2002; Görmez, 1995; Türcan, 2005). It should be stated that the Turkish articles on Raziq are somehow similar. Görmez, Azimli, and

Turcan start to give background about Raziq then discuss the book as a whole. While Gormez examines Raziq in the context of secularism, Azimli and Turcan focus on his arguments about the concept of the caliphate. Görmez sees Raziq as “the person who starts the discussion of secularism in the Islamic world.” To my knowledge, Görmez’s article is one of the first publication on Raziq in the Turkish language in addition to the translation of the book. Azimli argues that the book is written more journalistic style rather than academic, and “the major problem of the book is its apprehensibility” (Azimli, 2001, p. 62). Erroneously, Türcan made an enormous mistake with the date of birth and death years. He states that Raziq lived between 1883—1967. However, the truth is Raziq was born in 1888 and died in 1966. Overall, the three scholars rightly state that the biggest problem of Raziq is his ambiguous argument about the nature of the authority of the Prophet Mohammed.

1.6. Organization of the Thesis

This study consists of five chapters. After this introductory chapter, I explain the historical context that shaped Raziq’s views of the caliphate and political system during the Prophet Muhammad. The political context of Egypt and the discussions about the separation and abolition of the sultanate and caliphate among Ottoman elites is important for understanding Raziq’s ideas. In the chapter, I also give a short personal story of Raziq.

In the third chapter, I discuss one of the central arguments of Raziq: The concept of the caliphate. I explain how Raziq differs from the orthodox interpretation of the caliphate. I utilize a comparative perspective and compare Raziq’s views with medieval scholars. In this chapter, I explain how the caliphate became the first controversial topic among Muslims, how al-Ghazali, Mawardi, Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn Khaldun and many others viewed the concept of the caliphate. More importantly, I examine how Raziq challenges the classic theory of the caliphate.

In the fourth chapter, I examine Raziq's second and the most controversial argument: political authority in Islam and the Islamic state. Like the previous chapter, I first discuss how political authority, Islamic state, and power generally seen in the mainstream views, namely Muslims scholars, Islamists, and orientalists. By applying a comparative method, I show how and where Raziq differs and perhaps challenges the existing views.

In the conclusion part, I summarize Raziq's main points and discuss whether the criticisms against him are reliable or not. I show that while this discussion happened a century ago, the topics that Raziq discussed are still hot topics among scholars. As the literature that I used in this thesis show, in fact, the first full English translation is done only recently. And many doctoral level theses were written on Raziq in the last decades. It is reasonable to think that the reason why Raziq's arguments are increasingly being reviewed is that because of the transformation and new developments within political Islam movements and the politics of Muslims in the world.

CHAPTER II

CONTEXTUALIZATION OF RAZIQ'S ARGUMENTS

2.1. Introduction

In this chapter, I give a historical background regarding Ali Abd ul-Raziq and the political situation of the time when he published his book, *al Islam wa Usul al-Hukm*. First, I argue that Raziq's personal experience helps to understand his ideas such as his study in Azhar while Muhammad Abduh was a scholar and taking courses from orientalist in Egyptian university, his short experience in the United Kingdom, and being a member of a notable liberal family. Without one aspect of his personal story, Raziq's arguments cannot be contextualized. Second, I briefly explain how Ottoman elites justified the abolition of the caliphate and what kind of debates took place among Turkish and Egyptian intellectuals in the 1920s. I believe that without understanding the historical circumstances of the 1920s when Ali Abd ul-Raziq came to the scene, it would be challenging to navigate Raziq's arguments. This chapter aims to contextualize Raziq's main arguments for helping readers to understand the next chapters. Therefore, I provide a short historical context of the debates and developments regarding the abolition of sultanate and caliphate in newborn Turkey and Egypt.

While the eradication of the caliphate opened a new gate for some Muslim scholars like Ali Abd ul-Raziq to think about new concepts and systems, not all people were willing to accept it. In Turkey, Egypt, India and many other places people reacted to the abolition of the caliphate. I argued that the debates over the removal of the caliphate in Turkey and Egypt had affected Raziq to come up with a controversial book. He was affected by the arguments such as "caliphate cannot be separated with sultanate" or "the caliphate is a religiously necessary institution." For instance, Raziq shows that he was aware of the debates took place in the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA), more specifically he gives reference to Justice Minister Seyyid Bey's speech that favored abolition of caliphate

in the Assembly. Therefore, before discussing Raziq's case, I give a brief political context of debates that Ottoman elites held about the abolition in Egypt and Turkey. Following the discussion about abolition in Turkey and Egypt affected Raziq to write his book.

2.2. A Synopsis about Ali Abd ul-Raziq's Life

Ali Abd al-Raziq (1888–1966) came from an elite Egyptian family. His father Hasan Abd ul-Raziq was a large farm-owner and was, in 1907, among the founders of the Umma Party (People's Party). His brother Hasan was the governor of Alexandria, and another brother Mustafa was a well-known philosopher who was a student of Muhammad Abduh—the pioneer of modernist Islam—in Azhar where Mustafa later became the rector in 1945 (Hourani, 1983, p. 163). Another brother Mahmud was a co-founder of the Liberal Constitutionalist Party (LCP).

Like his brother Mustafa, Ali Abd ul-Raziq was a classically trained Islamic scholar. From age 10 to 23, he studied in Azhar where Abduh was an Islamic scholar, and Raziq was graduated with the title of shaikh (Sagiv, 1995, p. 25). As Charles Adams states, Raziq had the opportunity to be a student of Abduh for a short time as well as a student of Shaikh Ahmad Abu Khatwah who was a friend of Abduh and another student of al-Afghani (Adams, 1968). After completing his studies in el-Azhar, Raziq attended the newly founded Egyptian (Cairo) University (EU) which was the center for western-style studies (Reid, 1990).

Scholars argue that besides Abduh, Raziq was also influenced by his western professors like Carlo Alfonso Nallino and Santillana (Broucek, 2012; 'Ināyat, 1991). While his professors in the Egyptian University may have influenced him, scholars argued that Ali Abd al-Raziq was affected more by the first modernist Islamists Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani and Muhammad Abduh (Abū-Zaid, 2006; Adams, 1968; Ali, 2009; Black, 2011; Fakhry, 2004; Hatina, 2000; Hourani, 1983; 'Ināyat, 1991). For instance, Hamid Enayat states that "his writings did not indicate much absorption of Western thought - this, in fact, was his

strong point in so far as his ideas were meant to influence moderate religious opinion” (Enayat, 1982, p. 62). Hourani also believes that “the direct influence of English thought is not great, and once more we are in the climate of thought created by Abduh” on Raziq (Hourani, 1983, p. 183). Scholars see Raziq’s experiences in the Egyptian University where several orientalist such as Nallino taught important factor for explaining Raziq’s arguments (Broucek, 2012, pp. 163–169; Hassan, 2016, p. 225). A similar argument can also be found in Jankowski and Gershoni’s book: “Ali Abd al-Raziq's book was a drastic and dramatic manifestation of the Western-oriented modernism that flourished in Egypt in the 1920s” (Gershoni & Jankowski, 1986, p. 61). Broucek argues that Raziq took the course of the history of Arabic literature given by Nallino in Egyptian University and Raziq applied the historical methodology that he learned in this course to his book (Broucek, 2012, p. 164). He states:

Historians like Francois Guizot or Carlo Nallino believed they could study the past to discover laws of culture, sociology, economics, or politics that could guide the progress of nations into the future. Arab historians, on the other hand, were primarily interested in amassing and authenticating all surviving accounts of the past. According to Nallino, even the best Arab historians have “confined themselves to detailing the memory of events and occurrences year by year, without research into [their] causes, social circumstances, the connection between events, their effects, and without extending their aim to anything more than a genuine memory of the apparent contingencies that befall the nation.” Arab historians were more interested in transmitting reports exactly as they had received them, then combining these reports into an argumentative narrative. Nallino’s observations about the deficiencies of Arab history reveal the virtues of European historical research that he intended to pass on to his students (Broucek, 2012, p. 166).

Hassan also argues:

Following the critical historical methodology impressed upon him and others of his generation as a service to their nation by a rousing Nallino, Abdul Rāziq began considering the history of the Islamic judiciary and by extension that of Islamic governance and the caliphate from which it derived its legitimacy. This intellectual side project occupied him off and on over the years that he served as a judge (Hassan, 2016, p. 225).

After his studies, Raziq started to teach history courses at Azhar for a while. In 1912, he went to England to study political science and economics at Oxford University, but due to the eruption of the World War I, he returned to Egypt in 1915 and he was only able to study the English language during his stay in England (Broucek, 2012). When he returned, he was ratified by Azhar to be a shari'a court judge in the city of Mansoura, and he taught Islamic law at the Islamic Institute of Alexandria (Sagiv, 1995, p. 25). According to Azimli, Raziq had a chance to read and think about Islamic law and history during his duty as a judge (Azimli, 2001).

Raziq was active in politics like his father and brothers. For instance, his brother Mahmud and he supported—and funded—the establishment of the LCP in 1922 (Hassan, 2016, p. 225). He even ran for a seat in the parliamentary election of 1923–1924 (Hatina, 2000). Raziq and his liberal associates were against the increasingly authoritarian attitude of King Fuad and Zaghlul in 1924. With the independence, political parties like LCP wanted to take part in the government as Wafd Party.

Meanwhile, the institution of the caliphate was abolished in 1924, which perceived as a “horror” for orthodox Muslims (Hourani, 1983, p. 184). Many scholars were discussing the future of Muslims without caliph, and they were deeply concerned about the future. However, the abolition could also be seen as an opportunity as it opened gates to Muslim states for new approaches to international relations and rethinking about new political concepts for Muslims (Black, 2011, p. 298). In fact, it was what Raziq also believed, meaning that the institution of the caliphate was now gone, and Muslims had to think about the new political system for themselves. Hourani states, “there was a lively discussion throughout the Muslim world about whether the Turkish action was legitimate and whether the caliphate could or should be revived” (Hourani, 1983, p. 183) and so do Egyptian Azharite scholars.

Raziq believed that Azharite scholars sought to elect King Fouad as the new caliph in the forthcoming Cairo conference on 13-19 May 1926. To counter a potential decision of Azharite scholars for suggesting King Fouad as new caliph, Ali Abd ul-Raziq published his groundbreaking book in April 1925. In this book, Raziq attacked traditionalists and their ambition to choose King Fuad as caliph (Binder, 1988, p. 130; Gershoni & Jankowski, 1986, p. 62). He believed that Muslims should look for new systems; perhaps he suggested that Muslims should adopt democracy or constitutional monarchy and should undoubtedly close the chapter of the caliphate. He thought that King Fouad was already powerful, and with the title of the caliphate, he would become much more powerful and authoritarian, which the King may even shut down the political parties and Assembly.

Briefly, Raziq claimed that the concept of the caliphate had no basis either in the Quran or the Sunna, and there has never been a consensus (*ijma*) in the history of the caliphate. Raziq argued that no political system could be labeled as “Islamic.” According to him, religious authority and political authority are different and separated in Islam, and the Prophet Muhammad was only a spiritual leader. Hourani argues that Raziq opened the doors for asking two fundamental questions: Is the caliphate a religiously necessary institution, and is there such a thing as an Islamic system of government? (Hourani, 1983, p. 184). As Muhammed Imara states, “no other book has caused such controversy, disrupt and aggression since the invention of the printed press” (In Azimli, 2001, p. 57).

Raziq’s arguments became the main subjects of the Egyptian media, and his case created a massive political crisis in Egypt, which Hassan depicted it as a “storm” (Hassan, 2016, p. 232). They could not believe the fact that how an Azharite scholar holds such ‘heretic’ views. The traditionalists severely criticized Raziq. For instance, Rashid Rida argued in Egyptian nationalist newspapers and al-Manar journal that Raziq’s book can be used by the enemies of Islam (Ali, 2009; Sagiv, 1995, p. 28). After several months, the Azharite scholars were still debating Raziq’s book and tried to refute his claims. For instance, scholars like Muḥammad Bakhit al- Muṭī’i and Yusuf al- Dijwi published over six hundred

more pages to refute Raziq's arguments (Hassan, 2016, p. 230). Perhaps, one reason why they criticized him was that Raziq's title and vocation as a sharia judge. As Hamid Inayat states "all this was somewhat paradoxical" to traditionalists (Enayat, 1982, p. 62). In other words, it would not be a problem if the bold claims were coming from a secular nationalist Egyptian scholar.

During the 1930s, it is argued that the over 25 books were written to refute Raziq's arguments (Azimli, 2001, p. 66). In the June of 1925, the head of the Azhar, Muhammad Abu'l- Fadl al- Jizawi, received letters from scholars to act against Raziq. For instance, sixty-three religious scholars published an open letter demanding Shaykh al- Azhar Jizawi to defend Islam against Raziq's "atheistic" claims (Hassan, 2016, p. 228). These scholars reminded the article 101 of law that passed in 1911. According to the law, the responsibility of Azhar was "to protect religion and convey beneficial knowledge, to support and defend that beneficial knowledge within all possible legal means, to spread sacred, clement guidance among Muslims, to encourage public benefit and discourage general harm, to oppose heterodoxy, clarify misconceptions, and counter poor morals and behavior" (Hassan, 2016, p. 228).

The calls for taking action against Raziq was successful, and the Azhar's High Council of Ulama Council (AHCUC) (Hay'at Kibār al- 'Ulamā') met to discuss Raziq's arguments in July 1925. Eventually, they found Raziq's arguments as unacceptable and listed seven charges were stated against him:

1. He [Ali Abdul Raziq] makes the Islamic shari'a a purely spiritual law, with no connection to the administration of justice [al-hukm] and the legal execution [al-tanfid] of worldly affairs.
2. And [he alleges] that the religion [of Islam] allows that the Prophet's war efforts were [performed] on behalf of the monarchy [al-mulk], and not on behalf of religion, nor for the transmission of God's word [al-da'wa] to the territories.
3. And [he alleges] that the system of government administration [al-hukm] in the age of the Prophet was a vague, obscure, disorganized, and deficient subject that necessitates confusion.

4. And [he alleges] that the Prophet's mission was to convey the shari'a, apart from justice and administration [al-tanfid].
5. And [he] doubts the consensus of the Companions concerning the necessity of establishing the caliphate.
6. And [he] doubts that the judicial office is an office of the shari'a.
7. And [he alleges] that the government of Abu Bakr, and the Rightly-Guided Caliphs after him, was not religious (Broucek, 2012, p. 8).

After these seven charges, the council decided to expel Raziq's 'alim' or 'shaykh' title, to dismiss him from his sharia court judge duty. The rector of al-Azhar, Jizawi read the Council's decision:

We, the Shaykhs of al-Azhar University, with the consensus of the twenty-four ulama among us from the High Council of 'Ulama, have ruled to dismiss Ali Abd al-Raziq—one of the 'ulama of al-Azhar University, judge of the Mansura Shari'a Court of First Instance, and author of the book Islam and the Foundations of Government—from the corps of ulama (Broucek, 2012, p. 8).

Although the council decided to dismiss Raziq as judge and to expel his title of alim in 17th of August 1925, the committee had to wait for the approval of the justice ministry until 12 September in 1925. Within a month, Egypt faced a severe political crisis because of the Azharite scholars' decision. The acting prime minister was royalist Ittihadist Yahya Ibrahim Pasha, and the justice minister was the chairperson of LCP, Abd ul-Aziz Fahmi. While Fahmi did not want to approve the document against Raziq, Ibrahim Pasha try to force him to approve Raziq's dismissal (Gershoni & Jankowski, 1986, p. 63). Fahmi believed that Raziq used his freedom of speech right, and he would resign instead of signing the document (Hassan, 2016, p. 231).

The King was provoked with Raziq's arguments and a dissolution of the coalition of the two parties, Ittihad, and Liberal constitutionalist would help him to expel the independent interior minister Isma'il Sidqi Pasha to obtain full control of the next elections (Hassan, 2016, p. 231). The British high commissioner, however, wanted to preserve the coalition because of the fear of Wafd to return to power in the upcoming

election. Raziq's book caused the dissolution of the cabinet, and the King Fuad approved a new assembly that composed entirely of royalist Ittihadists. Eventually, Azhar's demand for dismissal was accepted on September 17, 1925. Raziq lost his job, a prestigious title, and a diploma as a result.

Because of the prosecution in 1925, Raziq decided to go to England again to continue his study, but this time he studied law instead of political science and economy. When he returned to Egypt, he worked as an attorney for a while. When his brother Mustafa became the Sheikh of Azhar in 1945, he helped Raziq to be part of the Egyptian public life. He received the title of "pasha" and taught Islamic law for 20 years at EU (Radhan, 2014, p. 16). In 1947, Raziq published "*al-ijma* fi al-shari'ah al-Islamiyah" (Consensus in the Islamic Law). Radhan states Raziq "became the member of the Egyptian secretary of endowments from 1948 to 1949 (Radhan, 2014, p. 17). Raziq also became a member of parliament and even the minister of religious affairs. During his ministry, Azharite scholars decided to give Raziq's alim title back. Some argue that Raziq changed his views by the end of his life, but Radhan states there is no evidence (Radhan, 2014, p. 17). Ali Abd ul-Raziq died on September 23, 1966.

Today, Raziq's name—at least once—stated in books written on the history of ideas, Islam and politics or modernization in the Middle East. In fact, the abolition of the caliphate, establishment of modern nation-states in Muslim majority lands forced Muslims to re-think about governance and political system. Raziq's book, therefore, opened an alternative gate, which caused the enrichment of the literature about state-religion relation in Islam.

2.3. Debates over the Separation of Sultanate and Caliphate

It is crucial to know the political background of the 1920s when analyzing Ali Abd ul-Raziq's arguments. He cannot be understood without knowing the theoretical debates

in the 1920s about the abolition of the caliphate in Turkish Assembly and Egyptian media and the general political context of the new countries.

Regarding the political context, by the 1920s, Turkish and Egyptian nationalists tried to weaken the Ottoman sultans and imperialists powers. While the Turkish national movement became an elite movement gradually after the independence wars, Egyptian one became remarkably popular among ordinary people against British (Hourani, 1983, p. 209). In 1919, Egyptians revolted for their independence but failed against the British. However, only three years later, British unilaterally issued a declaration of independence for Egypt. Nevertheless, it was not real independence because the British still had the control of Egypt through various channels.

In Egypt, Fouad—the Rector of Egyptian University—became the King of Egypt after his elder brother died in 1917. While British favored Fouad, it also allowed political parties to organize election and form governments. British did not want to give all the political power to King Fouad to be able to prevent a future political crisis. The Wafd Party was formed during the independence revolutions, and its leader Saad Zaghlul was the most popular figure among Egyptians. However, British authority did not favor Zaghlul’s Wafd Party because of its nationalist leadership. Meanwhile, in October 1922, a group of people left Wafd to establish another political party, titled “Liberal Constitutionalist Party.” It should be noted that the LCP was not popular among Egyptians when considering the popularity of the WP and his leader Saad Zaghlul. As a result, Wafd won the first election to form a government in January 1924. Since the new constitution of Egypt gave the legitimacy to the King to dismiss parliament whenever it was necessary, British accepted Zaghlul’s government. Nevertheless, Zaghlul stayed in the office until October 1924. King Fuad permitted a royalist Ahmad Ziwar who was a member of Wafd Party to be acting prime minister until upcoming election. After the assassination of British commissioner, British did not send a new person until in October 1925. King Fuad had the full control of Egypt. Acting Prime Minister Ziwar also took four months off for a

holiday (Reid, 1990, p. 79). As a result, the political arena was empty, and it was left to King Fuad and his royalists.

In Turkey, the independence wars brought its consequences. The new elites in Ankara did not aim to restore the authority of the Ottoman dynasty. As Hanioglu states, “The nationalist victory of 1922 rendered Ottoman ideology meaningless” (Hanioglu, 2013, p. 133). Like Hanioglu, Faroz Ahmad suggests that this victory opened a new beginning for nationalists, meaning that they had to decide how to form a new regime (Ahmad, 1993). TGNA at Ankara wanted to base the new order on the sovereignty of the people, not on the royal family. The first step toward the idea of ‘sovereignty of people’ was to abolish the sultanate.

2.3.1. Abolition of Sultanate

While Mustafa Kemal wanted to put an end to Ottoman sultanate and establish a new order based on the sovereignty of people, some of his associates such as Rauf Orbay and Refet Bele were against the abolition of the sultanate. For instance, in July 1922, according to Lewis, Rauf Orbay said:

I am bound by conscience and sentiment to the Sultanate and Caliphate. It is my duty to remain loyal to the sovereign: my attachment to the Caliphate is imposed on me by my education. Besides this, I would make a general observation. It is hard for us to control the general situation. This can only be secured by an authority that everyone is accustomed to regard as unapproachably high. Such is the office of Sultanate and Caliphate. To abolish this office and to try and set up an entity of a different character in its place, would lead to failure and disaster. It is quite inadmissible (Lewis, 2002, p. 257).

While the Kemalist elite wanted to eradicate the sultanate, it was not the first aim of the Turkish people. For instance, during the independence wars, Islamic identity and saving the institution of the caliphate were two main factors for people to side with the national movement and resisted imperial powers (Hanioglu, 2013, p. 135). The separation would be a critical move for Ankara. To many people, the abolition of sultanate is not only about

giving the sovereign rights to people but also endangering the institution of the caliphate. It would be easier for Ankara to abolish sultanate, Sukru Hanioglu argues, if there were not the idea of the inseparability of caliphate and sultanate:

Despite the original fusion of religion and politics in the early Islamic state, such a separation would not have been problematic a few centuries later, when the caliphate and sultanate were typically quite distinct institutions. Indeed al-Mawardi (d.1058) in the eleventh century had in effect legitimized such a separation, and the ulama in Mamluk Egypt had accepted a similar arrangement. Yet the premise of the inseparability of the caliphate and sultanate gradually became the mainstream assumption about the relationship between the two institutions. The Ottoman tradition expanded on this point in later years to justify the Ottoman sultan's possession of both titles. Hence, members of the ulama in the Turkish Grand National Assembly, who had vehemently defended this point of view, spoke out against the proposed separation (Hanioglu, 2013, p. 137).

When the proposal of the abolition of sultanate came to the Assembly, some members stated their theoretical concerns about the status of caliphate in case of the removal of the sultanate. For instance, Mustafa Kemal's associate, Refet Bele, believed that there was no alternative regime type other than constitutional monarchy (Ahmad, 1993, p. 52; Lewis, 2002, p. 257). Nevertheless, Mustafa Kemal was determined to change the regime despite all kinds of legal and theological objections in the Assembly.

Because of some theoretical discussion in the Assembly regarding the inseparability of sultanate and caliphate, Mustafa Kemal decided to give a speech in the Assembly. He said:

Sovereignty and Sultanate are not given to anyone by anyone because scholarship proves that they should be; or through discussion or debate. Sovereignty and Sultanate are taken by strength, by power, and by force. It was by force that the sons of Osman seized the sovereignty and Sultanate of the Turkish nation; they have maintained this usurpation for six centuries. Now the Turkish nation has rebelled, has put a stop to these usurpers, and has effectively taken sovereignty and sultanate into its own hands. This is an accomplished fact. The question under discussion is not whether or not we should leave Sultanate and sovereignty to the nation. That is already an accomplished fact—the

question is merely how to give expression to it. This will happen in any case. If those gathered here, the Assembly, and everyone else could look at this question in a natural way, I think they would agree. Even if they do not, the truth will still find expression, but some heads may roll in the process (Lewis, 2002, p. 258).

After the speech, those who were against the abolition of sultanate like Mustafa Efendi (Lewis, 2002, p. 258), pardoned and stated that they were discussion issue from more a theoretical perspective, but they were “enlightened” by Mustafa Kemal’s explanation (Hanioglu, 2013, p. 137). In November 1922, the Turkish Assembly passed the resolution, and as a result, the sultanate was abolished, and the institution of the caliphate no longer belonged to the Ottoman house. The Assembly gave the sovereign right to the people, and parliament members would choose a new caliphate for its nation. People like Mustafa Efendi was pleased with the idea that the Assembly would elect new caliph because they thought that even if sultanate were abolished, the caliph with his spiritual power would remain as the head of the state (Ahmad, 1993, p. 52).

2.3.2. Abolition of Caliphate

Throughout the Islamic history, the caliphate was the main subject of contestation. As an essential symbol of Islamic civilization, the caliphate was extensively utilized in the nineteenth century when the influence of western imperialism was much felt in Muslim majority lands (Karpat, 2002, p. 243). While people believed that the whole aim of the national resistance against imperialist powers was to restore the sultan’s authority, but they realized that the institution of sultanate is gone, and they were wrong (Ahmad, 1993, p. 52; Hanioglu, 2013, p. 135).

The theoretical debate about the inseparability of sultanate and caliphate in 1922 alarmed Kemalist elites, thus they waited for two years to abolish the institution of the caliphate that reminded Ottoman past. As Hanioglu argues limiting—if not taking all—the political power of caliphate and creating non-functional authority would be difficult to explain to Muslims who have no idea about a world without a caliph (Hanioglu, 2013). For instance, Halit Akmansu, a founding member of the Association for the Defense of

the National Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia, criticized the idea of the abolition of the caliphate. He argued that the leaders of national movement promised people in Anatolia for saving the caliph's authority and Islamic identity, but after the victory, they forgot their promise (Hassan, 2016, p. 161). Esref Edip, a famous Islamist, was criticizing the abolition of the sultanate and feared that the caliphate would also be abolished. He argued, like others, the sultanate was inseparable with a caliphate. To inform Assembly, he even prepared a booklet as titled "Hilafet-i Islamiye ve Büyük Millet Meclisi" (The Islamic Caliphate and the Grand National Assembly), and because he wanted to reach as many people as he could, he published under the name of Afyon deputy Ismail Şükrü Çelikalay (Hanioglu, 2013, p. 148). Edip argued that the caliph is above the Assembly, and the Assembly needs approval from the caliph. Since Eşref Edip gave references to Islamic sources during the process of abolition, Mustafa Kemal asks Justice Minister Seyyid Bey who was an Islamic law (Fiqh) scholar to refute Edip's arguments to prevent any further theological debates. Seyyid Bey gave a speech in the parliament and tried to convince deputies for abolishing the institution caliphate (Erdem, 1996).

Seyyid Bey's speech was published as a treatise and entitled "*Caliphate and the Sovereignty of the Nation*" by the Turkish Grand National Assembly. In 1924, this treatise was translated into Arabic by Abd-al-Ghani Sunni. Ali Abdul Raziq gives a reference to Seyyid Bey's speech in his book and categorizes him as a supporter of second theory to the caliphate, which was the caliph was the representative of people not the God. Briefly, Seyyid Bey supported the abolition of the caliphate, and he wanted to legitimize the TNGA as a new way of representing people's interest instead of the preserving the institution of the caliphate (Erdem, 1996; Yıldırım, 2004). Black argues that Raziq's book was a defense of the Seyyid Bey and the TGNA (Black, 2011, p. 330). Raziq was aware of the discussions in the TGNA and he developed his arguments as a response to the discussions. Seyyid Bey argued that the caliphate was not a matter of religious but a worldly matter (Kara, 2014). He asked while there were many hadiths for Muslims' daily behaviors, why is there no hadiths on caliphate? He concludes that the God did not

suggest a political system on purpose and the God leaved it to people decide. Seyyid Bey stated that Quran has two important principles for creating a worldly authority: consultation (*shura*) and obedience to authority. Because Turkish Assembly can substitute as *shura* mechanism, he asked people to obey the authority who wanted to abolish caliphate. Seyyid Bey believed that the Assembly would be a new version of caliphate since it is a representation of people. In the new circumstances, people will choose their own representation no need for caliphate because the new Grand Assembly will represent people (Kara, 2014, p.125).

The caliphate was abolished on March 3, 1924 despite the opposition of constitutional monarchists such as Rauf (Orbay), Refet (Bele), Kazım (Karabekir), Ali Fuat (Cebesoy), Cafer Tayyar (Eğilmez), and Cevad (Çobanlı) and Halit (Akmansu) (Hassan, 2016, p. 158). As Hanioglu states “the name of the caliph was now replaced in the Friday prayers by the phrase “Government of the Turkish Republic” (Hanioglu, 2013, p. 152). In the words of Anthony Black “It was a triumphal moment for secular modernism in the Muslim-controlled world: the acts of Lenin were hardly less revolutionary” (Black, 2011, p. 298). To Lewis, with the abolition of the caliphate “Kemal was making his first open assault on the entrenched forces of Islamic orthodoxy” (Lewis, 2002, p. 264). Overall, abolishing sultanate and separating religious and political authority were two radical changes for Turkish nationalists toward the idea of creating nation-based state and putting an end to politics of Ottomanism (Cleveland & Harmanci, 2008, p. 201). Only a year after the abolition of the caliphate, Muslims around the world looked for choosing a caliph since they believed that caliphate was one of the fundamental tenets of Islam, and Islam would lack one of its cornerstones without it. The abolition was criticized all around the Muslim World from India to Egypt.

2.4. Attempts to Re-establish Caliphate in Egypt

Initially, the Turkish revolt in the 1920s against the imperialists was regarded favorably in Egypt. Even the abolition of sultanate did not change the support of Egyptians to the

Turkish national movement (Gershoni & Jankowski, 1986, p. 56). They were disappointed by the development, and the decision was seen as "the most repugnant crime against Islam in the history of Islam" (Gershoni & Jankowski, 1986, p. 56). For instance, Amin al-Rafi'i, the spokesman of Watani Party, strongly criticized the decision and labeled it as "evil decision" (Gershoni & Jankowski, 1986, p. 56). Egyptian scholars declared that did not accept the decision of Turkish assembly, and they recognized the exiled Abd al-Majid as caliph. For instance, as Hilal L. Menkûç shows, on 10 March 1924, a group of Azharite scholars published a letter on el-Ahrâm, and several similar articles published in al-Menâr by Amin ar-Rafiî and Rashid Rida criticizing the TGNA and arguing that the decision was illegitimate on the eyes of Muslims (Livaoğlu-Menkûç, 2017, pp. 115–130).

However, this stance gradually changed, and Egyptian scholar decided to find a way to solve this problem. Over time, they realized that the situation of the Caliph in exiled was losing his authority among Muslims. It was not realistic to insist on accepting him as the Caliph. Many scholars discussed the future of the institution of the caliphate through media. They planned to organize an international conference to discuss the future of the institution of the caliphate and elect a new caliph whom would be recognized by all Muslims in different parts of the world. It was argued that because of the "central geographical position," "preeminent religious institutions" and "considerable degree of political independence," Egypt was the right place for such a conference (Gershoni & Jankowski, 1986, p. 57). In fact, the idea of organizing a conference was discussed previously among Egyptian scholars in 1923 when Mustafa Kemal declared through the press that he was determined to abolish the caliphate. However, with the official abolition, this idea reappeared and advocated even more in the Egyptian media (Gershoni & Jankowski, 1986, p. 57).

As Hassan argues, while initially Liberal Constitutionalist Party was supporting a conference under the sponsorship of Egypt, they were not aware of the fact that Azharite scholars would suggest King Fuad as a potential caliph (Hassan, 2016, p. 206). News and

speculations were spreading about King Fuad's ambition for being caliph, which made liberals to change their position over caliphate conference. As a result, "through their major newspapers, turned their pens against the caliphate conference as a mere vehicle to further King Fu'ād's ambitions" (Hassan, 2016, p. 206). Indeed, Azharite scholars wanted to organize a Muslim congress by using the name of Shaykh al-Azhar, and this idea found support from the Palace (Gershoni & Jankowski, 1986, p. 59). Hassan argues "...the Azhar- affiliated caliphate conference committees proliferated throughout the country, it became clear that Ḥasan Nash'at Pasha, with close ties to the palace, was actively supporting their formation" (Hassan, 2016, p. 206).

While King Fuad depicted himself as disinterested for being caliph, through royalists like Nash'at Pasha, he also supported an international caliphate congress in Egypt (Hassan, 2016, p. 205). For instance, Nash'at Pasha arranged meetings with scholars in various cities (Kedourie, 1963, p. 217). Similarly, a group of scholars discussed the abolition of caliphate at the house of an ex-prime minister, Muhammad Said Pasha, and according to Kedourie, one of them said: "Why should the caliphate not go to King Fuad? We have but to assemble the ulama of Egypt and they will elect him and give him their suffrages, and the caliphate will thus come to belong to the King of Egypt" (Kedourie, 1963, p. 215). Another indicator how King Fuad supported the conference was, Kedourie argues that the Egyptian parliament asked in 1927 to former Minister of Pious Foundations Muhammad al-Gharabli Pasha to explain why he gave £2500 to the Rector of al-Azhar during 1924. It appeared that the money was spent on the organization of the conference (Kedourie, 1963, p. 216).

As an Islamic scholar and a liberal constitutionalist, Ali Abd ul-Raziq published his book on April 1 in 1925 in this historical context. In his book, Raziq attacked traditionalists and their potential ambition to choose King Fuad as caliph (Binder, 1988, p. 130; Gershoni & Jankowski, 1986, p. 62). He feared that some Azharite scholars like Rashid Rida were planning to choose King Fuad as the new caliph. As far as the time of the book is

concerned, it seems that while the media discussed the possibility of King Fuad as a new caliph, Raziq hurried up to put his raw arguments immediately on the paper to counter King Fuad's and Azharite scholars' ambitions. King Fuad was already powerful, and with the title of the caliphate, he would become much more authoritarian and may cease the remaining party politics in Egypt.

In his book, Raziq challenged the long-held assumption about the necessity of a caliphate in Islam. Enayat states "(Ali Abd ul-Raziq) was certainly the most controversial theorist thrown up by the crisis. He took advantage of the abolition of the Caliphate to launch a forceful attack on the entire traditional school of Islamic political thought" (Enayat, 1982, p. 62). Raziq believed that Shari'a could be changed according to historical circumstances (Black, 2011a, p. 331). Raziq was arguing "for a Muslim equivalent of separation between church and state..." (Brown, 2000, p. 49). He argued that Islam is purely a religion and does not have a specific injunction for temporal governance in the world.

As an inexperienced in party politics, Egypt faced a severe political crisis in its third year of the constitutional monarchy because of Raziq's book. *Al Islam wa Usul al-Hukm* shaken the coalition of Ittihadist and liberals in Egypt. Because Raziq was close to Liberal Constitutionalists, British high commissioner warned that any action against Raziq would collapse the fragile coalition government of royalist Ittihad Party and Liberal Constitutionalist Party, which eventually British un-favored Wafd party would take advantage of the political crisis (Hassan, 2016, p. 228). However, the warnings of the British did not work. The fragile alliance fell apart due to the political crisis that Raziq's book created. Especially the royalist Ittihad Party to gain more public support from Egyptians, it helped and promoted scholars to criticize Raziq—thus Liberal Constitutionalists. As a result, only three years after the independence, the Egyptians were disappointed by the political instability and King's increasing censorship. They thought that a "liberal age" had started in 1922 and with the formation of the parties; they felt that they had reached its political goals. However, it was a miscalculation:

That experiment was supposedly to grant Egypt a constitutional form of government, to institute representation and political parties, freedom of speech, the right to the opposition – that is, all the trappings of a modern, democratic, representative government that operated in favor of the majority and not of a select elite. The reality turned out to be far distant from the dream... (Sayyid-Marsot, 2007, p. 97).

2.5. Conclusion

The main aim of this chapter was to give the historical context of the time when Ali Abd ul-Raziq wrote his book. I historicized the political events that took place in Turkey and Egypt during the 1920s, which had an enormous effect on Raziq. Perhaps, Raziq would not have written his book if the sultanate and caliphate were not separated and abolished respectively. I argued that the debates over the caliphate in Turkey were one of the reasons for him to write his book. There is clear evidence that shows Raziq was following the theoretical discussions about the inseparability of sultanate and caliphate and the necessity of caliphate. Especially, he read and used some Seyyid Bey's arguments. What he aimed with writing the book was to challenge scholars who argued against the abolition of the caliphate.

As an Islamic scholar and a member of the Constitutionalist Party, Raziq opposed the Azharite scholars' ambition for choosing the authoritarian King as Caliph. He feared that the King might become more authoritarian and close the assembly and party politics in Egypt. With writing the book as a member of Constitutionlists, he caused the political crisis in Egyptian politics, which eventually caused the dissolution of the coalition of his party constitutionalists with ittihadits.

I argued that Raziq's own story tells much about his source of arguments. His personal history, family connections, coming from a politicized family, his education, and the courses he took affected Raziq's views. Without the knowledge of his personal story, his arguments cannot be analyzed.

CHAPTER III

ALI ABD UL-RAZIQ AGAINST THE CLASSIC THEORY OF CALIPHATE

3.1. Introduction

Although Ali Abd ul-Raziq is known more for his arguments against caliphate in the literature, I argue that he did not contribute much to the literature. Instead, he became famous because while many scholars tried to re-establish the caliphate, he argued that the caliphate was not religiously necessary. Therefore, Raziq owns his popularity much to his provocative language not his arguments regarding the caliphate. As I will show in this chapter, many of arguments he made in his book were said either by Ibn Khaldun or Seyyid Bey previously, which Raziq gives reference to both of them. In this chapter, I discuss how Ali Abd ul-Raziq explains that the caliphate is unnecessary and justifies the abolition of the caliphate. To understand in what sense Raziq's arguments differs from the mainstream understanding of the theory of the caliphate, I briefly explain the Sunni classic theory of the caliphate. Comparing Raziq's and medieval scholars' views would be appropriate for analyzing Raziq's arguments.

As I showed in the first chapter, Raziq was against the re-establishment of the caliphate, and he claimed that "there is no such thing as a political system with the specific label Islamic" (Abū-Zaid, 2006, p. 37). One of the main goals of Raziq was to prevent Azharite scholars from choosing King Fuad as the new caliph, which he believed it would be challenging to maintain constitutional monarchy under an authoritarian king. Of course, Ali Abd ul-Raziq does not state his real ambition in *Al-Islam wa Usul al-Hukm*, but scholars agree that historical context profoundly influenced Raziq (Ali, 2009; Azimli, 2006; Black, 2011; Broucek, 2012; Enayat, 1982; Hassan, 2016; Hatina, 2000; Hourani, 1983). I argue that Raziq's book is not only an attempt to prevent King Fuad but also it is also a challenge to classic understanding of caliphate.

Caliphate was the first issue—and the cause of the major debates—that Muslims had to face after the Prophet’s death (Saribiyik, 2013). As a result, there has been an enormous literature about the caliphate and many scholars have written on the controversial topic, to name a few, al-Abu Bakr al-Baqillani, Abu al-Hasan al-Mawardi, Ghazali, Ibn Jama’a, Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn Khaldun, Shams al-Din Muḥammad al-Dhahabi, Jalal al-Din Abd al-Raḥman al-Suyuṭi, Abd al-Malik al- Juwayni and many more (Ali, 2009, p. 21; Ardiç, 2012, pp. 78–142; Hassan, 2016, pp. 98–141; Rosenthal, 2009, pp. 33–89). Since the main goal of this chapter is to analyze Raziq’s arguments regarding the caliphate, I will not be able to discuss all the scholars’ arguments. Rather, I show the general understanding of the theory of caliphate. However, because Mawardi and Ibn Khaldun and Ibn Taymiyyah are the most known in the literature of the caliphate, I mostly compare Raziq’s arguments with these scholars.

3.2. Temporary Solutions in Early Time

After the Prophet’s death, the question of “who will be the head of the community?” became the central issue among Muslims. Choosing the leader of the Muslim community was not an easy task for Muslims. As a result, the discussion and disagreement started among Muslims even during choosing Abu Bakr as the first caliph (Azimli, 2006, pp. 68–78). After Prophet’s death, Muslims of Media, *Ansar* (the helpers) immediately organized a meeting, known as Saqifa of Banu Saida, to choose the new leader. Without having the consent of *Muhajirin* (The Emigrants), Ansars decided to choose Sa'd Ubadah as the leader of the community. However, Muhajiruns believed that the caliph should to be a Qurashite descent (Parlak, 2012).

Ibn Khaldun explains the first debate regarding the first political crisis among Muslims in the Saqifa of Banu Saida in the Muqaddima:

On that day, the Ansar intended to render the oath of allegiance to Sa'd b. 'Ubadah. They said: "One amir from among us and another from among you." But the Qurashites argued against them with Muhammad's statement, "The imams

are from among the Quraysh." They also argued that Muhammad had exhorted them "to do good to (those of the Ansar) who do good, and leave unpunished those of them who do evil." Now, (the Qurashites) said, if the leadership were to be given to (the Ansar), the latter would not have been recommended (to their care as indicated in Muhammad's statement). The Ansar bowed to these arguments and retracted their statement (just quoted), "One amir from among us, and another from among you." They gave up their intention to render the oath of allegiance to Sa'd (Ibn-Ḥaldūn, 1989, p. 159).

After the meetings, Abu Bakr became the first the caliph. However, given the discussion at the meetings, it appeared that the solution in the Saqifa was temporal. The discussions during the meeting were signs of the more significant problems in the future. Considering some Muslims initially did not give their *bay'ah* (allegiance) to Abu Bakr, the hadiths that Qurashites stated in the meeting was not seen convincing enough. Perhaps had the Prophet explicitly appointed a name as the leader of the Muslim community or outlined a political system for the future, this discussion could not have taken place (Ardıç, 2012; Azimli, 2006).

Because of the temporary solutions, the question "who and how to choose a caliph" has always become a problem for Muslims. In fact, history has many examples of how Muslims change the rules for choosing the next caliph. For instance, on the one hand, during electing Abu Bakr, Muslims did not wait for the arrival of those who were absent, and five electors among Muslims were seen as enough. On the other hand, when Umar was chosen as the second caliph, the necessary number for consultation increased to six (Māwardī, 2000, p. 5). While the Prophet did not appoint anyone the caliph, Abu Bakr appointed Umar as next caliph after him. The solutions were changed, which prevented Muslims from developing an organized political system. The way of the assessing the first two caliphs could have produced a set of rules of governance for Muslims if the rules were not changed after them. It could be understandable that Muslims did not want to set solid principles for choosing caliphs of the future generation due to the circumstances may change. Nevertheless, it also caused considerable confusion among Muslims throughout the centuries.

3.3. Classic Theory of Caliphate

In general, the classic theory of the caliphate necessitates its foundation and, is argued that caliphate serves the interests of the Muslims, brings order and stability. As Hassan states a few have questioned the concept of the caliphate in the mediaeval era: “The universality of the general obligation to designate a leader for the Muslim community was so widely recognized that only a few third/ninth- century Mu’tazilite figures, chiefly al- Ašamm and Hishām al- Fuwaṭī, are mentioned as adopting a position contrary to this overwhelming consensus, as are the Najadāt sect of the Kharijites.” (Hassan, 2016, p. 100). Scholars such as al-Baqillani, al-Mawardi, Ghazali, Ibn Jama’ā, Ibn Taymiyya, and Ibn Khaldun discussed the concept of caliphate/imamate. While scholars had different opinions and there is no universal theory that all Muslims accept, it can be generalized that Sunni medieval scholars were in favor of caliphate for several different reasons such as public interest, order, and stability, signs of power, etc. For instance, while Al-Baqillani sees Qureyshi descent as a condition, Ibn Khaldun argues the caliph is not necessary should be Qureyshi decent. Medieval scholars discussed what the word “caliph” means, which term is correct, “the caliph of God” or “the caliph of the Messenger of the God,” who can be the caliph, how a caliph is chosen, who would choose a caliph and whether sharia law or reason requires formation of the institution, and they generally gave the same answers.

Except for Ibn Taymiyyah, all the Sunni Muslim scholars mentioned here believed that it was a religious obligation to form an institution of the caliphate and obey the caliph. Al-Baqillani argues that the function of imam or caliph is being the leader of the Islamic state, defend umma, apply sharia, and share revenues (Ali, 2009, p. 22). For him, the institution of the caliphate is an obligation on Muslims. Al-Ghazali argues that the caliphate is necessary because sharia requires, and he argues that umma had a consensus on the caliph (Ali, 2009, p. 28). For Ghazali, the imam should be qualified to be a leader, to be a knowledgeable and pious person (Ali, 2009, p. 29). More importantly, he argued that because many people had exaggerated the first caliphs and forget they

were also ordinary people, over times, they caused as if imams were infallible (Ali, 2009, p. 29). Ali states that “Ghazali holds an intermediary position between al-Mawardi (unity of the polity) and Ibn Taymiyya (political pluralism”) (Ali, 2009, p. 29). Ghazali believed that the appointment of an imam is an obligation based on Sunna, the consensus of the umma and its usefulness (Rosenthal, 2009, p. 39). Ghazali believed that there was a hadith as “Religion and -temporal- power are twins” and in his books, he uses sultan and imam interchangeably (Rosenthal, 2009, p. 39). Ibn Jama’a even uses the imam and sultan interchangeably (Ali, 2009; Rosenthal, 2009). He is concerned about stability. For instance, he said that “If a ruler acts with justice, the reward is his and it is for the people to give thanks; if the ruler is tyrannical, the crime is his, and it is for the people to be patient” (Ali, 2009, p. 30). He believes that caliphate can be established in three ways: Election, appointment, and forceful seizure (Rosenthal, 2009, p. 44).

Unlike other Sunni scholars, Ibn Taymiyya does not focus on the imamate instead, he believes that obeying sharia plays the central role in his views (İbn Teymiye, 1999; Rosenthal, 2009, p. 52; Şahin, 2013). As the title of his book, *Siyasa shari’a*, shows, he put sharia in the first place, and he did not even discuss the qualifications of a caliph (Rosenthal, 2009, p. 52). He argues that a universal caliphate is not obligatory on Muslims and there can be more than one imam in different parts of the world (Ali, 2009, p. 31). For Taymiyya what is important is to have a harmony in the society between rulers and ulama (Rosenthal, 2009, p. 56). He was interested in strengthening the authority of ulama (Ali, 2009, p. 31). Taymiyya believed that the God did not ask Muslims to choose a caliph among them, instead the God says all the humans are the caliph, thus, instead of concern for choosing a caliph, all Muslims should aim to be caliphs, which is what the God wants and what sharia requires (İbn Teymiye, 1999; Rosenthal, 2009, p. 52; Şahin, 2013). He argued that the caliphate is not obligatory, but it is preferable. For him, what is really matters is the power and strength of the caliph. If a caliph is powerful enough then he would be able to serve interests of Muslims and implement sharia. Ibn Taymiyyah did not discuss whether caliphate is a religiously necessary institution or not

(Ali, 2009). For Taymiyyah, caliph and his administration must approach Muslims and society to the God (Ibn Teymiye, 1999). Ali states “ignoring the political struggle of the time, Ibn Taymiyya focused heavily on the Shari’a regime as the best for the Islamic umma. His main concern was a community guided by the Prophet’s *Sunna* (exemplary behavior) regardless of how tyrannical the leaders of such a community might be” (Ali, 2009, p. 31).

Like other scholars, Mawardi and Ibn Khaldun favored the institution of the caliphate and believed that they are obligated by Sharia to form the caliphate. Accordingly, forming a caliphate is a part of their religious obligation, and they maintained that authority has to be formed since Islam does not allow an anarchic system. For instance, Mawardi states that without authority in the world, Muslims would be in a chaotic situation and savagery (Māwardī, 2000, p. 3). Similarly, Ibn Khaldun states that “In no period were the people left in a state of anarchy. This was so by consensus, which proves that the position of imam is a necessary one.” (Ibn-Ḥaldūn, 1989, p. 156).

The term consensus is a crucial notion for Ibn Khaldun. He argues that after the death of the Prophet, Muslims around the Prophet—had an agreement—accepted Abu Bakr as the new leader of the community. In the succession of caliphate section of the *Muhaddima*, Ibn Khaldun says that appointment of a ruler is a part of religious law through the consensus of the Muslims. Ibn Khaldun maintains:

A great number of the men around Muhammad were present on the first and on the second (occasion). None of them expressed the slightest disapproval. This shows that they were agreed upon the correctness of the procedure and recognized its legality. It is recognized that consensus constitutes proof. (Ibn-Ḥaldūn, 1989, p. 167).

Mawardi in his book, the *Al-Ahkam As-Sultaniyyah Wat Wilayat Al Dinniyya*, defines caliphate as “the Imamate, or supreme leadership is intended as vicariate of the prophecy in upholding the faith and managing the affairs of the World” (Māwardī, 2000,

p. 3). For Mawardi, imamate/caliphate is responsible for all affairs of Muslims (Geçit, 2013, p. 318). As Antony Black states, Al-Mawardi believed that caliphate is "the keystone of the system" (Black, 2011, p. 87).

Another major figure Ibn Khaldun provides the details on the early discussion about theories of the caliphate. Ibn Khaldun starts the chapters on the caliphate by explaining why authority is a necessity for Muslims. He believes that the social needs of humans created the obligation of authority, which the institution of caliphate fulfills. In the *Muhaddima*, Ibn Khaldun historicizes the caliphate/imamate and shows how the institution of caliphate evolved in centuries. Ibn Khaldun's definition of caliphate demonstrates how vital the caliph is in Islam for him:

It should be known that all the religious functions of the religious law, such as prayer, the office of judge, the office of mufti, the holy war, and market supervision (*hisbah*) fall under the "great imamate," which is the caliphate. (The caliphate) is a kind of great mainspring and comprehensive basis, and all these (functions) are branches of it and fall under it because of the wide scope of the caliphate, its active interest in all conditions of the Muslim community, both religious and worldly, and its general power to execute the religious laws relative to both (religious and worldly affairs) (Ibn-Ḥaldūn, 1989, p. 171).

Both Mawardi and Ibn Khaldun discuss whether the obligation of the establishment of a caliphate on Muslim is the 'rational necessity of mankind' or 'imposed by sharia.' They support that religious law itself requires establishing a caliphate, and they believe that establishing the caliphate and obeying the caliph are a part of religious duty (Ibn-Ḥaldūn, 1989, p. 156; Māwardī, 2000, pp. 1–2). Mawardi states that those who believe that religious law requires imamate disputes that without considering faith, legal decisions may not be appropriate with the revealed law. To be clear, although Mawardi and Ibn Khaldun believed that revealed law requires a religious authority, they did not oppose rational necessities for establishing a caliphate. As Yücesoy states

What these scholars were suggesting was not that human reason was incapable of comprehending whether or not leadership was necessary, but rather that the imamate as an institution was prescribed for Muslims and that religious law provided a better and a clearer way of knowing the kind of rulership that the Muslim community needed; the imamate's specific functions could not be known by reason alone (Yücesoy, 2016, p. 20).

According to the imamate theory of Mawardī, a supreme leader can be elected or appointed by predecessor (Māwardī, 2000, p. 5). Once the appointment or election result, the whole Muslims need to learn about the result and the caliph. Although Mawardi states Qureshi descent as a condition for eligibility to be a caliph, Ibn Khaldun believes that being a Qurashite descent is not necessarily a condition for eligibility to be caliph. Ibn Khaldun argues:

The power of the Quraysh weakened. Their group feeling vanished in consequence of the life of luxury and prosperity they led, and in consequence of the fact that the dynasty expended them all over the earth. (The Qurashites) Thus became too weak to fulfill the duties of the caliphate. The non-Arabs gained superiority over them, and the executive power fell into their hands (Ibn-Ḥaldūn, 1989, p. 159).

Ibn Khaldun sees that if a descent can serve the best interest of the public, then imamate can choose from that descent. After giving historical information about, Ibn Khaldun argues that during the early period of Islam, Qurashite tribe was powerful and had a stronger regarding the "group feeling," that is why they were the best group that could serve the interest of the public, and hence the being qurashite became a condition for imamate (Azimli, 2006, p. 41). Ibn Khaldun states that "Islam does not consider preservation of (the ruler's) inheritance for his children the proper purpose in appointing a successor. The (succession to the rule) is something that comes from God who distinguishes by it whomsoever He wishes." (Ibn-Ḥaldūn, 1989, p. 169). Ibn Khaldun sees the caliphate as a public interest, and he supports the idea of the necessity of the caliphate because he believes that it serves the best interests of the public. He argues that the institution of the caliphate is a part of the religious law.

While Ibn Khaldun believes that the institution of the caliphate is an obligation on Muslims, he acknowledges that the caliphate is transformed into royal authority after the first four caliphs. He states that “The form of government, in the beginning, was a caliphate,” but he discusses that “the characteristic traits of the caliphate disappeared, and only its name remained” which eventually led caliphate to become a matter of group feeling and sword (Ibn-Ḥaldūn, 1989, p. 166). One of the critical contributions that Ibn Khaldun makes in the theories of the caliphate is that he asserts that caliphate is not one of the pillars of the faith and he accepts that the Prophet did not appoint anyone for a successor. If it were a pillar of the faith, the Prophet would have given a clear answer to Muslims around him. Ibn Khaldun:

The doubt of the Imamiyah in this matter is caused by the fact that they assume the imamate to be one of the pillars of the faith. This is not so. It is one of the general (public) interests. The people are delegated to take care of it. If it were one of the pillars of the faith, it would be something like prayer, and (Muhammad) would have appointed a representative (caliph), exactly as he appointed Abu Bakr to represent him at prayer. (Had he done so,) It would have become generally known, as was the case with the matter of prayer. ... It also shows that the question of the imamate and succession to it was not as important then as it is today... (At that time,) Islam was winning the hearts of the people and causing them to be willing to die for it in a way that disrupted the customary course of affairs. ... it was not necessary to pay any attention to group feeling...The (questions of) caliphate and royal authority and that of the succession to both became very important affairs in the opinion of the people. It had not been this way before. It should be noted how unimportant the caliphate was in the time of the Prophet, (so unimportant that) he did not appoint a successor to it.... (Ibn-Ḥaldūn, 1989, p. 170).

3.4. Raziq’s Challenge to Classic Theory of Caliphate

While scholars argued that Muslims need to establish a caliphate for a variety of reasons, Ali Abd ul-Raziq came out with different arguments. He claimed that the caliphate is not a mandatory religious institution, and it is not among the tenets of the faith. Raziq maintained that the caliphate is a political institution. In fact, he was “one prominent scholar who took this position, defending his unorthodox views, with arguments and rationales from within the Islamic legal culture” (Meiloud, 2017, p. 341). In his *Al-Islām*

wa Usūl al-Hukm, Raziq argues that the caliphate is not a religious regime, and Islam does not require Muslims to form a caliphate, and more importantly, Raziq denies the transfer of political legitimacy from the Prophet to the caliphs (Binder, 1988, p. 131).

It should be stated that Raziq uses a very assertive language that might hurt someone or threatened a traditional view over the caliphate among Muslims. As Kedourie states Raziq's "argument is so novel, both theologically and historically, it could easily and with considerable justification be denounced as a heresy" (Kedourie, 1963, p. 223). Meiloud argues that the book may not create such reaction if it were not published right after the abolition of the caliphate (Meiloud, 2017, p. 73). Did not Raziq expect such a reaction to his book? The answer would be in fact he was aware of the trouble, but it did not stop him. This can be understood from Raziq's words at the beginning of the book: He states that "I worship and fear none but Him... He is my only recourse and my best protector."

Raziq states that his book is an "investigation of the caliphate" which he studied on over ten years. He maintains that the book is a product of long-term research and readings while working as a judge in the Islamic courts of Egypt ('Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 21). Raziq wants his book to be seen as a scholarly book not an answer to certain scholars or propaganda against the King Fouad. I argue that whether Raziq wrote his book in a few months or over ten years, and even if Raziq had political ambitions against King Fouad, he reminded some aspects of the theory of caliphate that had been forgotten throughout the centuries.

Raziq states that two main topics that he wants to discuss in his book, one is "caliphate" and the other is "the theory of political power in Islam." However, one can easily acknowledge that the whole aim of the book is to disprove the institution of the caliphate as an Islamic concept. It can be argued that the discussion regarding caliphate has the central importance in the book. However, it should be stated that Raziq was not criticized because of his argument about the caliphate but because of his arguments about the

political power in Islam. While Ali states that Raziq's arguments are "direct deconstruction of al-Mawardi's theory" (Ali, 2009, p. 72), Binder states that Raziq's arguments depend on Ibn Khaldun's views of the caliphate (Binder, 1988, p. 132).

Ali Abd ul-Raziq starts with the discussion of the linguistic origin of the word "caliphate" as Mawardi and Ibn Khaldun did. He defines "caliphate" as "deputizing for someone," "succeeding him" or "following in his wake" ('Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 25). The author shows that there are two approaches to the theory of the caliphate. He categorizes them as *a)* caliph derives his authority and power directly from God *b)* caliph derives his authority from the umma. The first approach is not common, which Ibn Khaldun shows that this term was not used during the first four caliphs (Ibn-Ḥaldūn, 1989, p. 156). However, Raziq indicates that in fact there were some rulers and scholars that used the term "caliph of God" after the four caliphs. For instance, Raziq gives some names who interpreted caliph as the "shadow of God on earth" such as Abu Ja'afar al-Mansur ('Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 31). He also shows that there were several poets and writings of several religious scholars that attribute a divine mission to the caliph during the Ummayyid and Abbasid period.

One and the most common approach is that caliph is seen as the representative of Prophet and derives his authority from the umma. This is the classic understanding of most of the medieval scholars, but Raziq does not stress the information because he does not want to contradict with his argument that Muslims saw the caliphs as "shadow of the God."

Raziq's arguments can be classified into three groups. He argued that nothing in Quran justifies the institution of the Caliphate, that there is no single verifiable hadith that shows the Prophet advocated the system of the caliphate and appointed a person to be the first caliph. Lastly, he believed that not only the Quran and Sunna do not justify the

caliphate but also there has never been a consensus (*ijma*) of ulama on the necessity of the caliphate in the history.

3. 4.1 Nothing in Quran on Caliphate

Raziq states that scholars—like Mawardi and Ibn Khaldun—advocate the obedience to the caliph, who see that obeying to the Imam is equivalent to obedience to the Prophet and thus the God. For instance, Ibn Khaldun states that “disobedience makes itself noticeable and leads to trouble and bloodshed” (Ibn-Ḥaldūn, 1989, p. 154). Raziq states that two verses are used when scholars discuss obedience to authority:

O believers, obey God and obey the Prophet and those set in authority over you. (4:59)

When there comes to them a report, bearing news of security or of foreboding, they spread it wide. Were they to refer it to the Messenger and to those set in authority over them, its true import would be ascertained from them by those best fitted to understand it. (4.83)

However, he believes that the expression “those in authority” in the verses do not support the establishment of the caliphate. Hourani states that Raziq sees the verses as “vague general statements enjoining respect for those in authority” (Hourani, 1983, p. 185). Raziq argued that the verses could be interpreted as “certain people present, among Muslims, are entrusted with the conduct of their public affairs” (‘Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 37). Raziq does not elaborate these two verses and instead he refers the orientalist Sir Thomas Arnold’s “The Caliphate” for more details about the verses, which he believes that Arnold explains well. It should be noted that Raziq receives most of the criticisms about the caliphate because of giving reference to Arnold. For instance, James Broucek shows that scholars like Shaykh Muhammad Bakhit and Shaykh Muhammad al-Khidr Husayn criticized Raziq for being influenced by European scholarship (Broucek, 2012, p. 210). Bakhit stated that “The consensus of Muslims is that the claim of a non-Muslim, about matters pertaining to the religion of Islam, is unacceptable—especially when pertaining to the caliphate” (Broucek, 2012, p. 210). However, as I showed in the

previous chapter, many scholars argue that the roots of the Raziq's arguments do not come from western thoughts. Moreover, stating a few ideas from western scholars do not make Raziq's arguments as western oriented. However, it could have been strengthened Raziq's argument about the argument that the Quran does not have anything about the caliphate as a political system, if he used alternative sources. Moreover, Raziq argues that Quran shows all possible explanations and details about all aspects of Islam, which he states the verse "We have not neglected any matter in this Book (6:38)" and disputes that if caliphate is a part of Muslim's duty why does not Quran say anything about it? Raziq argues:

None of the scholars who attested that the appointment of an imam was a religious duty could substantiate this thesis with a verse from the Quran. If such a verse had existed, the scholars concerned would not have hesitated to utilize and expound it at length. Had there existed a mere shred of evidence in favor of the thesis of the Imamate as an obligation, the more zealous among the proponents of the caliphate would have taken this hint as complete proof. However, the scholars, whether neutral or partial to the caliphate, were unable to find any arguments in favor of their thesis in God's book. Therefore, they satisfied themselves with the legal thesis that a consensus had been reached on the subject, with further, logical elaborations ('Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 36).

While Raziq did not elaborate on what he understands from the verses, it seems that he reads the verses the way Mark Wegner reads. Wegner argues that the verses about obeying authority are not helpful for forming a theory of caliphate:

On the one hand they are formulated as general statements about authority no more applicable to the institution of the caliphate than to any other type of government. On the other, they all occur in such specific contexts—duly recorded by the tafsir interpretation—that it is a stretch to interpret them as being intended as guidelines for general application (Wegner, 2001, p. 94).

3.4.2 No Verifiable Hadiths on Caliphate

Raziq argues that not only Quran does not state anything about the caliphate as an institution, but the Prophet did not say anything about the concept of the caliphate and did not appoint a caliph when he died (Ali, 2009, p. 73). He believes that “the religious scholars were unable to provide even a single hadith in support of their case on this issue. Had they found the least evidence to buttress their argument in the Sunna, they would have used it to reinforce the idea of unanimous agreement” (‘Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 38). In fact, there are several hadiths that medieval scholars attributed to the Prophet about the necessity of caliphate and appointing Abu Bakr as the caliph, but scholars dispute their authenticity (Wegner, 2001, p. 99).

Ali Abd ul-Raziq criticizes Rashid Rida, for believing in the idea that the caliphate has a place in prophet's tradition. He believes that the book that Rida gives a reference—Taftazani's *al-Maqasid*—does not have any proofs from Quran or the Sunna of the Prophet (‘Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 39). Wegner also sees it as peculiar that the Prophet who did not make any reference to the Quran regarding the caliphate, had many statements about the caliphate. Like Raziq, Wegner argues that “It seems more likely that a majority of these hadiths came into circulation after the Prophet's death as part of the ongoing polemic about what form of government was best suited to perpetuate his legacy” (Wegner, 2001, pp. 99–100).

Raziq claims that the words of the Prophet like “imamate,” “allegiance” and “community” are allusions, and they do not justify the necessity of caliphate (Hourani, 1983, p. 185). He argues that these words in the Islamic discourse do not have the same interpretation with their uses in the religious law (‘Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 40). Similarly, Wegner asserts that “amir” or “imam” interpreted as referring to the caliphate but had different meanings (Wegner, 2001, p. 100). Wegner shows many hadiths (denoted by imam or amir) that used for the legitimization of obedience to the caliphate. Raziq states that “the allusions to the concepts of “caliphate,” “imamate” and “allegiance” in the

Prophet's hadiths do not mean anything beyond what Christ meant when he referred to the legal requirements pertaining to the government of Caesar" ('Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 41). Here Raziq, quotes the famous phrase "Render unto Caesar what is Caesar's" and tried to show that even if Christ used the phrase, it does not mean that there will always be Caesar (Hourani, 1983, p. 185). Raziq states that this phrase does not attribute a sacred power to Caesar and it does not mean that recognizing the authority of Caesar is a part of divine duty that Christians should take into consideration.

Raziq believes that all the hadiths and words of the Prophet do not "support the claim that the sharia conclusively lays down the principle of the caliphate or the great imamate, understood as a deputyship for the Prophet and a fulfilment of the functions that he undertook among Muslims" ('Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 40). He debates that if it is true that the Prophet commanded Muslims to obey an imam, the God also commands Muslims to be fair with the agreements and deals with polytheists. He argues that it does not mean that the God accepts polytheism. Similarly, Raziq states that sharia requires Muslims to obey tyrants if acting otherwise increase disorder, but it does not mean that tyranny is legitimate. He continues to give examples:

Again, God talks to us about slavery. He exhorts us to set slaves free, to treat them well and lays down several other recommendations regarding them. However, this does not imply that slavery is a religious obligation, or that it is desirable. The same applies to issues such as divorce, borrowing, commerce, mortgaging and so on, frequently mentioned in the God's book and plainly regulated in His law. This does not mean that these issues are religious duties, or that they have a special significance for God ('Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 41).

By giving all these examples, Raziq tries to convince that anything written in the Quran and done by the Prophet is not significant only because it is stated in Quran or done by the Prophet, but the whole message is more important. He argues that the terms "imamate," "caliphate" and "allegiance" do not justify an institution of caliphate only because Quran states about "those in authority," or the Prophet used the words of "imam" or "caliph." As Binder states, for Raziq "neither political power, nor polytheism,

nor slavery, nor any of the other topics of Quranic legislation are rendered obligatory simply because it is discussed in Quran” (Binder, 1988, pp. 137–138).

3.4.3 No Consensus (*ijma*) on Caliphate

The third point is that—unlike Mawardi and Ibn Khaldun, — Raziq claims that there has never been a consensus over the caliphate throughout the Islamic history (Hourani, 1983, p. 185). He uses words of Mawaqif who argues that the consensus was only available during the contemporaries of the Prophet and discusses that Mawaqif’s statement shows that the consensus over caliphate is not something that can be verifiable (‘Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 38). Raziq believed that it is difficult to know whether *ijma* exists or if it exists, is it possible to known (Wegner, 2001, p. 200). Wegner states that Raziq argues “there is no record of a *mustanad* (roughly "base rationale") for the *ijma* about the necessity of establishing the caliphate in general. There is no evidence of either tacit (*sukut*) or explicit (*sarih*) *ijma* on the elections of any individual caliph” (Wegner, 2001, p. 201).

Raziq does not believe that there was a consensus on necessity of the caliphate. While Mawardi and Ibn Khaldun stated Mu’tazilas and Kharijites as those who were heretics because they did not believe in the necessity of caliphate, Raziq gives similar examples to show that without Mu’tazilas and Kharijites, no one can argue about that there was an *ijma* of scholars (‘Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 52). Nevertheless, Raziq did not discuss *ijma* argument in details. Perhaps, the main reason is that he was confident enough with the first two arguments and did not need to elaborate on the third one, but the Azharite scholars accused Raziq of disregarding the *ijma* of scholars. Instead, he tried to explain why and how political science has been neglected by Muslims over centuries. He believed that because caliphs were powerful and used force, no one could say or develop an alternative system that could challenge his authority. Similarly, he argues it would be clearer if Muslim political scientists could write freely on the subject (‘Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 46).

Binder states that “Abd al-Raziq’s purpose is to demolish the argument that the caliphate is required by the sharia as determined by a consensus of the *umma*” (Binder, 1988, p. 136). Wegner states that

Islam is no less aware of the ambiguities inherent in the principle of *ijma* than of the danger of hadith fabrication. Its potential for self-serving justification of the status quo—particularly in the realm of government and politics—is obvious: since the outcome of any political struggle can be interpreted as a consequence of an *ijma* of the community, and since any *ijma* of the community is an expression of God's will, all historical events can be stamped with ex-post facto divine approval (Wegner, 2001, p. 25).

It seems that Raziq would agree with Wegner. For Raziq, if there is an *ijma* on a specific issue everybody has to accept it. For instance, he criticized Ibn Khaldun for saying that there was a consensus (*ijma*) for establishing an institution of caliphate. Raziq asked how could there be a consensus if Mutazilites and Kharijites did not agree upon necessity of caliphate. It is clear that Raziq sees the term *ijma* as something that cannot be used to justify any system or change in Islam. For him, only if all Muslims agreed upon a concept, system or rule to be adopted or to be changed, then there can be a proper *ijma*.

Raziq does not elaborate why he argues that there has not been *ijma* on the necessity of the caliphate. Raziq asks if the Quran did not mention, and the Prophet did not say anything about the caliphate, and if there is no *Ijma* on caliphate “can one still talk about a religious duty in the absence of any support for this thesis, be it in the sacred book, the tradition of the Prophet or by way of unanimous agreement on the part of the believers?” (‘Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 52).

3.4.4. Roots of Caliphate: Coercion and Sword

Raziq maintains that the history shows that the caliph has always faced opposition among Muslims, but they could not do anything about it (‘Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 45). He argues that the institution of the caliphate has never been based on voluntary allegiance.

He states that history shows that caliphate was founded on “sheer coercion and that in the most instance this took the form of physical, military coercion” (‘Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, pp. 46–47). Raziq differentiates the first three caliphs whose authority, and states that they may not rely on physical force and coercion, but Raziq believes that “‘Ali and Mu’awiyya, the fourth and fifth caliphs, rose to the caliphate by means of the sword,” which became a trend in following centuries. Even if Raziq differentiates the first three caliphs, in the following chapter, he contradicts himself when he argues that even Abu Bakr was the first king whose authority was based on military power. Raziq states that “We have no doubt that coercion has always been the basis of the caliphate. History does not offer us a single example of a caliph whose image is not associated with the fear inspired by the brutal force surrounding him, with the armed force supporting him, and the unsheathed swords that lent him protection” (‘Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 47). Moreover, Raziq claims that there has been an incontestable link between the institution of the caliphate and the use of violence. Raziq even goes much further to state that “The caliphate has always been, and still remains, a disaster for Islam and for Muslims. It has been a constant source of evil and corruption” (‘Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 54). This provocative statement shows the selective approach of Raziq regarding reading historical information. Raziq blames the institution of caliphate as a source of all the disasters in the Islamic history.

3.4.5. Is Caliphate Necessary?

After discussing all three aspects of the arguments, Raziq argues that there is only one argument that left to discuss, which is the idea that a caliphate is necessary for Muslim. Raziq argued that some scholars see the caliphate as a “condition for the practice of religion” (‘Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 52). However, Raziq gives the example of Mongol invasion when Muslims lived for three years without a caliph, and he argues that Muslims were able to continue their life and practice their religious beliefs. He states that

What was the situation of the extensive realm of Islam beyond Egypt, where the shackles of the caliphate had been cast away, where its authority was

disregarded, and whose inhabitants have lived, and still live, free from the shadow of the caliphs and their supposedly sacred glory? Were the practices of faith neglected there more than anywhere else? Did any single catastrophe befall them? Did the sky over their temporal realm cave in when the caliphal star vanished from it? Did the bounty of the sky and the earth disappear when the caliph was gone? None of this came to pass ('Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 56).

He states that like other communities, Muslims also need to form governments to organize their public affairs. If these scholars see the caliphate as equivalent to a government that Muslims need to establish for their worldly matters, then they were right, Raziq said. In that case, the caliphate would be like the forms of personal, or republican, despotic, constitutional, consensual, democratic, Bolshevik government. However, if the scholars see the caliphate as an institution that is based on religion, then their arguments are weak and need further evidence ('Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, pp. 53–54). He states that “neither the conduct of our spiritual life nor the direction of our temporal affairs calls for the caliphate” ('Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 54). Scholars argue that Raziq reduced Islam to the realm of spirit and separated Islam from state, which I explain in the next chapter, and he limits Islam’s concerns to only theology, ethics and rituals (Azmeah, 2016, p. 4; Jadaane, 1985, p. 45).

Raziq argued that from the early days of Islam, the caliphate was seen as a religious institution rather than political, and this “erroneous view” supported by scholars and political authorities over centuries. However, he states that

They did so with a view to protecting their throne and suppressing their opponents in the name of religion. They were relentless in inculcating this belief among the masses through numerous means—the belief, namely, that obedience to rulers is tantamount to obedience to God; and rebellion against them, a rebellion against God ('Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 116).

Raziq states that kingships (despots) misled Muslims, blocked the doors of knowledge, prevent them from developing political systems, theories, and concepts. In his words,

“These despots have likewise thwarted an understanding of religion and imprisoned Muslims within the mental boundaries set by them” (‘Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 117).

3.5. Ibn Khaldun and Raziq

Ibn Khaldun’s works over the caliphate have central importance in Raziq’s arguments, and he gives many examples from Ibn Khaldun’s work (Binder, 1988, p. 132). For instance, while he uses Ibn Khaldun’s arguments to support his thesis—e.g., caliphate became a kingship later—, he opposes Ibn Khaldun—e.g., there is a consensus on the necessity of caliphate. Ibn Khaldun states that Khajarites and Mu'tazila were the exceptions, they did not support the idea of the necessity of the caliphate. For Raziq, one cannot say that there was an *ijma* if some Muslims Khajarites and Mutezilas were excluded (‘Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 45; Ibn-Ḥaldūn, 1989, p. 157). Adams states that Raziq placed himself in the category of Kharijites with the denial of the caliphate (Adams, 1968, p. 266).

Another example that both Ibn Khaldun and Raziq agree on is that the caliphate is not one of the pillars of the faith. Raziq states that Muslims treated the institution of the “caliphate” as a matter in the religious science and gave high status as if it is a pillar of the faith, but in fact, it is not (‘Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 117). It can be understood that Raziq borrows this idea from Ibn Khaldun. Like Ibn Khaldun, he asks if this topic is a vital issue for Muslims why did not the Quran explicitly state anything, why did not the Prophet appoint any successor, and why have there been many debates on the question of caliphate without a concrete solution?

While Raziq criticizes Ibn Khaldun’s ideas such as the necessity of the caliphate, he also supports Ibn Khaldun for specific arguments. For instance, Raziq supports Ibn Khaldun’s words on the kingship that its established based on “superiority and the power to rule by force; kingship is nothing but coercion and rule by constraints” (‘Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 48). However, Raziq’s argument is different from Ibn Khaldun’s in the sense that while

Ibn Khaldun argued that caliphate transformed into kingship, Raziq argued that even there is no caliphate in Islam let alone its transformation to kingship. Raziq states that there were countless examples regarding how rulers obtain the title of caliph through the history. Azimli criticizes Raziq for picking the wrong examples to make his arguments stronger (Azimli, 2001).

3.6. Conclusion

Indeed, the historical context of Raziq's book matters, Raziq may not write his book if the caliphate was not abolished, if the King Fuad did not want to be the new caliph or if Azharite scholars did not believe that caliphate is religiously a necessary institution. However, one cannot underestimate Raziq's stated arguments in the book against the classic theory of the caliphate. Of course, it would be more academically persuasive if Raziq organized his thought and support his arguments. Perhaps, this drawback of the book is an indicator for the scholars who argued that Raziq rushed to write his book in a few months to tackle Azharites and King Fouad.

The classic theory of the caliphate sees the foundation of the caliphate and obeying the caliph as a religious duty. Accordingly, the caliph is responsible for stability, order, public interests and safety of Muslims as well as approaching Muslims to the God. However, Raziq claimed that in fact the caliphate could not be legitimized by religious principles. He argued that the caliphate is merely a political institution that has nothing to do with religion. Many times, he refers to Ibn Khaldun's words regarding the history of the caliphate to show how it was used by political authorities for legitimizing their kingship. In general, Raziq did not bring an original thought other than restating Ibn Khaldun's words and the bad examples of caliphs in the history. In fact, Raziq owed his popularity to his assertive language and radical views regarding caliphate. Raziq, like Ibn Khaldun, accepts that the caliphate did not appoint a caliph and the caliphate is not a pillar of Islam. Raziq is wrong when he argued that most Muslim scholars saw caliph as a "the caliph of the God" because as I showed most of the medieval scholars believed that

caliphate is necessary for the stability, order, power and public interests of Muslims. They did not attribute religious importance, as Raziq claims.

Perhaps, no one would criticize Raziq, or he might not lose his sharia judge position if he only had discussed the concept of the caliphate. However, besides Raziq's arguments about the classic theory of the caliphate, Raziq carries the discussion to much broader level by discussing the political legitimacy of the Prophet and political power in Islam.



CHAPTER IV

NATURE OF PROPHET'S AUTHORITY AND STATE

4.1. Introduction

After discussing the concept of the caliphate in Islam, Ali Abd ul-Raziq questions the entire governance in the time of the Prophet Muhammad. Raziq examines whether the Prophet was a king and whether he established a state or not. It should be noted that when compared to his theory of caliphate, questioning the political system of the early period of Islam is where Raziq has received most of the criticisms. Raziq's alternative path for understanding religion-state relations faced vehement opposition in the early twentieth century. In fact, five—out of seven—reasons of Azharite ulama for expelling Raziq from his judge position were about his views on political authority and system in Islam. Similarly, due to Raziq's assertive language and unorganized thoughts, his views and arguments did not find support among Egyptian society except some members of the Liberal Constitutionalist Party during the 1930s. In fact, he even became an object of derision in Egypt. For instance, Wafd Party's Saad Zaghloul said for him that "he was amazed first of all by how a scholar of Islam could write in this manner on this issue" (Pankhurst, 2010, p. 835). On June 23, Rashid Rida published an update to refute Raziq's arguments and asked other Azharite scholars to reject them (Broucek, 2012, p. 203). Rida claimed that the enemies of Islam could use Raziq's book (Hourani, 1983, p. 189). Hourani states that it was understandable why Raziq's ideas received so many oppositions: Because Raziq "propounded a new historical theory about matters of which the accepted historical view had something of the nature of religious doctrine..." (Hourani, 1983, p. 189).

With all the discrepancies and bold claims, it can be stated that Raziq broadened the literature of Islam and politics. I argue that Raziq uses a selective approach to Quranic verses and Hadiths to strengthen his arguments and faces difficulties to convince readers

in many cases. In these cases, he tries to escape from the critics by highlighting ambiguity and lack of knowledge about the history of the early period of Islam. Indeed, he could have launched a new understanding of the political system, if his arguments were good enough and less heated. However, I argue that the debate over Raziq's case between orthodox and secular Muslims made conservative Islamic movements more robust (Jadaane 1985; Azmeh 2016). For instance, modern political Islamist movements are all offshoots of the Muslim Brotherhood, and they all denounced Abd al-Raziq and his book (Abū-Zaid, 2006, p. 46).

What did Raziq argue? How un-orthodox were his views? Raziq claimed that

- i. Islam is revealed for the people not for the states.
- ii. Islam is silent regarding the political systems.
- iii. The Prophet was not a king; he did not form an Islamic state.
- iv. Governing was not part of the Prophet's mission.
- v. The Prophet was only a spiritual leader
- vi. Being a political leader was not part of the Prophet's mission.
- vii. Abu Bakr was the first king in the Islamic history.
- viii. Abu Bakr's administration was secular and only political.
- ix. Jihad is a political means rather than a religious one.

With these bold claims, Raziq aims to challenge three central assumptions: *a)* all Muslims need to be unified and aim to form an Islamic state that was once founded by the Prophet, *b)* The Prophet Muhammad was both spiritual and political leader of the community, and Islam and state are interconnected and cannot be separated, *c)* the four "rightly-guided" caliphs had religious mission. In this chapter, I examine how Ali Abd ul-Raziq challenges the three assumptions. To do that, first, I give a short overview of how the notions of political authority and system were understood. By doing that, I believe it would be the right way to comprehend how Raziq differs from the mainstream

understanding. Secondly, I discuss Raziq's arguments by dividing them into several themes. While analyzing Raziq's case, I also address the criticisms to his theses. Lastly, I present some scholars who, I believe, have similar ideas as Raziq even if they do not have a direct connection.

4.2. Mainstream Views of Political Authority and State in Islam

The concept of "Islamic state" has increasingly become popular among Muslim scholars in the last two centuries. It is believed that the Prophet formed an Islamic state, which was established in Medina after the migration (Hegira) in 622. Accordingly, the Prophet was not just only a messenger but also the political leader of the community (Ashour, 2018; Rayyis, 1995). Islamists such as Hassan al-Banna, Abul A'la Maududi, or Yusuf al-Qaradawi believe that the Prophet formed the Islamic state (Afsaruddin, 2006, p. 154; Ashour, 2018, p. 8; Pankhurst, 2010, p. 840). Similarly, some western scholars also argue that the Prophet had a political mission, and he was the political leader as well as the founder of the Islamic state. It can be argued that from Ghazali to Qaradawi and from Islamists to Orientalists, in general, scholars believe that political goals were inseparable from the mission of the Messenger.

4.2.1 Medieval Muslim scholars' Views

As we see in al-Mawardi and Ibn Khaldun's views in the previous chapter, the Sunni Muslims scholars see forming an authority or a political system as necessary. While Mawardi believes that building political authority is a religious obligation, Ibn Khaldun argues it is necessary for serving public interests of Muslims in the world. Similarly, al-Ghazali also argues that political power needs to be formed because humans are incapable of living alone (Yücesoy, 2011, p. 22). He states in his *Ihya Ulum al-Din* (The Revival of the Religious Sciences), "Rule and religion are twins; religion is the base and authority is the guardian. Anything without a base will inevitably be ruined, and anything without a guardian inevitably will be lost" (Qaradawi, 1998, pp. 19–20).

Another key figure in the Islamic political thought, Ibn Taymiyyah believes that people's need creates a community, which he sees an initial point for a "vilayah" or state to be formed (İbn Teymiye, 1999, p. 194; Şahin, 2013). It is important to see that both Ghazali and Taymiyyah see the political authority as a tool for approaching to God. For Taymiyyah, a state or a political authority has to be an instrument for serving religion (Şahin, 2013, p. 620). While Taymiyyah does not see the caliphate as a necessary for Islam, he believes that there should be an authority for serving the interests of Islam on the earth. Rosenthal argues that Taymiyyah shifted from the long-debated concept of the caliphate to the concept of a religious society where everybody is supposed to be a caliph (E. I. Rosenthal, 1996, p. 78). In his book, Taymiyyah quotes the statement that "Forty years with a cruel imam is better than one day without a sultan or leader" (İbn Teymiye 1999, 195), which demonstrates that like al-Mawardi and Ibn Khaldun, he holds that without a ruler there would be "fitna" (strife) and bloodsheds or anarchy (Şahin, 2013, p. 623). Other than Kharijis and Mutazilis, which are labeled as "anarchist" (Yücesoy, 2011, p. 13), it can be generalized that Muslim scholars do not differentiate between religious and worldly authority and believe that Muslims are required to form a political body (Crone, 2005, p. 11; Rayyis, 1995).

4.2.2 Contemporary Muslim Scholars' Views

Most of the Sunni scholars in the twentieth century believe that the state cannot be separated from Islam. For them, Mohammad, as a prophet and a statesman, established a state and showed the appropriate way of governing a people. Thus, the idea of differentiating between the divine and the worldly authority of the Prophet is not something that they accept. For instance, Muhammad Diya' al-Din Rayyis states that there is no doubt that the Prophet established a system, which accommodates all the factors that define the modern notion of "political" (Rayyis, 1995, p. 30). He argues that subjectively or objectively, Islam encompasses all the factors and has the full authority to change everything in the life of Muslims, and thus he adamantly refuses the separation of the world and heaven in Islam (Rayyis, 1995, p. 30). Rayyis argues that

those who try to limit Islam to heavenly matters, they are in a miserable condition (Rayyis, 1995, p. 31).

Muslim scholars believe that while the forming a state was not a significant concern for the Prophet in Mecca, it became one of the goals when the Messenger decided to migrate to Medina. For instance, Muhammad Selim Avva believes that the migration to Medina started the process of “Islamic political community,” which he argues had three levels (Avva, 2011). First, after the migration, Muslims finally felt safe, and more importantly accepted Medina as a new home. Avva defines this level as “regional dependence.” Secondly, with the level of “social conscience,” hearth and thoughts of the people coalesced for common goals that helped Muslims to reach the final (third) level of “political society” (Avva, 2011, p. 37). A similar argument can also be found in many other works (Ammara, 1991, p. 332; Ashour, 2018; Qaradawi, 1998; Rayyis, 1995, pp. 28–34). Amara argues that many signs indicate how the Prophet Muhammad formed a state, and how he was acting as the political leader of the community (Ammara, 1991). For instance, the Prophet had meetings with the leaders of tribes such as Aws and Khazraj, and he negotiated with the non-Muslims for creating a new constitution of Medina, as well as he sent ambassadors to dynasties and tribes. He argues that these examples show that the Prophet had a political mission, not only a spiritual one (Ammara, 1991, pp. 332–350).

4.2.3 Leading Islamists’ Views

Expectedly, the leading Islamist figures also argue that Islam and state are inseparable, and the Prophet was the political leader of the first Islamic state. For instance, the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt Hassan al-Banna states “whoever speculates that religion or, more precisely, Islam, is not concerned with politics or that politics is not within its realm of inquiry has wronged himself and has wronged his knowledge by this [sort of] Islam” (Balqazīz, 2009, p. 122). For Banna, it would be difficult to achieve a “good society” without an Islamic state. As Ahmad Moussalli states Banna’s

perception of Islam was “as a complete system regulating all aspects of life and including a system of social norms, government, legislation, law, and education,” which cannot be materialized without establishing an Islamic state (Moussalli, 2013, p. 133).

Maududi is another figure who argued that an Islamic state has to be formed to serve religion. To him, the faith would never have been practiced if Islam had not been located in the centers of power (Nasr 1996). Maududi believes that Islam is “an all-embracing social order where nothing is superfluous, and nothing is lacking” (White & Siddiqui, 2013, p. 145). Nasr states that for Maududi, “If there were no Islamic state, the whole reason for revelation would come into question, for religious teachings were not sent by God to be ignored” (Nasr, 1996, p. 81).

Similarly, one of the influential scholars Yusuf al-Qaradawi who has written several books on Islam and politics, believes that the Prophet established an Islamic state, and he was the first leader of the state (Qaradawi, 1991, 1998). He says “the Islamic state is a dogmatic and ideological one and it is based on creed and ideology. It is not a mere “security device” to preserve the Ummah from internal aggression or external invasion rather its function is much greater than that” (Qaradawi, 1998, p. 20). Qaradawi gives several reasons why he believes that the concept of “state” exists in Islam: First, he believes that the verses in the Quran give a clear message to Muslims to be unified and obey the one who is in power. Secondly, Qaradawi argues, historically, the Prophet did whatever he could do to form an Islamic state, meaning that he called Arab tribes to embrace Islam, and invited them to construct a “homeland.” According to him, the goal of the migration to Medina in 622 was to establish an independent Islamic state for constructing a Muslim society (Qaradawi, 1998, p. 15). Thirdly, the nature of Islam, he argues, supports the formation of a state. Because Islam opposes anarchy and disorder, he implies that it would be nonsense to think that Islam does not have a state project. To demonstrate how the nature of Islam advocates a state, Qaradawi states that the Prophet ordered Muslims to arrange into rows during prayers and choose the most

knowledgeable person to lead the prayer, and the Prophet said that if you are traveling with someone, appoint one as your leader (Qaradawi, 1998, p. 17). Moreover, he argues that even if the first and second proofs did not exist, the nature of Islam itself would inevitably require an establishment of a state (Qaradawi, 1998, p. 20).

4.2.4 Western Scholars and Orientalists' Views

Finally, some western scholars and orientalists argue that unlike Christianity, Islam does not recognize a separation of religion and state, which means that the Prophet Muhammad was not only the Messenger of God but also a person who is responsible with the world matters of his community. To sum up, I listed several quotes from the scholars who argue that religion and state are inseparable in Islam:

Dr. V. Fitzgerald: Islam is not a mere religion, but a political system. In spite of the fact that in the recent years have occurred some Muslims who claim themselves to be “Modernists” attempting to separate between the two aspects. The whole Islamic structure is fundamentally based on the fact that both aspects are indispensable.

C. A. Nallion: Muhammad has simultaneously established a religion and a state whose limits were preserved along his whole life.

Dr. Schacht: Islam is more than a religion. It represents political and legal theories. In brief, it is a complete cultural system that includes religion and state together.

R. Strothmann: Islam is a religious, political phenomenon or its founder was a Prophet, wise politician, or a statesman.

D. B. MacDonald: Here, in Medina, the first Islamic state was formed and the basic principles for Islamic Law were laid down.

Sir. T. Arnold: The Prophet was, at the same time, head of religion and head of state.

Gibb: Then, it was clear that Islam was not just individual religious acts, and it was a must to establish its distinctive community, that has its own style in ruling along with its own laws and regulations (Ammara, 1991; Avva, 2011; Qaradawi, 1998, pp. 31–32; Rayyis, 1995).

Several other scholars also make similar arguments:

Rosenthal: "The core of ... *umma* was, of course, formed by the "believers".... Muhammad's original mission as a purely religious call inevitably attained its consummation in a political organization..." (E. I. J. Rosenthal, 2009b, p. 25).
Rosenthal: "The distinction between secular and spiritual for Muslim has no meaning" (E. I. J. Rosenthal, 2009a, p. 1).

Ann. K. S. Lampton: "Islam, like Judaism and Christianity, believes in the divine origin of government. ... The distinction between secular and spiritual for the Muslim has no meaning. The only distinction is between believer and unbeliever" (Lampton, 1981, p. 1).

Kerr: "In professing to provide man with a political and legal system as well as a spiritual faith, Islam denies at the outset the conception familiar in Christendom of a separation between temporal and spiritual matters" (Kerr, 1966, p. 3).

Patricia Crone: "Muhammad was active among warring tribes and had to take political and military action if he was to accomplish his mission. The religion could not survive without communal embodiment, and the community could not survive without defense. Hence it had to have a political organization" (Crone, 2005, p. 12).

Patricia Crone even argues that the Prophet had both prophethood and kingship mission. She claims that it was believed in Islam that "the more power you have, the better you can do" to spread the message of the religion (Crone, 2005, p. 11). She also argues that the article "whenever you disagree about something, the matter should be referred to God and Muhammad" in the constitution of Medina shows that the Prophet was the ultimate decision-maker. In other words, the Prophet was the leader of a political community (Crone, 2005, p. 13). Finally, she states, "thanks to Muhammad's career, Muslims came to think of prophets as the paradigmatic founders of states" (Crone, 2005, p. 13).

As it can be seen, both medieval and contemporary Muslim scholars, as well as western and orientalist scholars, believe that the Prophet possessed a political authority, and

there cannot be a separation between spiritual and secular in Islam. Ironically, Qaradawi, Avva, and Rayyis give references to orientalist scholars to support their claims against those like Ali Abd ul-Raziq and other modernist Muslims. In fact, Qaradawi and Rayyis aim to discredit the modernist arguments about Islam by giving references to Orientalists after discussing the Islamic sources. Their message was clear: 'See! Even the orientalists accept the fact that the Prophet had a political mission and established a state, why don't you, the modernists Muslims, admit the fact!'

4.3. Ali Abd ul-Raziq's Response to Mainstream

Ali Abd ul-Raziq holds several bold claims about political power and state in Islam as I listed above, which are entirely against all the mainstream arguments about the nature of state in Islam. Although Raziq was not the first one who argued that 'there is no Islamic state, and the Prophet was not a political figure,' Raziq has been considered as the father of the unorthodox views. As a result, he is labeled as one of the "First Muslim secularists" (Gazi 2009). However, as Yücesoy explains, well before Raziq, some Muslims in the medieval era argued against the concept of political authority and the necessity of a state:

Some Mutazilis thought they could do away with the imamate and argued for a notion of self-government instead of rulership.... As was the case with daily prayers, which could be performed with or without a prayer leader, they reasoned that the community was free to elect or not elect an imam as long as individuals knew their personal obligations (*farai'd*), which can be fulfilled without the coercive power of the imam (Yücesoy 2011, 14).

If some Muslims put forward the similar arguments long before Raziq wrote his book, why is Raziq being criticized so vehemently over several decades as if he was the pioneer of these arguments? It seems to me that Raziq owes his popularity to the historical context of the 1920s as I explained in the first chapter. His disorganized thoughts and assertive language stirred anger in the Islamic world where people had to find a way to adopt the new system of government after the abolition of the caliphate. While Muslim

scholars such as Rashid Rida tried to arrange meetings to discuss and even resist the new system, Raziq brought the long-forgotten arguments back to the discussion.

4.3.1 Raziq's Main Arguments

Raziq believed that the Prophet was a messenger of God, not a king, and he had a divine authority rather than temporal authority. For him, the Prophet possesses much more power than a temporal ruler does. He states that even if the Prophet has a similar role to any political leader, the Prophet does not share his power with anyone else. Raziq maintains, "it is a function that enables him to see directly into the hearts of people, to rend asunder their veils so as to gain insight into their innermost recesses" ('Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 83). Perhaps, no one would be against the argument that the Prophet's authority comes from the heart and the consent of people, but Raziq goes beyond these arguments later in his book. For instance, Raziq states that "Muhammad was strictly a Messenger, entrusted with a purely religious mission, uncompromised by any desire for kingship or temporal power" ('Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 81). Similarly, he argues that the Sunna of the Prophet also explicitly shows that the Prophet did not want to be treated as a political leader. As evidence, he states that the Prophet once said to a man who feared when he saw the Prophet "Be calm, for I am neither a king nor a tyrant. I am but the son of a Qurayshi woman who used to partake of salted meat" ('Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 92).

While Raziq attributes a uniqueness to the Prophet's authority, he also reduces the Messenger's power to 'only spiritual' matters, which is where he receives most of the objections. Nevertheless, in the following pages of his book, Raziq self-contradicts himself because he states that the Prophet "deals with relations of the body as well as the mind, on earth as well as in heaven. He is concerned with things of this world as well as the next" ('Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 84). Moreover, Raziq believed that the Prophet was not a founder of an empire or a state, and he was not preaching in favor of temporal authorities or kingdom in the world. Kingdom, empire, political power, and so on these are what kings are interested in, not a messenger of a God. However, one can ask if the

Prophet's authority is much more powerful than the temporal king's power, why then the Prophet does not have the power that a king who does not have religious authority possess.

While Raziq does not accept that the Prophet was a political leader and formed a state, he became in a self-contradictory position to write "the state of the Prophet" and "the Prophet's state" ('Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 76). Similarly, in the following pages, Raziq contradicts himself: He states, "We do find activities in the career of the Prophet which appear to be political and which seem to indicate an exercise of imperial or stately power" ('Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 94). Azimli also stresses that Raziq's arguments are full of discrepancies and the Prophet's role in the process of the Constitution of Medina and his other practices in Medina disprove Raziq's arguments about the mission of the Prophet (Azimli, 2002, p. 65). Azimli argues that even if Islam does not propose a state system, Islam does have an ideal state project. For instance, the Quran consists of several essential factors that a model Muslim state should have such as justice and consultation (*shura*). Raziq argues that one of the reasons why the Prophet did not form a state or government is that whereas the Prophet likes simplicity, the systems of government are complicated and convoluted.

4.3.1.1 Ambiguous state structure

In the second and last parts of the Islam and the Foundations of Political Power, Raziq first deals with whether there was a governmental organization during the time of the Prophet ('Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, pp. 59–111). He specifically discusses the judiciary system, and it seems as if he was convinced that the system was not ambiguous, he would accept the fact that the Prophet had formed a government. However, he believes that juridical practices of the Prophet were vague and unclear because of several reasons ('Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, pp. 61–62). For instance, he states that while the position of Ali who was sent by the Prophet on a mission to Yemen can be considered as the position of a judge, it may also be considered as a tax collector. Similarly, there is uncertainty about the

mission of Mu'ad ibn Jabal who was sent by the Prophet to the province of Janad. Raziq states that while Ibn Abd Al-Barr believes that Muad was sent as a judge, Al-Ghassani argues that Mu'ad was treasurer, and Ibn Maymun sees Mu'ad as an official in charge of the prayers. As a result, Raziq maintains that this unclear picture convinces him of the fact that there was neither an organizational structure during the time of the Prophet nor a system of government ('Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 64). Furthermore, Raziq asks several questions to convince his readers:

If it is true that the Prophet instituted a political regime; or if he at least set into motion a process leading to such a state of affairs, why should this "state" have remained bereft of the paraphernalia typical of any temporal power? Why did scholars inquiring into this subject fail to identify the governors of this regime? Why was it not possible to know the procedures for the nomination of judges? Why did the Prophet not speak to his subjects about government and about the rules of popular consultation? Why did he keep the theologians in doubt about such an important subject as the system of government that he himself had introduced? ('Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 74).

While the mainstream scholars believe that the Prophet had a comprehensive administration in the medieval context, Raziq states that other than conflict resolution and general jurisdiction over provinces, none of the other functions such as "management of finance" and "the upkeep of law and order" can be observed during the Prophet's time ('Abd al-Rāziq, 2012, p. 64). He sees these functions as the fundamentals for even a rudimentary state. He would confidently accept the authority during the time of the Prophet as "a system of government," if these functions ever existed. Raziq states "the Prophet from time to time delegated certain limited functions, such as command over troops, supervision of property, the leadership of the prayer, instruction in the Qur'an, and the propagation of the faith, to certain individuals. These assignments were not continuous or permanent..." ('Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 64). However, Raziq states that none of the features of temporal power can be observed during the Prophet; he forcefully argues that the order of the Prophet was not a type of government

or a state and the community around the Prophet was not a political movement, and he was not a king or prince ('Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 96).

Raziq made another mistake in comparing the functions of a typical state during the Prophet's time to those of the modern state structures. He states that today's states are well-organized powers and there was not such a powerful state organization during the time of the Prophet. Raziq states that the Prophet had somehow an authority over his community but "this is not the same as the power or authority that a temporal ruler wields over his subjects" ('Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 82). Abdurrazzak Sanhoury argues that the Prophet's state was not the same as a typical modern nation-state; however, it does not mean that Prophet's state did not have institutions that a state would have such as the tax system, the judicial system or the military institutions (Radhan, 2014, p. 145). Sanhoury believes that "Muhammad accomplished a religious and political unification of Arabia and that he even centralized the administration by directly sending governors to Yemen and other provinces" (Radhan, 2014, p. 146). For Rayyis, the Prophet performed all the functions of both political and religious state (Radhan, 2014, p. 146).

However, Raziq asks the question of why historians did not find evidence and historical information about the state officials such as governors, generals, judges during the time of the Prophet? He asks the question because he argues that historians conducted extensive research on the state officials during the first four caliphs, but they could not find much information about the officials during the Prophet's time. It seems, for Raziq, that the lack of information can be a sign that in fact there were no state officials at all. Raziq argues that, when it comes to the officials who were elected by the Prophet and their duty, historians use vague and inconsistent statements ('Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 64). Therefore, he concludes that it is difficult to observe a general system adopted by the Prophet, and one cannot be sure whether the Prophet appointed a person for a specific task. With this discussion, Raziq wants to open a gate to the inquiry of "the exact nature of the Prophet's mission," which means that he wants to discuss whether the Prophet

was a Messenger or a head of state. He asks, “was the Prophet, a king?” (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 65).

4.3.1.2 *Spiritual and temporal power*

Raziq argues what is essential is

whether the Prophet’s sovereignty over his people stemmed from his role as the Apostle of God or whether it was an imperial phenomenon; whether the occasional display of power in his actions points to the presence of a state, or of a spiritual authority; and whether the nature of the entity over which he presided was political, or whether it was rather a strictly and exclusively religious community. In a word, again, what is essential to determine is whether the Prophet was only an apostle of God or both (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 87).

He believes that the spiritual and temporal power should not be confused. He compares the two types of authority as follows:

The former aims at a leadership over men in the path of justice and initiation into the Truth. The latter has to do with the organization of the vital requirements of society and the occupation of land. The former aims at the establishment of religion; the latter serves the interests of this world strictly. The former provides religious and spiritual direction; the latter is a purely **secular** enterprise. How far they are from each other! What a distance lies between them – between religion, on the one hand, and politics, on the other! (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 85).

4.3.1.3 *The Prophet or King?*

Raziq states that there has not been an inquiry about whether the Prophet was a king among the Muslim, and he argues that questioning this idea does not harm their faith. He believes that “the mission of the Prophet is very different from the position of a king and there is no necessary link between these two” (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 68). Raziq argues that the Prophet did not involve into political matters of tribes and he did not intend to change the system of the tribes. He asks several questions:

If the establishment of a state had indeed been part of his appointed purpose, how could he have left it so vague that the Muslims, finding themselves entirely in the dark [after his death], fell to killing one another... How could he have left his people in such utter confusion as that which swept over them and instantly plunged them into the most vicious violence even before they could see his body to the grave? ('Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 104).

Raziq also gave the reference the phrase that is attributed to the Prophet: 'You know the worldly matters better than me.' Here Raziq selectively chooses hadiths that could strengthen his arguments. Azimli argues that the Prophet used this sentence in a specific context for fertilization of palms (Azimli, 2002, p. 65). Muhammad al-Bahi and Mehmet Gormez also believe that Raziq used the hadiths out of its context (Görmez, 1995; Radhan, 2014, p. 145). But clearly, there are also many examples that could challenge his arguments.

Raziq states that most of the Prophets that known are only the messengers of the God, not a king such as Jesus or Joseph. Here, Raziq gives Jesus's famous statement again: "render unto Caesar what is Caesar's and unto God what is God's," which he wants to show that Jesus supported the idea of obeying Cesar and his authority. Raziq states that lay Muslims and theologians generally see the Prophet as a Messenger-King sent by God. He claims that this argument is the prevailing view among Muslims as well as opinions of theologians such as Ibn Khaldun and Tahtawi ('Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 67). However, this argument is not true given the medieval scholars' views about the Prophet. Ibn Khaldun does not see the Prophet as a King, and in fact "kingship" is what Ibn Khaldun uses in a negative context to describe the evolution of the caliphate to kingship. Therefore, Ibn Khaldun does not see the Prophet as King. Unlike Raziq, Ibn Khaldun locates the Prophet authority in a place where encompasses all the authority that a king would have. Similarly, other medieval scholars like Mawardi, Ghazali or Taymiyyah do not see the Prophet as a king since King would only have a worldly power and not appointed by the God. However, some orientalist like Patricia Crone see the claim that the Prophet was a king (Crone, 2005). Raziq criticizes Ibn Khaldun for considering Islam both as a message

and as a system of legislation and encompassing both spiritual and temporal power. In fact, as I show above, not only Ibn Khaldun but also medieval and contemporary scholars consider Islam as a comprehensive religion. Raziq argues that the idea that Islam proposes a system of legislation and a state model is “an unfounded interpretation.” He argues “it is not justified by any authoritative source. Worse still, it is in contradiction to the significance of the Prophet’s message” (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 74).

4.3.1.4 *The Prophet and coercion*

Raziq denies the political authority of the Prophet because he believes that the mission of the Prophet was persuasion and exhortation to the good and not by force or violence (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 71). This argument is a component of his theory of the caliphate. As I showed in the previous chapter, he argued that the caliphate was a political, and a matter of coercion and violence. Conversely, the mission of the Prophet was not to be a king and form a state, and he did not use oppression and violence for spreading his divine message to people. Raziq believes that while Prophet’s authority came from God and was born in the heart of people, the power of a king is material and has nothing to do with the hearth of people. Raziq states that if Muslims accept that the Prophet did not use force, then they should conclude: The Prophet did not form a state since states built based on coercion and violence and cannot survive without them (Hourani 1983, 187). For instance, Raziq state that “No prophet, throughout history, has ever tried to bring people to believe in God by the sword, or conquered a people so as to convince them to join his faith” (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 71).

As I stated above, Ibn Taymiyyah did not believe that a caliphate is necessary for Muslims to practice their religion as long as a mundane authority existed. In that sense, Ibn Taymiyyah could be a reference for Raziq. One can wonder why Ali Abd ul-Raziq did not mention Taymiyyah’s name or why he did not influence by Taymiyyah’s view of the caliphate. The answer is that while Ibn Taymiyyah does not see the caliphate as a necessary institution, he sees the sword as a way to preserve religion (ibn Teymiye,

1999). However, Raziq denies that coercion and violence cannot be the tools for spreading Islam, which the Quran indicates. For Raziq, oppression and violence are state/political apparatus not religious. In contrast, Ibn Taymiyyah believes that “anyone who deviates from the Quran will be corrected by force, and that is why the Quran and the sword cooperate in preserving religion” (Qaradawi, 1998, p. 19).

As for how he explains why the concept of the caliphate is not Islamic, Raziq lists several verses and hadiths to show that the Prophet did not have an interest in gaining political power. He argues that these verses show that “Quran explicitly forbids a view of the Prophet as a custodian of men” and does not allow the use of violence to make belief in the faith (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 88). However, control and domination are the tools for temporary leaders. According to Raziq, the Prophet was not ordered to force people into spreading the message, and Raziq gives another list of verses to show that the Prophet Muhammad was only a messenger. (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 89–91). Raziq quotes various Quranic verses in the book to strengthen his arguments, but Azimli states if Raziq believes the verses that he uses in the book to convince readers as if Quran does not indicate anything about political authority, Raziq’s knowledge of Quran is extremely limited (Azimli, 2002, p. 64).

4.3.1.5 Jihad

While Raziq argues that the Prophet shared his message through persuasion, not coercion. He states that the Prophet “secured this union by means of the word and by means of the sword” (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 86). He believes that Jihad was a means among other means that the Prophet used for reaffirmation of his teaching and reinforcement of his message, and from his definition of “jihad,” he sees it as “violent and brutal” (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 95). Broucek claims that despite Prophet participated in wars, Raziq believes the Prophet fight but not because of his prophetic mission but because of his “personal decisions” (Broucek, 2012, p. 177).

Görmez argues that Raziq unintentionally pictures the Prophet as if who was “a fighter for wealth and power for his state” (Görmez, 1995, p. 230). He argues that one cannot clearly understand Raziq’s arguments about political authority during the Prophet because of his conflicting statements (Görmez, 1995, p. 230). As far as I am concerned, I see a major fallacy because while Raziq believes that jihad became a means for establishing an Arab state, which was political and has nothing to do with religious mission, during the first Caliph Abu Bakr, he states the Prophet also used jihad as a means. The questions are if jihad is a political means why did the Prophet use if he did not have political goals? If the Prophet spread his message through persuasion and if the message was born in the heart, then why did the Prophet apply “jihad”? Similarly, Rosenthal also asks: If the Prophet engaged in holy wars, how can Raziq argue that force is incompatible with Islam? (Rosenthal, 2009, p. 94).

4.3.1.6 Abu Bakr as the first King

While Raziq argued that the Prophet did not form a political organization or state, the first caliph Abu Bakr established the first Arab state, which had nothing to do with Islam. Rosenthal states that Raziq implies that the early Muslims and the caliphs -Khulafa Rashidun- “have betrayed” the mission the Prophet by focusing on the temporal authority (Rosenthal, 2009, p. 86). Broucek states that “By calling Abu Bakr Islam’s first king, ‘Abd al-Raziq knowingly confused the distinction between the rightly-guided caliphs and the rulers who followed them” (Broucek, 2012, p. 182). Raziq believes that Islam was not revealed only for Arabs, and the message of Islam is the universe and cannot be limited with Arab entities or states (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 99). Unlike the Prophet, Abu Bakr “became the first ruler in the history of Islam” (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 109). Raziq argues that Abu Bakr created an Arab state and despite the state had a significant impact on spreading the message and preservation of Islam, the Arab state still was a secular temporal in nature (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 109).

Raziq implies that if there were a need for a formation of an “Islamic state,” God will certainly make it happen. What Abu Bakr formed was not an Islamic state rather it was only an Arab state that concerns about temporal political power in the world. Raziq states that “the new state created by the Arabs was an Arab state and an Arab power. While Islam, as we know, is a religion addressed to all humanity, a religion that is neither Arab nor non-Arab” (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 109).

Raziq uses the term “regime of Abu Bakr” and argues that the regime did not have any religious significance (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 114). When Abu Bakr was chosen as the first caliph, some did not accept, but they still believed in the Prophet and his message. He argues that the wars, conflicts, and struggles during Abu Bakr were all political and not on the name of religion. Thus those who opposed the “regime of Abu Bakr” cannot be seen as “apostasies” and launch a war on them. (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 113). Raziq argues the early Muslims were aware of the fact that they were establishing a temporal authority, not a religious, which allowed disagreement or rejections (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 110). If it were seen as sacred, no one would be against the temporal authorities. However, Sanhoury believes that because there was a rejection of paying the alms (zakat), which was one of the cornerstones of Islam, Abu Bakr’s wars of apostasy were religious wars not political (Radhan, 2014, p. 175).

4.3.1.7 Scientific method

Raziq believed that he inquires the political system during the Prophet in a scientific way. He stresses “scientific” word in many places to show that the previous scholars did not examine and accepted many assumptions without concrete evidence. He states, “A scientific mind will not dismiss this line of reasoning without examining it” (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 75). He maintains that people are ignorant of historical information and no one should be completely certain about anything that may not be true. James Broucek argues that Raziq adopted the “scientific” method from his professor Carlo Nallino (Broucek, 2012, p. 187).

He implies that even if it has been argued or assumed by many that the Prophet was the political leader and he formed a state in Medina, because of this argument may not be correct. He wants to show that he may not hold the truth about system of rule by the Prophet, but by doing that he also wants to challenge the Sunni Muslim scholars confidence: 'Even I who utilize a scientific method to the debate about system of government during Prophet is not a hundred percent sure, how can you, traditionalists who carry a lot of assumptions be so confident?' Raziq believes that "as long as the present evidence is not refuted by new data, this possibility need not prevent us from wondering about the real origin and significance of the confusion and ambiguity concerning the Prophet's system of authority which we have pointed out" ('Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 76).

4.3.1.8 *Secularism/laicism*

It can be said that Raziq believes in secularism/laicism in the sense that he wants to differentiate religious power and political/temporal power. While Raziq is known as Muslim secularist or pioneer of Islamic laicism, he did not define himself as secular or laic. Considering his views about the separation of spiritual from worldly matters, it can be claimed that Raziq supports a type of secularism. Because secularism does not have a positive connotation in the Islamic world, it should be explained in what sense Raziq can be called as "Muslim secularist." For instance, Raziq does not support an irreligious society and does not call for it, nor does he have any plan to change people's religious belief from top-down processes. What he stresses is that the spiritual power and temporal power are not the same.

Muhammad al-Bahi claims that Raziq attempts "Christianization of Islam" as he gives references to Jesus in several times in the book (Radhan, 2014, p. 152). A similar argument can also be seen in the views of Black who states that unlike orientalist and Islamists, Raziq sees the Prophet Muhammad as Christian scholars see Christ, and Raziq

wants to open gates for developing a new political system that could help to compete with other nations (Black, 2011, p. 331). Belkeziz states that the government that Raziq advocates has a civil and political character, which is different than sultanate or caliphate (Balqazīz, 2009, p. 105). While Sanhoury seems to agree with Raziq when he believes that the state of Arabia was primitive, he still argues that the political institutions relied on religious concerns and the terms “religion” and “state” were not two separate entities (Radhan, 2014, p. 151). Imarah criticizes Raziq for separating state matters from Islam. He argues that the relationship between religion and state is not a matter of separation rather it is a matter of differentiation (Radhan, 2014, p. 151). He argues that consultation (*shura*) that the Quran explicitly advocates is a matter of world and political issues. Similarly, Abderrazak Sanhury, Muhammad al-Bahi, and Rayyis criticize Raziq for his selectivity. They argue that Raziq omits Medina verses that have more information about authority and relies more on the Mecca verses. Rayyis argue that the verses (Quran 4:58-59) that Raziq denies are in fact about legislation and ruling (Radhan, 2014, pp. 142–143). Mamduh Hiqqi argues that Islam and state are inseparable (Ali, 2009, p. 107). Hiqqi argues that Islam is a different religion, which has its system of government. He argues that “The Islamic order is neither absolutist-monarchic, nor constitutional, nor representative, nor communist, nor socialist -- the system is called “Islam” (Radhan, 2014, p. 171).

4.3.1.9 Umma: Spiritual Union

Raziq believes that Islam constitutes a religious union, and it is a spiritual unity, not a political or imperial unity. He maintains that as long as one agrees that the unity is spiritual, it is not essential to calling the unity as “state” “empire” or any other words (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 86). However, Muhammad Amara asks how it can be possible that a Prophet has a state or imperial power, but his community was only a religious union (Radhan, 2014, p. 145)? Raziq states that the umma (community) around the Prophet was not a political entity but only a religious one, and the reason why all the people came together not because of being a state citizen but because of believing in a religion and a

prophet. He argues “The Arabs gathered themselves around him as an act of love for God, an act that earned them the favor of the divine revelation, the opening of the heavens and the commandments and prescriptions of the Lord” (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 103).

Raziq argues while there may be a single unified religion in the world, it is impossible to see a single government (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 94). He argues that there were many kinds of people who accepted Islam. These people from not only different identities but also ruled under different political systems such as those who embraced Islam and continued to live under Byzantium and as independent entities. There were significant differences between the operations of government, customs and many aspects of material and economic life (‘Abd al-Rāziq 2012, 100).

Amara argues that if Quran does not explicitly prohibit the Prophet to engage with ruling a community, and if the Prophet commands and appoints governors, tax collectors, and imams, and if Muslims have to follow the Sunna of the Prophet, then they also need to form a government. Muhammad Al Bahi also argues that religious rituals can only be practiced in a world where Muslims are protected, which requires a political system (Radhan, 2014, pp. 143–169).

4.4. Intellectuals influenced by Raziq

There were several people in 1930s in Egypt who shared similar ideas with Raziq, for instance, Taha Husayn (1889-1976), Muhammad Husayn Haykal (Hatina, 2000, pp. 38–46) are the best known. Similarly, many other Egyptians like 'Abd al-Qadir al-Mazini, Ahmad Amin, Yusuf Idris, Zaki Najib Mahmud, Najib Mahfuz, Tawfiq al-Hakim, Shaykh Khalid Muhammad Khalid –he was forced to change his views later on– and Faraj Ali Foda had similar views with Raziq’s (Najjar, 1996). The names above have suffered for many years because of their opinions, even some of them like Faraj Ali Foda assassinated in 1992 (Black, 2011, p. 331). Although scholars that I discuss their arguments in this part

may not entirely agree with Raziq, some scholars like Nasr Hamid Abu Zeyd, Luay Radhan and James Broucek argue that Raziq influenced Ahmed An-Naim, Muhammad Sa'id al-Asmhawi, Fuad Zakariya, Munawir Sadzali, Ghaleb Bencheikh, Abdurahman Wahid, Tayeb Al-Oqbi, Mohammad Talbi and Mohamad Charfi (Abu-Zaid, 2006; Radhan, 2014; Broucek, 2012). However, I believe it is difficult to argue that these intellectuals saw Raziq as the mastermind of their views, and they may even be offended by such an analogy. Since I have limited space, I select some of them (the one who most engage with state/religion issue in an Islamic context), namely Abdullahi Ahmad An-Naim, Muhammad Sa'id al-Asmhawi, Fuad Zakariya, Munawir Sadzali and Abdurahman Wahid.

Abdullahi Ahmad An-Naim, a law professor, strongly believes that Muslims need to establish secular state. In his "Islam and the Secular State," he argues that "in order to be a Muslim by conviction and free choice, which is the only way one can be a Muslim, I need a secular state" (Na'im, 2008). Even though Naim can be seen as a scholar influenced by Raziq, Naim gives Raziq's name only in two times in the beginning of the book. Part of the reason is that Naim influenced more by his teacher Mahmoud Mohamed Taha (Naim, 2008, p.2). In the beginning of the book, Naim states that Raziq "conclusively demonstrated the validity of *this premise* (religious law enforced by a state is not necessarily Islamic) from a traditional Islamic perspective more than eighty years ago (Naim, 2008, pp. 1-2). By separating Islam from state, Naim's ideas resemble to Raziq's (Radhan, 2014; Broucek, 2012). For instance, Naim states:

Islam is the religion of human beings who believe in it, while the state signifies the continuity of institutions like the judiciary and administrative agencies. This view is fundamentally Islamic, because it insists on the religious neutrality of the state as a necessary condition for Muslims to comply with their religious obligations (Naim, 2008, p. 4).

Muhammad Sa'id al-Asmhawi was a High Court judge and known his critics against Islamists in Egypt. Like Raziq, he argued that the so-called religious state has been a disaster in the past and he advocated a civil administration (Shepard, 1996). Asmhawi

argues that government under the Prophet was religious; however, after him, a religious government has never been established and it cannot be found in the future (Shepard, 1996, p. 48). He engaged with an etymological inquiry to show that there is no verse in the Quran that could provide a way of government (Fakhry, 2004, p. 379). In his one of the book, to criticize Islamists, he states

That the politicization of religion or religiousness of politics nothing but acts of prostitution by iniquitous men or an act boorishness. For these acts enable opportunism to appear as an act in the name of religion; they allow the exploiter to legitimacy by way of [Quranic] verses; they transform lechery symbol in the name of the Sharia... (Sagiv, 1992).

Fuad Zakariya was a professor of philosophy and advocated a secular state. Like Asmhawi, he was also very much against the politicized Islam. He argued that Islam and secularism were not contradictory terms (Gallagher, 1989). In a conference 1989, Zakaria supported secularism against Shaykh Muhammad al-Ghazali, Yusuf al-Qaradawi, argued “Secular governments accept faith but reject the Shari'a. Secularism did not mean atheism but rather the separation of religion and State” (Gallagher, 1989, p. 211). Furthermore, he stated that rationalism, criticism, logic, and intellectual independence were all attributes of Islam. He argues that Islamists deliberately want to confuse the meaning of “secularism” (Wu, 2007).

Munawir Sadzali was the former minister of religious affairs in the late 1980s in Indonesia. He was another advocator of renewal. Like all reformist, he also held a contextual approach to Islam and claimed that the Quran should be interpreted according to modern social circumstances. Like Raziq, he also claims that Quran and Sunna do not propose a particular type of state and Islam has nothing to do with regulating the issue of state affairs (Abū-Zaid, 2006, p. 63). He claims Muslims learned the concept of “Islamic state” from the Western colonialism; there is nothing in Islam as “Islamic state” that Muslims in both classical and medieval periods did not experience (Abū-Zaid, 2006, p. 63). Another Indonesian *Abdurrahman Wahid* also rejected the idea

that Islam presupposes a type of state. Like Sadzali, he was also a supporter of Indonesia's secular state ideology, *Pancasila*, and supports minority rights and multi-cultural society. Wahid had studied in modern schools, Al-Azhar as well as the University of Bagdad. He believed in a "cultural Islam" meaning that individual moral values, religious tolerance, protection of non-Muslims and heterodox Muslim sects and like other modernist seculars, he rejected "Political Islam" (Bruinessen, 2009).

4. 5. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have discussed Ali Abd ul-Raziq's arguments about political authority and state structure. I showed that Raziq received most of the criticisms because of the arguments that I analyze in the chapter. While Raziq's views about the concept of the caliphate were not original, his opinions about political authority and system are authentic even eccentric despite the similarities with medieval anarchists' views. Raziq believed that Muslims scholars have three main assumptions about political authority and the state structure of the Prophet, and he aimed to disprove the assumptions. I have argued that despite several contemporary figures who might have influenced by Raziq's argument, Raziq has been mostly criticized because of his bold claims that I presented here such as the political authority of the Prophet and the claim about the nature of Abu Bakr's authority.

I tried to highlight Raziq's arguments by comparing his arguments with medieval and contemporary Muslims scholars, Islamists as well as western and orientalist scholars' views about the Islam and state relations. Because, all the people I discuss believed that Islam and state are inseparable, the Prophet was not only spiritual but also a political leader, I labeled them as "mainstream" even if they many different views about Islam in general.

Raziq aimed to show an alternative path to understand politics and even to develop a new system based on their needs in the 1930s. However, his assertive language,

unorganized thoughts, and selective approach to the Quranic verses and hadiths made this goal difficult. Because Raziq and his followers were too unorthodox, they even created reactions which only after a couple of years, Hassan al-Banna formed the Muslim Brotherhood and demand an Islamic state.

Indeed, many scholars argue that Raziq was right in the sense that Quran does not suggest a state system or regime type, and the Prophet did not explicitly appoint a person to be the leader of the community. However, claiming the Prophet's authority as only spiritual and that jihad was a means of political, not religious, even a western-oriented secular Muslim would not agree with Raziq. Raziq could have found supports among Muslims if he did not go too far with his arguments.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Perhaps, one of the critical developments in the history of Muslims in the last two centuries is the abolition of the caliphate. While few medieval scholars claimed that caliphate was not necessary, it can be argued that caliphate was treated as a religious institution among most Muslim scholars. Similarly, while the mainstream believes that the Prophet Muhammad was not only a religious leader, but he was also a political head of his community. In this thesis, I have explained how Ali Abd ul-Raziq challenged the two mainstream beliefs with his book, *Al-Islam wa Usul al-Hukm* (Islam and the Foundation of Political Power). He claimed that the caliphate is not religiously mandatory institution in Islam. He held that neither the Quran nor Sunna justifies the concept of the caliphate, and there has never been consensus (*ijma*) in the history of the caliphate. Similarly, he maintained that the Prophet did not form a state and he was only the Messenger of God, who did not interest in gaining political authority in the world. Raziq was a unique scholar in the sense that he questioned the traditional concepts, the authority of the first caliph Abu Bakr, and even he claimed that jihad was a political means not religious. Because of these arguments, the Azharite ulama expelled Raziq from his duty as a sharia judge and took back his title of the sheikh. In this thesis, I have examined how Ali Abd ul-Raziq came to these different conclusions. I analyzed Raziq's arguments, his sources and the logical integrity of his arguments based on evidence he shown. I argued that while Raziq did not introduce new ideas regarding the concept of the caliphate. For instance, 'the institution of caliphate became a tool for political gain' argument was also argued by Ibn Khaldun. However, Raziq's arguments about the nature of the authority of the Prophet can be seen as *too* unorthodox. Indeed, Raziq criticized not because he thought the caliphate was not religiously mandatory institution but because of his statements about the nature of the authority of the Prophet and the first caliph Abu Bakr.

Before, analyzing Raziq's case, I argued that Raziq's personal history played a crucial role in his way of thinking about political concepts in Islam. Therefore, I first contextualized his own life story and the political circumstances when he published the book. I explained that coming from an elite family in Egypt, and he had the opportunity to meet many famous Egyptian intellectuals and politicians in his father and brothers' circle. As his family, Raziq was also politically active, and even he ran for a seat in the parliament before 1925. While ten years old, he joined Azhar where the famous modernist Abduh's legacy was still alive. In addition to his classic study in Azhar, he also attended in Egypt's secular university. Perhaps, one of the distinctive features of Raziq was that he was not a scholar who found his references from the sources of the western scholars; instead, his sources and supporting ideas came from the intellectual history of Muslims. While he references twice the names of two British philosophers, most of the scholars believed that Raziq's sources and influence were not western scholars and philosophy. Of course, even if Raziq does not refer western philosophy, his study in Egyptian University had affected his method of thinking and constructing his arguments. Some scholars claimed that Raziq's courses on history by Orientalist scholars like Carlo Nallino in Egyptian University affected his way of thinking about historical developments.

I argued that without the historical background of the 1920s, Raziq's arguments would be difficult to understand. Before and after the abolition of sultanate and caliphate, some theoretical discussion rose about the nature of sultanate and caliphate. Some Turkish scholars believed that sultanate and caliphate could not be separated because they were both linked institutions. Raziq was a 35-year-old intellectual when the caliphate was abolished. He showed that he was aware of the debates that took place among Turkish elites. For Ali Abd ul-Raziq, the abolition of the caliphate was a progressive development because Muslims now could think about new political system according to their needs. I showed that for Raziq, the theoretical debates were vital because he constructed his arguments based on the discussion for and against the abolition. Raziq refers to Justice Minister Seyyid Bey's speech in the Turkish Assembly in

his book, and his goal was to challenge the theoretical arguments of the Turkish and Egyptian scholars who believed that caliphate is a religiously necessary institution. While following the discussion in Turkey, his supporting party became a coalition partner in Egypt despite the party was not popular among Egyptian society. As a Liberal Constitutionalist, Raziq was in favor of constitutional monarchy and wanted to gain more support from the society as a political party.

While initially, Azharite scholars were against the abolition, they eventually accepted the decision of the Turkish Assembly. They believed that Egypt could play a central role for re-establishment of the institution of the caliphate. The Egyptian media circulated news that Azhar scholars planned to organize an international caliphate conference to discuss the future of caliphate and lobbying King Fouad of Egypt for the new caliph. Raziq believed that King Fouad already held too much power, and if he were to possess a “religious legitimacy” than nothing could stop him to act freely. He believed that as a new constitutional monarchy, Egypt should adopt new concepts and ideas rather than outdated concepts.

Raziq first explained the traditional understanding of the caliphate. He showed that how medieval scholars saw the concept of the caliphate. He then started to challenge all traditional beliefs about the caliphate. He claimed that Islam is silent about the political system and does not require the caliphate. He believed that the caliphate is only a political institution and does not have religious authority. Neither Quran nor Sunna justifies the caliphate, and there has never been a consensus of scholars on necessity of the caliphate. Some scholars argued that Muslim scholars did not discuss whether a caliph was necessary or not; instead, they discuss who and how to choose one as caliph. Therefore, the whole debates about the person not the nature of the caliphate. Raziq shares several historical information to show how the system of caliphate transformed to kingship. Scholars showed that Raziq was influenced by Ibn Khaldun’s methodology and examples that he showed about the transformation of the caliphate. However, even

if it seems Raziq influenced by Ibn Khaldun, I explained that Raziq differs from Ibn Khaldun in many aspects. For instance, Ibn Khaldun believed that after the four rightly guided caliphs, the caliphate system transformed to kingship, Raziq believed that the roots of the concept of the caliphate are in fact kingship. In other words, Raziq did not differentiate the four caliphs and implied that they were kings.

I have shown that Raziq used a selective approach and tried to find the worst examples to justify his argument regarding the caliphate. In fact, Raziq was right when he asserted that the first debate among Muslims was whom to choose the caliph after the Prophet's death. Indeed, many wars occurred between dynasties and empires for taking the institution of the caliphate over centuries, and the institution of the caliphate was used for political gains. However, Raziq also had to discuss what role the caliph had in the daily life of Muslims. Raziq was censured for stating only the worst examples and not debating other aspects of the caliphate. For instance, while Raziq relied upon Ibn Khaldun's historical examples and supported Ibn Khaldun's thesis that caliphate became kingship, he should have been aware of Ibn Khaldun's statement about the importance of caliphate in the life of Muslims. Ibn Khaldun believed that Muslims need a caliph for their public interest and it should not be seen as a pillar of Islam. Of course, scholars like Rashid Rida criticized Raziq for his arguments about the caliphate, and Raziq's caliphate arguments ruined King Fuad's plan. However, Raziq did not receive most of the criticisms because of his discussions about the nature of the caliphate --many scholars like Seyyid Bey were already cognizant that the Quran does not advocate a system-- instead the Quran shows the general features of an ideal system and that the Prophet did not appoint a person to be the caliph after him. Because of Raziq's views about the political authority of the Prophet, and his arguments about Abu Bakr, he became a controversial figure and destroyed his reputation scholar.

Raziq did not stop with challenging the idea of the caliphate and started to question the whole system of governance during the Prophet. He asked whether the Prophet was a

king or not, whether he formed a state and was the leader of the state or not. His answers to these questions were that the Prophet was not a king, he was only the Messenger of the God and did not interest in gaining political authority. As when he discussed caliphate, he states various verses and hadiths to show that Quran and Sunna do not justify the political authority of the Prophet. Moreover, he also claimed that Abu Bakr was the first king of the Arab state which did not have any religious mission even though it helped to spread the Message. Raziq goes too far by claiming that jihad is not a religious means but a political one. As justification, he asserted that the Quran does not allow coercion and violence to be used on people to force them to accept Islam.

I showed that the mainstream view about the political authority of the Prophet is entirely different than what Raziq supported. Medieval and contemporary Muslim scholars, Islamists and even western and orientalist scholars believe that the Prophet was not only a spiritual leader, and religion and state are inseparable in Islam. I discussed that Raziq's arguments were too unorthodox to be accepted by a Muslim. When analyzing Raziq's arguments, one can easily see that he contradicts himself in some instances. For instance, while he denies that the Prophet did not form a state, in somewhere of the book, he uses "the Prophet's state." Similarly, while he claims that the authority of the Prophet is more than any other person in the world, but he denies that a prophet cannot have the authority that a political leader or a king possesses. I explained that while Raziq attributes a unique authority that a king cannot have, he also reduced the mission and power of the Prophet into "only spiritual" matters.

If Raziq were not so radical with his arguments about dividing religious and political authority, he would have found many followers. Even the most secular Muslims did not argue that the Prophet did not have political power (Ashour, 2018). Indeed, as some scholars argued even the secular liberal constitutionalists in the 1920s did not hold the same ideas with Raziq, but they felt that had to support Raziq against the traditional scholars (Hassan, 2016). Similarly, had he had not used assertive language, or had he

developed his supporting arguments as Seyyid Bey did, he might not have criticized so vehemently. It can be speculated that Raziq's arguments caused a traditional reaction. For instance, only after three years of Raziq's case, Hassan al-Banna found the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) in Egypt. Although Raziq and his views may have had little effect or no direct effect on the formation of MB, views such as separating realms of religion and state was one of prominent criticisms that political islamists asserted during the 1930s.

Although Raziq did not call himself as secular, scholars argue that Raziq justifies secularism or as Radhan states "Islamic laicism." However, I argued that if Raziq supported secularism, it was only about separation of religion and state not more. For instance, he did not support a top-down secularism, nor did he suggest privatizing religion. In fact, Raziq would not accept a type of secularism that was hostile to religion or monopolizes religion. Perhaps, Raziq could have been a pioneer of a school of thought, if he stressed characteristics of good governance in Islam.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdi, S. (2017). Understanding Religion-State Relations in Muslim Societies: Beyond Essentialist and Secular-Liberal Narratives. *Indonesian Journal of Interdisciplinary Islamic Studies (IJIS)*, 1(1), 27–48. <https://doi.org/10.20885/ijis.vol1.iss1.art2>
- Abdurrazık, A. (1995). *İslam'da İktidarın Temelleri*. Birleşik Yayıncılık.
- Abū-Zaid, N. Hāmid. (2006). *Reformation of Islamic thought: a critical historical analysis*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam Univ. Press.
- Adams, C. C. (1968). *Islam and Modernism in Egypt*. Russell New York.
- Afsaruddin, A. (2006). The “Islamic State”: Genealogy, Facts, and Myths. *Journal of Church and State*, 48(1), 153–173.
- Afsaruddin, A., & Palgrave Connect (Online service). (2011). *Islam, the state, and political authority: medieval issues and modern concerns*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ahmad, F. (1993). *The making of modern Turkey*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Ali, S. T. (2009). *A religion, not a state: Ali Abd al-Raziq's Islamic justification of political secularism*. Salt Lake City, Utah: University of Utah Press. Retrieved from <http://public.ebib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=3571984>
- Ammara, M. (1991). *İslam Devleti Laiklik Ve Dini Fanatizm Arasında*. Kitapevi Yayınları.
- Ardıç, N. (2012). *Islam and the politics of secularism: the Caliphate and Middle Eastern modernization in the early 20th century*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Ashour, O. (2018). Democratic Islam? Assessing the Bases of Democracy in Islamic Political Thought, 21.
- Attas, S. M. N. al-. (1978). *Islām and secularism*. Kuala Lumpur: International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilisation (ISTAC).
- Avva, M. S. (2011). *İslam Devletinde Yönetim Şekli*. Mana Yayınları.
- Azimli, M. (2002). Hilafet Karşıtı Bir Kişi Olarak Ali Abdurrazık ve Kitabı “El-İslām ve Usûlu'l-Hukm” Üzerine Bazı Mülahazalar. *Marife Bilimsel Birikim Dergisi*, (3), 55–66.

- Azmeh, W. (2016). Misconceptions about the Caliphate in Islam. *Digest of Middle East Studies*, 25(2), 227–263. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dome.12083>
- Balqazîz, ‘Abd al-Ilâh. (2009). *the state in contemporary Islamic thought: a historical survey of the major Muslim political thinkers of the modern era*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Binder, L. (1988). *Islamic liberalism: a critique of development ideologies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Black, A. (2011). *The history of Islamic political thought: from the Prophet to the present* (2nd ed). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Broucek, J. (2012). *The Controversy of Shaykh ‘Ali ‘Abd Al-Raziq*. Florida State University.
- Brown, L. C. (2000). *Religion and state: the Muslim approach to politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bulaç, A. (1998). *Modern ulus devlet* (2. baskı). İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık.
- Cleveland, W. L., & Bunton, M. P. (2013). *A history of the modern Middle East* (Fifth edition). Boulder, CO: Westview Press, a member of the Perseus Books Group.
- Crone, P. (2005). *Medieval Islamic political thought* (Paper ed). Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.
- Donohue, J. J., & Esposito, J. L. (Eds.). (2007). *Islam in transition: Muslim perspectives* (2. ed). New York, NY: Oxford Univ. Press.
- El-Karadavi, Y. (2013). *İslam’da devlet mefhumu: devletin İslam’ daki yeri ve temel unsurları demokrasiye ve gayrimüslimlere karşı tutumu*.
- Erdem, S. (1996). Cumhuriyet’e geçiş sürecinde hilâfet teorisine alternatif yaklaşımlar: Seyyid Bey örneği (1922-1924). *Dîvân: Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi*, 2.
- Esposito, J. L., & Shahin, E. E. (Eds.). (2013). *The Oxford handbook of Islam and politics*. Oxford, UK; New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Fakhry, M. (1954). The Theocratic Idea of the Islamic State in Recent Controversies. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)*, 30(4), 450–462. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2608725>
- Fakhry, M. (2004). *A history of Islamic philosophy* (3rd ed). New York: Columbia University Press.

- Gallagher, N. E. (1989). Islam v. Secularism in Cairo: An Account of the Dar al-Hikma Debate. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 25(2), 208–215.
- Gazi, F. (2009, April 9). Faisal Gazi: the first scholar of Muslim secularism. *The Guardian*.
- Gecit, M. S. (2013). Maverdi'nin Hilafet Anlayışında Meşruiyet Sorunu *EKEV Akademi Dergisi*, 57(57), 311–328.
- Gershoni, I., & Jankowski, J. P. (1986). *Egypt, Islam, and the Arabs: the search for Egyptian nationhood, 1900-1930*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Görmez, M. (1995). İslam Dünyasında Laiklik Tartışmasını Başlatan Bir Kitap ve Bu Kitabın Serencamı. *İslami Araştırmalar*, 8(3–4).
- Hanioglu, M. S. (2013). *Ataturk: an intellectual biography*. Place of publication not identified: Princeton Univ Press.
- Hassan, M. (2016). *Longing for the lost caliphate: a transregional history*. Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Hatina, M. (2000). On the Margins of Consensus: The Call to Separate Religion and State in Modern Egypt. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 36(1), 35–67.
- Hourani, A. (1983). *Arabic thought in the liberal age, 1798-1939*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 'Abd al-Rāziq, 'Alī. (2012). *Islam and the foundations of political power*. (A. Filali-Ansary, Ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press in association with the Aga Khan University, Institute for the Study of Muslim Civilisations.
- İbn Teymiye. (1999). *Siyaset: Es-Siyasetu'ş-şer'iyye*. İstanbul: Dergah.
- Jadaane, F. (1985). Notions of the state in contemporary Arab-Islamic writings. *The International Spectator*, 20(2), 33-50
- Kara, I. (2014). *Hilafet Risaleleri 6.Cilt / Cumhuriyet Devri*. Klasik Yayinlari
- Kedourie, E. (1963). Egypt and the Caliphate 1915–19461. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 95(3–4), 208–248. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00121938>
- Kerr, M. H. (1966). *Islamic Reform: The Political and Legal Theories of Muhammad 'Abduh and Rashid Rida* (1st edition). University of California Press.
- Kurzman, C. (Ed.). (1998). *Liberal Islam: a source book*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Lambton, A. K. S. (1981). *State and government in medieval Islam: an introduction to the study of Islamic political theory: the jurists*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, B. (2002). *The emergence of modern Turkey / Bernard Lewis* (3rd ed). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Māwardī, ‘Alī Ibn-Muḥammad al-. (2000). *The ordinances of government =: Al-Aḥkām al-sulṭāniyya w’al-wilāyāt al-Dīniyya*. (W. H. Wahba, Ed.) (1. Paperback ed). Reading: Garnet.
- Meiloud, A. (2017). *The Islamic Rational State: The Arab Islamists’ New Politico-Legal Discourses of a Post-Caliphate Order*.
- Menküç, H. L. (2017). *Mısır basınında hilafet tartışmaları: 1922-1926*. İstanbul Üniversitesi.
- Moaddel, M., & Talattof, K. (Eds.). (2000). *Contemporary debates in Islam: an anthology of modernist and fundamentalist thought*. Place of publication not identified: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Moussalli, A. (2013). Hassan Al-Banna. In J. L. Esposito & E. E. Shahin (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Islam and politics*. Oxford, UK; New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Najjar, F. M. (1996). The Debate on Islam and Secularism in Egypt. *Arab Studies Quarterly*, 18(2), 1–21.
- Nasr, S. V. R. (1996). *Mawdudi and the making of Islamic revivalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Naim, Abdullahi A. (2008). *Islam and Secular State: Negotiating the Future of Shari’a*. Harvard University Press.
- Pankhurst, R. (2010). Muslim Contestations over Religion and the State in the Middle East. *Political Theology*, 11(6), 826–845. <https://doi.org/10.1558/poth.v11i6.826>
- Parlak, N. (2012). Sakife’deki Halife Adayları. *İstem*, 10(9), 121–136.
- Qaradawi, Y. al-. (1991). *Islamic Awakening: Between Rejection and Extremism* (2. Aufl). London: The International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Qaradawi, Y. (1998). *State in Islam*. Cairo: El-Falah.

- Radhan, L. (2014). *Muslims against the Islamic state: Arab Critics and Supporters of Ali Abdarrazizq's Islamic laicism*. New York ; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Rayyis, M. Z. (1995). *İslamda siyasi düşünce tarihi*. İstanbul: Nehir Yayınları.
- Reid, D. M. (2002). *Cairo University and the making of a modern Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenthal, E. I. (1996). *Ortaçağ'da İslam siyaset düşüncesi*. İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık.
- Rosenthal, E. I. J. (2009a). *Islam in the modern national state*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenthal, E. I. J. (2009b). *Political thought in medieval Islam: an introductory outline*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sagiv, D. (1995). *Fundamentalism and intellectuals in Egypt, 1973-1993*. London; Portland, Or: F. Cass.
- Şahin, H. (2013). İbn Teymiyye'nin Siyaset Anlayışı. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 6(3), 615–638.
- Sarıbıyık, M. (2013). İslam Siyaset Düşüncesinde Hilafet Kurumunun Aşıl原因 Sorunları Üzerine Bazı Mülahazalar / An Evaluation on Some Dissolved Matters Concerning to The Caliphate in Islamic Politic Thought. *Şarkiyat Mecmuası*, 0(23), 169–185.
- Sayyid-Marsot, A. L., & Sayyid-Marsot, A. L. (2007). *A history of Egypt: from the Arab conquest to the present* (2nd ed). Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tibi, B. (1997). *Arab nationalism: between Islam and the nation-state* (3rd ed). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Türcan, T. (2005). Hilafet Karşıtı Bir Ezher'li: Ali Abdurrazık (1883-1967). *İslam Hukuku Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (6), 409–426.
- Wegner, M. J. (2001). *Islamic government: the medieval Sunnī Islamic theory of the caliphate and the debate over the revival of the caliphate in Egypt, 1924-1926*. University of Chicago.
- White, J. T., & Siddiqui, N. (2013). Mawlana Mawdudi. In J. L. Esposito & E. E. Shahin (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Islam and politics*. Oxford, UK; New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Yıldırım, R. (2004). *20. Yüzyıl İslam Dünyasında Hilafet Tartışmaları*. Anka Yayınları.

Yücesoy, H. (2011). Justification of Political Authority in Medieval Sunni Thought. In A. Afsaruddin (Ed.), *Islam, the state, and political authority: medieval issues and modern concerns*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Zürcher, E. J. (2007). *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin tarihi: Turkey, a modern history*. İstanbul: İletişim.

İnāyat, Ḥamīd. (1991). *Modern Islamic political thought: the response of the Shī'ī and Sunnī Muslims to the twentieth century* (Reprinted). Houndmills: Macmillan Education.