

Hakimiyyah and *Jahiliyyah* in the Thought of Sayyid Qutb

SAYED KHATAB

The work of the Egyptian thinker and activist Qutb is dominated by the concept of *jahiliyyah*. In developing this theory, Qutb took as one of its bases the idea of *hakimiyyah*. An understanding of *hakimiyyah* is therefore important to the study of Qutb's thinking. This article examines from a religious and socio-political perspective the role of *hakimiyyah* as developed by Qutb.¹ The Arabic term *hakimiyyah* is a verbal noun derived from the Arabic root 'h.k.m', from which the substantive '*hukm*', the nomen agentis '*hakim*' (the singular of *hakimun*), and *hukkam* are derived. Ibn Durayd, in his *Jamharat al-Lughah*, has shown that 'the *hakim* is the one who exercises judicial authority; a ruler or governor ... and there is none but Allah is the Highest Governor, the Ruler and the Supreme legal authority'.² Edward W. Lane in his Arabic-English Lexicon says that 'the *hakim* is the one who exercises judicial authority, rule, domination, or government; a ruler, or governor. The *hakim* between people is so called because he restrains from wrongdoing. The plural is *hukkam* and *hakimun*'.³ Ibn Manzur defines *hukm* as follows: 'Allah is the Sovereign (*Ahkam*) of sovereigns (*hakimin*) and His Qur'an is the *hakim* for and among you'.⁴ This indicates that the word *hakim*, in classical Arabic, always signifies the highest governmental and legal authority. The verbal noun of the word *hukm* is *hakimiyyah*, which means, according to the Arabic-English Dictionary, 'governorship; rule; command; dominion, and authority'.⁵ According to the unanimous agreement (*ijma'*) of the Muslim community, the term refers to the highest political and legal authority and that authority belongs to none but God. With this definition, Qutb is in full agreement.⁶

Let us consider, in brief, the word *hukm* in the Qur'an; keeping in mind, however, that the Qur'anic terms have a connotation of their own. The Qur'an uses the word *hukm* and its derivations more than 250 times.⁷ The word group of *hukm*, according to Qutb, always expresses the concept that authority and command rest with Allah alone.⁸ In support of this, Qutb argues from the Qur'an and suffice it to refer to his *Zilal*, quoting a number

of verses: 'He governs all affairs from the heavens to the earth.'⁹ 'He to Whom belongs the domination of the heavens and the earth, no son has He begotten, nor has He a partner in His sovereignty.'¹⁰ 'The command rests with none but Allah.'¹¹ The Qur'an orders the prophet of Islam himself to declare that he is not above the law of God: 'Say "I am but a man like yourselves. It is revealed to me that your God is One God".'¹² 'We sent not an Apostle, But to be obeyed, in accordance with the Will of Allah.'¹³ In view of these Qur'anic assertions, the ultimate sovereignty (*hakimiyyah*) belongs solely to Allah. He is the Creator and Sustainer of the universe. He is the One in whom rests all authority, political or other.

The above mentioned Qur'anic verses suggest, at least, the notion of the political commandment of the term *hakimiyyah*. According to the English translation of the meaning of the Qur'an, which was carried out by the Supreme *Sunni* Council and the Supreme *Shi'i* Council of Lebanon and revised by Muhammad Zayid, the term *hakimiyyah* is the Sovereignty in which rests the highest legal and governmental authority.¹⁴ The two Supreme councils fully agreed that the term Sovereignty is the title of a whole Qur'anic chapter (67), which begins with this verse: 'Blessed be He in Whose hands all sovereignty. He has power over all things.' Similarly, the very title of the same chapter (67) was translated by the word 'Dominion'. This translation is in the *Mushaf al-Madinah al-Nabawiyah*, which was revised and edited by the Islamic researchers of Saudi Arabia.¹⁵ The very words of the translation and commentary, in this edition, are not different from Yusuf Ali's translation and commentary. Yusuf Ali translated the same title by the word Dominion. George Sale (1679–1736), translated the title of the Qur'anic chapter (67) by the English word Kingdom.¹⁶

The above translations of the Qur'an reveal that the synonym of the Arabic term *hakimiyyah* is the Arabic term *mulk*, while the synonym of the Arabic word *hakim* is the Arabic term *malik*. This means that the *hakim* (sovereign) is the *malik* (sovereign) and that the *hukm* (sovereignty) is the *mulk* (sovereignty). In the Qur'an, the terms *hukm* and *mulk* and their derivations are repeatedly mentioned. According to al-Layhani, Ibn Manzur, al-Layth, Ibn Amr, Ibn Kathir, Ibn Amir, Hamzah, Asim, al-Kasa'i, Ya'qub and others, the term *mulk* means sovereignty over everything.¹⁷ This is stated in the Qur'anic command (3: 26) 'Say: Lord, Sovereign (*malik*) of all sovereignty (*al-mulk*). You bestow sovereignty on whom You will, and take it away from whom You please; You exalt whomever You will and abase whomever You please. In your hand lies all that is good; You have power over all things.'¹⁸ This absolute sovereignty over the universe, over life and man, is the sovereignty which Qutb speaks about. The above injunctions make it clear that there is no one from amongst human beings, even the entire creation, who can rightly claim to possess the dominion

status of the sovereignty of *hakimiyyah* and 'any quarrel or wrangle about this point means nothing but an attempt to run away from the truth'.¹⁹

The significance of the term *hakimiyyah* rests in its political meaning, which is closely bound to the concept of *tawhid*, the corner stone of Islamic belief. To confess that divinity belongs to Allah is to acknowledge that *hakimiyyah*, in human life, belongs to none but Allah. This means that Allah is the only '*Hakim*' or Sovereign and He has the right to ordain the programme of human life; people must live according to the *shari'ah* ordained by Allah in the Qur'an and the *Sunnah*.²⁰ This implies the political connotation of the term *hakimiyyah*, the significance of which rests in the suggestion that Islam is both religion and state. This concept of *hakimiyyah* is the prism through which Qutb viewed the political systems of the world, dividing them into Islam and *jahiliyyah*. Qutb's argument is based on the integrated Islamic conception concerning the relationship between the Creator and the creation, the universe, life and man. Qutb then bound his argument to the concept of *tawhid* and supported his view with a considerable number of Qur'anic verses.

The argument used to oppose Qutb's view is, at the least, of two dimensions, each of which is the basis for further questions. The first rests on the claim that the term *hakimiyyah* is not a Qur'anic term; the second on the claim that the word *hukm*, mentioned in the Qur'an, has no political connotation. Thus, the two dimensions of the argument opposing Qutb's view aim principally to indicate that Islam is only a religion with no right to order human life. This means that Islam is simply not a state.

In the opinion of some intellectuals, the term *hakimiyyah* is not a Qur'anic term but is derived from the Arabic verb 'to govern' and 'to judge'.²¹ Despite the fact that the verb 'to govern' has political connotations and that the verb 'to judge' denotes the highest legal authority,²² they deny the political connotation of the word *hakimiyyah*. Similarly, the word *hukm*, as asserted by some intellectuals, does not have political connotations; for them the word *hakam*, as a noun, is used in Arabic for 'referee'.²³ Investigation of the dimension of their view reveals that their argument is largely based on some references that repeatedly appear as a common point of reference in the debate. There are some thinkers, for instance, who refer to Ali Abd al-Raziq's *al-Islam wa Usul al-Hukm*²⁴ and others who refer to al-Hudaybi's *Du'ah wa la Qudah*;²⁵ some others refer to both texts. According to Shepard, 'These two texts, until this day, are one of the major points of reference in the debate'.²⁶

An examination of this point of reference needs to be undertaken in order to remove any confusion related to Qutb's view. In relation to Ali Abd al-Raziq's *al-Islam wa Usul al-Hukm*, some intellectuals referred to this book and claimed that Islam is only a religion (*din*) and not a 'religion and

state' (*din wa dawlah*). In their reference to Ali Abd al-Raziq, the word group of *hukm*, which is repeatedly mentioned in the Qur'an, means only judgement and has no political connotation, so that the term *hakimiyyah* has no political meaning.²⁷ This claim, however, can be challenged in reference also to Ali Abd al-Raziq himself and Abd al-Aziz Fahmi, the Minister of Justice who dealt with the subsequent development related to Ali's book in 1925.²⁸

Ali Abd al-Raziq's text was published in 1925, a year after the collapse of the Islamic Caliphate in Turkey in 1924. According to the Egyptian Muhammad 'Umarah,²⁹ the book was written in opposition to King Fuad's claim to the Caliphate.³⁰ Consequently, under the instruction of King Fuad, the Supreme Council of al-Azhar banned the text and excluded Ali from the Council of *Ulama* on 12 August 1925.³¹ These political circumstances are familiar ground in the literature and there is no need for repetition.³² The question here is: does Ali Abd al-Raziq suggest in his book that Islam is only a religion, not a religion and state?

Abd al-Raziq's book, from its title *al-Islam wa Usul al-Hukm* (Islam and the Foundation of Government) indicates its content. The title expresses the existence of government in Islam. In other words, Islam is a religion and state and that its form of government is not confined to and not necessarily a caliphate, but can be any form able to facilitate the application of the *Shari'ah*. Abd al-Raziq (1888–1966) never confined Islam to ritual duties or claimed that 'Islam is only spiritual' as claimed by Kepel (1985),³³ Haddad (1983),³⁴ and Abukhalil (1994),³⁵ or Mortimer (1982).³⁶ On the contrary, Abd al-Raziq states that 'the foundations of the government in Islam is the application of *Shari'ah*, and ... [this] depends on only government of any type and form'.³⁷ In response to his critics, Ali Abd al-Raziq replied:

They say that in my book I have suggested that Islam is only spiritual and has nothing to do with the affairs of life. This view in fact has no trace in my book and it never was my opinion. What I do believe and what I have suggested in my book is that Islam is a legislative religion (*din tashri'i*), and the *Shari'ah* impacts on all spheres of life. They also say that I claim that the Caliphate is not and never was a valid Islamic system (*nizam shar'i*). However, what I am saying is that if the Muslims agreed that their government should be a Caliphate and viewed the Caliphate as the foremost system for their common welfare, then the Caliphate is a lawful Islamic government (*hukumah shar'iyyah*) and the people must be loyal to it. My view in the book and what I believe is that the application of the *Shari'ah* in all spheres of life depends on government of any form and of any type, limited or

unlimited, autocratic or republican, tyrannical or constitutional, consultative or democratic, socialistic or Bolshevik. Islam does not impose upon Muslims a particular type or form of government, but allows us to choose the form that is able to facilitate the application of the *Shari'ah*.³⁸

This means that the position of Ali Abd al-Raziq is that Islam is a religion and a state based on the political connotations of the term *hukm*, mentioned in the Qur'an. The position of Ali Abd al-Raziq is reflected by that of al-Hudaybi. Despite the circumstances that faced al-Hudaybi, his position was also that Islam is both religion and state.

Al-Hudaybi shares Abd al-Raziq's views. His book *Du'ah wa la Qudah* (Preachers, not Judges) was written at the time when al-Hudaybi and others of his fellow Muslim brothers were in detention in 1965. Al-Hudaybi and Qutb were arrested in 1965 after their Islamic group was uncovered by the Security Apparatus. Their Islamic group was based on Qutb's book *Ma'alim Fi al-Tariq* (Milestones) published in 1964.³⁹ Thus, the book *Du'ah wa la Qudah* was written 'against the background of Qutb's book "Milestones" and its theoretical tools which analysed the Nasserite State in terms of the concepts of Islam'.⁴⁰ The point that should be remembered in this case is that al-Hudaybi was not the author of the book, a fact which was only made public in 1995 by Brigadier General Fu'ad 'Allam, the official of the Security Apparatus of the State in the period 1962–71. 'Allam pointed out that al-Hudaybi's book was written by some members of al-Azhar in co-operation with members from the security forces of the Interior Ministry. Fu'ad 'Allam wrote his memoirs and published them periodically in the weekly Egyptian journal *Rose El-Youssef* under the title 'Memoirs of Brigadier General Fu'ad 'Allam'. Among his published memoirs was an article published in *Rose El-Youssef* under the title 'The most risky (*akhtar*) text of al-Hudaybi's works is written by the investigators of the security of state'.⁴¹ Under this title 'Allam outlined the background to the incident, as follows:

In the mid sixties, Abd al-Nasser decided to release all Muslim Brothers who were in jail at the time. However, the security Authorities (*sulutat amniyyah*) opposed the decision due to the security policy then in place. Around this time, we obtained information that the Brothers who were brought to jail in 1965 were of three groups, comprising followers of al-Banna, the followers of al-Hudaybi, and the followers of Sayyid Qutb. There was no disagreement among them; they were all agreed that contemporary society was in a condition of *jahiliyyah* that must be changed to establish an Islamic state. Exactly when an Islamic state should be established varied amongst the three groups ...

The followers of al-Hudaybi and al-Banna preferred to delay the establishment of an Islamic state, since delay was in the interest of survival of the organization. Their view was that they should save the life of their Brothers and not to provoke the authority at that particular time. Given these circumstances, we sought more information and found evidence of extreme Islamic thinking among the Brothers in jail. Investigations revealed sufficient evidence to result in 37 potential charges (*qadiyyah*). We moved quickly to face this type of thinking that was spreading from jail and gaining public support due to current socio-economic discontent in the wider society. Our plan, of course, was to match this type of thinking intelligently. We asked the *Ulama* and the men of al-Azhar for assistance. We intended to take advantage of the differences that we found among the extreme groups with regard to when it was best to establish an Islamic state. We also devised a successful plan for us to infiltrate the Islamic groups, secure our presence among them and persuade some of them to co-operate with us ...

The truth of this matter is that Hasan al-Hudaybi did not co-operate by an opinion, or by a *fatwa* (legal opinion) in this book. The book was not, in fact, written by al-Hudaybi at all. Actually, the book was written by select members at al-Azhar. We managed to get the prepared chapters into the jail and circulate them amongst the Muslim Brothers. We then closed our eyes to their meetings and discussions. We had arranged for Ma'mun, the son of al-Hudaybi, to pass him the chapters. He did this pretending that they were his own ... Among the Brothers who were in the prison and co-operated with us in circulating this book in jail were Abd al-Mut'al al-Jabri and Saad al-Din Mutwally Ibrahim.⁴² We then collected the chapters and facilitated the book's publication and rapid distribution ...

The book made a significant impact on the Brothers and encountered their extreme thinkers particularly inside the jail. Muhammad Qutb and some of his supporters separated themselves from the groups of extreme thinkers, although with Muhammad Qutb were Shukri Ahmad Mustafa,⁴³ Sayyid 'Id Yusuf, and Ali Abd al-Fattah Abduh Isma'il.⁴⁴ These three Brothers were, however, the first to spread the militant extremism after they were released ...⁴⁵

There has been no response to this revelation from either Ma'mun, the son of al-Hudaybi, or from al-Azhar, and there is no reason to reject this new information.⁴⁶ Al-Hudaybi, like others of his brothers, believed that Islam is a religion and state. He, like the others, described the society of their time as a 'society of *jahiliyyah* that should be changed and an Islamic state be

established'. This revelation means that there is no difference between the position of al-Hudaybi and the position of Ali Abd al-Raziq on the concept that Islam is a lawmaking religion. The positions of both Ali Abd al-Raziq and al-Hudaybi emphasize that the Qur'anic term *hukm* has political connotations. The quotations from the two texts found in the literature concerning Ali Abd al-Raziq and al-Hudaybi on this particular matter⁴⁷ are doubtful and should be studied carefully.

Qutb's concept of *hakimiyyah* appeared for the first time in his '*Adalah*', written in 1948 and published in 1949. A comparison between the concept of *hakimiyyah* presented in his '*Adalah*', and that presented in his *Zilal* and the last of his works *Ma'alim* (Milestones), suggests that there is no difference between them.⁴⁸ The logical implication of this is that the ideas related to the concept of *hakimiyyah* had been developed prior to 1948.⁴⁹ Suffice it to note that the period 1925–48 is the period in which Qutb emphasized, among other ideas, the integrated conception of Islam and pointed out the relationship between the Creator and the creation, the universe, life and humankind. This idea, which he called '*al-wahdah al-kubra*' (the great unity), was clearly emphasized in his poetry which was written between 1925 and 1934.⁵⁰ It is the basis of his concept of *hakimiyyah*, which appeared in '*Adalah*' and in all of Qutb's writing until his last work *Ma'alim*.⁵¹ The same idea is also part of the framework of his ideological position in 1939, when he emphasized the Islamic culture and Islamic identity of Egypt.⁵² The very idea of 'the great unity' is, undoubtedly, the prism through which he viewed the works such as those of Taha Husayn, Yahya Haqqi, Najib Mahfuz and others.⁵³ Of human life concerning belief and conceptions Qutb stated: 'Of course, with this sightless motion of human life, no one knows where he comes from, or why he came, and cannot see where he is going.'⁵⁴

Qutb derived his concept of *hakimiyyah* from the comprehensive Islamic conception of what he repeatedly called *al-wahdah al-kubra* (the great unity). To Qutb, all the teachings of Islam go back to this great principle from which all Islamic theories, laws, commandments, provisions for worship, social relations are derived. Islam has dealt with 'the relationship between the Creator and the creation, between the universe, life and man and between man and his self, as well as between the individual and the group, between the individual and the state, among human groups generally and between one generation and another. Islam relates this to an overall comprehensive conception whose outline can be seen in all Islamic spheres.'⁵⁵ This means that all-human conduct; political, economic, art, literature or other activities must fulfil the ordinances of the *hakimiyyah* as acts of worship. According to Qutb, in Islam, there is nothing in human conduct that may be separated from the concept of worship or that may not

be fulfilled as an act of worship. Islam is 'a system in which all spheres aimed firstly and finally to fulfil the meaning of worship; in the system of government, economic, criminal law, civil law, personal status law and all laws and codes aimed to fulfil the meaning of worship'.⁵⁶

Within the context of his comprehensive concept of the great unity (the relationship between the Creator and the creation; the universe, life and man), Qutb's explanation of the nature and the meaning of *hakimiyyah* maintains that the entire universe issued from the absolute will of God and is regulated by His law. Every part is in harmony with all parts, and everything is in an integrated unity. Every existing part has a reason for being that is related to this complete and absolute harmony.⁵⁷ The universe, Qutb explains, is regulated by one single law that binds all its parts in a harmonious and orderly sequence. This systematic arrangement is the creation of the will of the one *hakimiyyah*. The multiplicity of essences, or beings, leads to a multiplicity of wills and gives rise to different rules, decisions and judgements. The will is the manifest expression of a willing essence, and law is the manifest expression of the effective will. If this were not so, the unity which regulates the system of the whole universe and harmonizes its course, direction and behaviour, would disappear, and disorder would follow the disruption of the harmony. According to Qutb, even an extreme atheist cannot ignore this reality of the harmonious system.⁵⁸

Man, as part of this harmonious system, finds his place, role and life ordained by *hakimiyyah*. The law of *hakimiyyah* is 'constant and dealt with man's essence which is also constant'. Gradual alterations and developments in man's life in general, as Qutb asserts, cannot change man's nature into another being. Thus, humans must co-operate in accordance with the law of *hakimiyyah* and must take their place in the harmonious system. Therefore, the Creator does not leave humankind or living things without direct guidance and continual care, since His absolute will is in direct contact with the whole universe and with every individual being in it at the same time.⁵⁹

The Qur'an is a constant, like the universe itself. The universe, as Qutb asserts, is the visible book of God, while the Qur'an is His legible book. Both give signs and irrefutable proofs of their Creator, and both exist to function; the universe continues to carry out its role according to the law of God, and the Qur'an carries out its role towards humanity. The Qur'an is God's message to man, whose instinct has essentially remained the same, and whose 'essential nature does not change into another being', despite changes in circumstances, and despite man's role in socio-political development. Therefore, the Qur'an remains valid: the comprehensible message to humankind, functioning according to the ordained law of

hakimiyyah. Qutb concludes his argument with the statement: 'If it be despicable for one to say, for instance, that the sun is an ancient reactionary (*raja'i*) star and must be replaced by new developed star! Or to say, man is an ancient reactionary creature and should be exchanged for another progressive creature capable to develop the earth! If these and others are despicable, it would be more despicable to say the same sayings in respect of God's law conveyed in the Qur'an the final message of God to mankind.'⁶⁰

Qutb based the above argument on Qur'anic verses, among which are the following: 'God keeps the heavens and the earth from falling. Should they fall, none could hold them back but He.'⁶¹ 'There is not a creature on earth whose sustenance is not (provided) by God. He knows its resting-place and its repository.'⁶² 'We created man; and We know the prompting of his soul, and We are closer to him than [his] jugular vein.'⁶³ 'It was Allah who made for you the night to rest in and the day to (give you) light. Allah is bountiful to men.'⁶⁴ 'It is Allah who has given you the earth for a dwelling-place and the sky for a canopy. He has given you shape and made your shapes beautiful, and has provided for you sustenance.'⁶⁵ 'It is He who has made the earth manageable for you, so walk about its regions and eat of His provisions.'⁶⁶ 'Who is it that will defend you like an entire army, if not the Merciful? Who will provide for you if He withholds His sustenance?'⁶⁷

In the light of these Qur'anic statements, Qutb's argument concerning the nature and the meaning of *hakimiyyah* cannot be synonymous with what is known in practice as 'sovereignty'. The word 'sovereignty' is derived from the Vulgar Latin word '*superanus*' which means 'super-over, or supreme'. The definitions of the term are varied, but always signify human governmental and legal authority.⁶⁸ This means that the will of this particular authority is not constant and nor will its laws be. This in turn means that there is multiplicity of authority, multiplicity of will, and multiplicity of rules and judgements. Therefore, the nature and the meaning of this sovereignty is not as envisaged by the Qur'an.

Among the most familiar definitions given to the term sovereignty is the one given by J. Austin (1790–1859) in *The Province of Jurisprudence Determined*. Austin states that 'if a determinate human superior, not in the habit of obedience to a like superior, receive habitual obedience from the bulk of a given society, that determinate superior is sovereign in that society, and the society (including the superior) is a society political and independent'.⁶⁹ This definition also has no relevance to the nature and the meaning of the sovereignty which Islam envisages. In Islam, according to Qutb, *hakimiyyah* is the Sovereign of sovereignty. It is the characteristic of divinity whose rule is immediate, and whose commands as revealed to the prophet Muhammad embody the law and constitution of the nation of

Islam.⁷⁰ Qutb's argument refers to the Qur'anic arguments of such verses as: 'To whom belong the earth and what it contains?'⁷¹ 'Who is it in whose Hands is the sovereignty of all things ... Who protects all but is not protected of any [say] if you know.'⁷² 'Who is the Lord of the seven heavens, and the Lord of the Mighty Throne?'⁷³ 'Say: O Lord, Sovereign of all sovereignty. You bestow power on whom You will, and take it away from whom You please'.⁷⁴ In view of these verses, no sovereignty in Islam can come up to Austin's definition. The Qur'anic verses in the above injunctions suggest that the nature and the meaning of *hakimiyyah* are completely different from the concept of sovereignty known today. Therefore, translation of the term *hakimiyyah* from Arabic, for instance, to the English term 'sovereignty' is not safe without a proper definition concerning the nature and the basis of the term. This is also because *hakimiyyah* is a Qur'anic term with a connotation of its own based on the comprehensive conception of *Tawhid*.

In view of contemporary Islamic thought, Qutb's thought concerning *hakimiyyah*, although an innovation, looks back to a past⁷⁵ when Islam was, according to Qutb 'a religion in the conscience, ethical principles in behaviour and *shari'ah* in society'.⁷⁶ He means that Islam is a religion and a state '*din wa dawlah*'. To him, Islam in its very nature is a political religion;⁷⁷ the unity between religion and politics is a great principle in Islam, and the system of government is an important element in the Islamic creed. In his *Zilal*, for instance, he states that, 'this group of verses (5: 41–50) dealt with the most important and serious, or riskiest (*akhtar*) case (*qadiyya*) in Islamic creed. This is because this group of verses in its positive terms sharply defined the system of government in Islam. This case is the case of government, the *shari'ah* and legitimization'.⁷⁸

Qutb emphasizes *hakimiyyah* as a first pillar before the *shari'ah*. In his commentary upon the Qur'anic verse 6: 136, he states that, 'Islam established its existence not by battling social and moral corruption first. These battles came after the battle of *hakimiyyah*'.⁷⁹ Qutb means that social and moral corruption was corrected according to the Islamic laws after *hakimiyyah* became the only creed and was established in the conscience of the people. This implies that practising *shari'ah* is the natural outcome of implementing *hakimiyyah* as the only creed of a society and that abiding by Islamic law is the outcome of the belief that Allah is the only Sovereign or *Hakim*. The legal implication of this is that there is no Islamic life before the belief that Allah is the only Sovereign, even if the *shari'ah* is practically implemented.⁸⁰ His argument is that the *shari'ah* is ordained in the Qur'an by the *hakimiyyah* (the Sovereign Will). The belief in the oneness of the Sovereign Will is the first pillar of *shari'ah*: there is no *shari'ah* without the belief in the oneness of the Sovereign Will which, in turn, implies practical obedience and complete submission to that Will in all aspects of life.

Because the order or the *shari'ah* of the Sovereign Will is indivisible and there is no partition in the Islamic creed, *hakimiyyah* is, therefore, the crossroads between Islam and *jahiliyyah*.

Qutb based the concept of *hakimiyyah* on the confession of faith: 'There is no god but Allah'. According to Qutb, the one who confesses that divinity belongs to none but Allah: 'He thereby confesses that *hakimiyyah* in human life belongs to Allah alone. Allah exercises *hakimiyyah* in human life on one hand by directly controlling human affairs by His will (*mashi'ah*) and determination (*qadar*) and on the other hand by establishing the fundamental order of human life, human rights, duties, relationships and mutual obligations by His *shari'ah* and His *manhaj* (programme).'⁸¹ In Islam, Qutb continued, no body is associated with Allah, neither in His *mashi'ah* and *qadar* nor in His *shari'ah* and *manhaj*. This means that the theory of government in Islam is completely based on *tawhid*: 'Any other theory would be *shirk* (idolatry) and *kufr* (unbelief).'⁸² Thus, the concept of *hakimiyyah* distinguishes Islamic government from *jahili* government. After accepting the *hakimiyyah* of God, the government in Islam, according to Qutb, is then based on (i) justice on the part of the *hukkam* (rulers), (ii) obedience on the part of the *mahkumin* (ruled), and (iii) *shurah* (consultation) between rulers and ruled. These are, as Qutb asserts, 'broad basic lines from which spring all principles which lay out the shape, the form and the nature of government'.⁸³

From a practical prospective, *hakimiyyah* means that, in the Islamic state, God is the supreme legislator and the ultimate source of legal and political authority. This in turn reveals to us that the government in Islam is a limited form designed to implement the *shari'ah* and administer justice in accordance with the ordinance of *shari'ah*. There is no place in Islam for arbitrary rule by a single individual or a group. The basis of all decisions and actions in an Islamic polity should not be individual whim and caprice, but *shurah* (consultation) within the boundary of *shari'ah*. Imposing the *shari'ah* and facilitating its application requires a state; it must follow, then, that Islam is both religion and state.

The above statements of Qutb's position concerning *hakimiyyah* reveal that his opinion is in agreement with the consensus (*ijma'*) of the Muslim *ummah*. Therefore, it is appropriate to observe some of the Muslim opinions as a point of reference upon Qutb's assertion that Islam is a religion and a state, that Allah is its highest legal and governmental authority, and that its constitution rests in the Qur'an and the *Sunnah*.

Abd al-Aziz al-Maraghi,⁸⁴ a justice and a professor of Islamic legislation, and Rizq al-Zalabani,⁸⁵ also a professor of law and politics, were both at Al-Azhar University during Qutb's time. In 1947, both al-Maraghi and al-Zalabani termed the highest governmental and legal authority as

hakimiyyah, with al-Zalabani, for instance, stating that '*hakimiyyah* belongs to none but Allah. He is the Creator and He alone is the legislator. All affairs are in His hands ... Every person of the *ummah* must stand within the boundary of *shari'ah*.'⁸⁶ Similarly to Qutb, both al-Maraghi, and al-Zalabani base their argument on the same Qur'anic verses to which Qutb repeatedly refers. Among these verses, for instance, are the following: 'Those who do not judge in accordance with Allah's revelation, those indeed are the unbelievers.'⁸⁷ 'Those who do not judge in accordance with Allah's revelation, those indeed are the transgressors.'⁸⁸ 'Those who do not judge in accordance with Allah's revelation, those indeed are the evil-doers.'⁸⁹ 'Is it the *jahili* laws that they like to be judged by?''⁹⁰

Similarly, in 1952, Muhammad al-Nawawi of al-Azhar states: 'Yes, al-Islam is a state, and possesses a clear political theory. Muslims must know that the *hakimiyyah* belongs to none but Allah. His *shari'ah* is *dustur* (constitution) of the Islamic polity since the time of the Prophet. This is the opinion of the consensus (*ijma'*) of the Muslim *ummah*. Even those who referred to the role of human intellect (*'aql*) in this particular matter, confined their theory to the cases and affairs upon which the revelation does not offer specific regulation or necessary guidance.'⁹¹ Likewise, Ibn Kathir (d.774/1373), in his commentaries upon the Qur'anic verse 4: 59, points out that '*hakimiyyah* belongs to none but Allah, He alone is the Legislator and His *shari'ah* is the crossroads between Islam and *kufur* (unbelief)'.⁹² Al-Jassas (d.373/979) refers to the Qur'anic verse 4: 65 and states that 'the role of *shari'ah* is strongly bound with the Islamic '*aqidah* (creed) and there is no Islam without the rule of *shari'ah*'.⁹³ The contemporary scholar of al-Azhar, Muhammad al-Ghazali (b.1917), emphasized that 'Allah is the only Legislator and that the *ummah* (nation) must establish the government of *shurah*'.⁹⁴

According to al-Qurtubi (d.671/1272), 'there is no difference among the opinion of the Muslim *ummah* or among the Muslim scholars (*Imams*) on that Allah is the Legislator and that there must be a *khilafah* (state)'.⁹⁵ Similarly, al-Mawardi (d.450/1057) asserts that '*al-Imamah* is prescribed to succeed to the prophethood as a mean of protecting the religion and managing the affairs of this world. There is a consensus of opinion that the person who discharges the responsibilities of this position (leadership) must take on the contract of *Imamate* of the *ummah*'.⁹⁶ Likewise, Ibn Hajar al-Haythami (d.974/1566) points out the importance of the Islamic state saying, 'You must know that the companions of the prophet agreed that the Islamic state of the prophet must continue and they elected their *khalifah* (leader) before the burial of the prophet'.⁹⁷ Similarly, al-Juwayni (d.478/1102) maintains that 'Muslims must have a leader to lead their state and that is the consensus of the opinion of the *ummah* and *Imams*'.⁹⁸ In the

words of Ibn Khaldun (d.808/1405) '*khilafah* is obligatory and that is known by the consensus of the opinion of the companions of the prophet'.⁹⁹

The contemporary scholar of al-Azhar, Muhammad 'Umarah (b.1931), in his *Dirasat wa Watha'iq*, emphasises that *hakimiyyah* is for none save Allah, saying: 'Islam is a state and Allah is its highest legal and governmental authority and its constitution is the Qur'an and the *sunnah*.' Similarly to Qutb, 'Umarah supports his argument with considerable number of Qur'anic verses and *hadith*'.¹⁰⁰ Muhammad al-Khidr Husayn Sheikh al-Azhar in 1953¹⁰¹ adds that 'separating religion from state is an act of destruction to the truth of the religion. This attempt is a kind of act that the Muslim cannot do and remain a Muslim'.¹⁰² Similarly, Mustafa Sabri, Sheikh al-Islam in the Ottoman State (1918), points out that separating Islam from politics is more than a conspiracy against Islam. According to him 'separating Islam from state, in Muslim countries, is '*bid'ah*' or heresy brought about by those moderns who imitate the foreigners and that is but an act of rebellion against Islam. This kind of attempt is a revolution from the government against the creed of the people, and is a deviant act because the right is the revolution from the people against the government to impose the law of Islam. Nevertheless, if this occurred against Islam firstly from the government and secondly from the people, there is nothing but *kufr* (non-belief)'.¹⁰³

Khalid Muhammad Khalid (b.1919), al-Azhar scholar of philosophy, culture, Islam, and education and who is widely considered part of the left wing of Islam stated that 'Islam has a legal and governmental duty, which is to order human life and organize their affairs through its Islamic state which must be established and must remain as long as there is Islam in this world. The constitution of this state is but the Qur'an and the *sunnah* of the prophet and the consensus of the *ummah*'.¹⁰⁴ Similarly, Shaykh Muhammad al-Bahayy, professor at the University of Montreal in the 1950s and then Minister of Islamic Endowments in Egypt in 1960 and who reformed al-Azhar in 1961, comments on the Qur'anic verse which says 'O prophet! Strive (*jahid*) hard against the unbelievers and the hypocrites and be harsh on them ... (66: 9). Concerning this verse, al-Bahayy notes that 'this verse which pointed out the command of Allah to his prophet means that Islam, as a creed, does not restrict to the conscience! Or to the efforts of conveying (*da'wah*) the message but also an organized force that protecting the establishment of the creed in the time of the revelation or after, this means that, Islam is religion and state.'¹⁰⁵

Muhammad Abduh (d.1905) himself stated that 'Islam is a religion of domination (*siyadah*), of authority (*sultan*), and of unity between this world and the Hereafter. Islam is a spiritual, social, economic, political, civilian and military system. Its military force is to protect the application of

Shari'ah, the general guidance, the freedom of the *ummah*, and not to force others to embrace Islam.¹⁰⁶ The president of the academy of jurisprudence (*fiqh*) in Makkah, Sheikh Bakr Abu Zayd, in his *Hukm al-Intima'*, explains that 'Islam in its very nature is an organized state, therefore, you cannot separate Islam from politics, and that is the basic principle of *da'wa* (call for Islam).'¹⁰⁷ Similarly, Gad El Haq Ali Gad El Haq, Sheikh al-Azhar (d.1996), states that 'separating Islam from the motion (*harakah*) of society is, undoubtedly, wrong doctrine and wrong thought; it is, materialistic thought differs not from Western civilization. What is there, in Western civilization of separating religion from the system of human life, is a matter that has its circumstances in the past when the Churchmen authorized their own overpower (*tasallut*) upon the rule (*al-hukm*) and the rulers (*al-hukkam*). The result of that is this social and political miseries (*ma'asi*) which are known to all of us. The motion of the Muslims, since the history of Islam, has nothing of this misery'.¹⁰⁸ According to the *Gamal Abd al-Nasser Encyclopaedia of Islamic Jurisprudence* (1961), 'There is no *hakim* (sovereign) but Allah; there is no rule but the rule of Allah, and there is no *Shari'ah* (law) but the *Shari'ah* of Allah. This is the consensus of Muslims'.¹⁰⁹

These opinions represent a wide spectrum of Islamic left and right thought whether medieval or modern, fundamentalist, conservative, or modernist. In view of the above injunctions, Qutb's concept of *hakimiyyah*, as one of the characteristics that distinguish between the Islamic system of government and the systems of *jahiliyyah*, is in agreement with the consensus (*ijma'*) of the Muslim *ummah*. Qutb's concept of *hakimiyyah* reveals, at least, these points: (i) the system of government in Islam is unlike any other systems; (ii) Islamic government is constitutional; (iii) Islamic government is not theocratic and; (iv) Islamic *shari'ah* or law is constant or unchangeable despite changes in leadership. Taking the first point it may be observed that, in contrast to Qutb's description of the Islamic system as based on Allah alone as the Legislator, other systems rest on the principle that *hakimiyyah* (absolute sovereignty) belongs to man and he legislates for himself. This means that the basis of the Islamic system of government is completely different from the basis of human made systems. The legal implication of this is that the 'Islamic system cannot really coincide with any other systems, and cannot be called any thing but "Islam"'.¹¹⁰

The Islamic political system can be explained also as rule through *shurah* (consultation). *Shurah* is a fundamental principle of *shari'ah*, and essential to the various organs and to the identity of the Islamic state.¹¹¹ Consultation, according to Qutb, is mandatory by virtue of its being the subject of a Qur'anic command (42: 38 and 3: 159), as are 'obligatory prayers and *zakah*' (legal tax).¹¹² Qutb does not insist on a particular form of

shurah, emphasizing that there is no specific form or procedure of *shurah* prescribed either in the Qur'an or *Sunnah*. Despite this, Qutb notes that, at the time of the Prophet and of his companions, various methods and procedures of *shurah* were preserved, although these need not be taken as the only ones; the 'Muslim community must devise its own methods to facilitate *shurah* (consultation) according to the environment, social circumstances, and requirements'.¹¹³ This means in practice that the leader or the chief executive of the state must be elected, but it is also up to the community to choose the successful means of facilitating the principle of *shurah*.¹¹⁴ Similarly, *shurah* is applied to all cases and affairs on which the revelation does not offer a specific method or the necessary guidance.¹¹⁵ In this regard, Qutb emphasized the flexibility of Shari'ah on the procedures of *shurah*: Will *shurah* be truly implemented through general vote – if so, is the vote will be in all affairs; politics, defence and others, or only in some affairs? Is *shurah* will be complete by general vote of only those influential figures (*Ahl al-Hall and al-'Aqd*), or by the vote of the representatives of the unions, the universities and other groups in the society? Which form of vote – vocally or in writing? Which authority that should be responsible to carry out the *shurah* correctly. Is it the responsibility of the Cabinet and the elected Chief Executive of the state? Is it the responsibility of the Judiciary Authority, or the People's Assembly? Will *shurah* be complete through the vote of only one national Council [Lower House], or there should be two national Councils? All these means were not prescribed in the authoritative texts of Islam. The procedures and the spheres of *shurah* were reserved to the circumstances of each nation (*ummah*), its time and place, and to the human experiences and human achievement in the field of consultation.'¹¹⁶ This implies that the form of government could be altered from time to time without any change in its Islamic identity in respect of this particular principle of *shurah*. Islam, as Qutb asserts, does not offer a specific form of government, for the logic of this religion's suitability for all times and places requires that matters that will change according to different circumstances arising in each age should be left to human reason, to be shaped according to the public interest and within the framework of the general principles of the *shari'ah*.¹¹⁷

In view of this context, the system of *shurah* is not synonymous with what is known today as parliamentary government of any type or form of democracy or other system. The system of *shurah* is an act of worship, divinely inspired, and based on the principle that *hakimiyyah* (the absolute sovereignty) belongs only to God. Secular democracy, however, is based on the principle that the absolute sovereignty is for the people. In this secular form, a group of people, the legislators, legislate for another group, the people, and overall the state enjoys the right of absolute authority.¹¹⁸ This

means that the secular government has the power to enforce the desires of a particular group. Secular democracy or the party rule is, as Qutb asserts, usurpation of God's rights of *hakimiyyah* on earth. Submission to individuals or groups, or even to an entire society means, to Qutb, violation of and opposition to the divine law, and a reversion to the days of *jahiliyyah*.¹¹⁹ This kind of submission is directly opposed to *tawhid*, upon which Islamic system is based.¹²⁰

In the system of *shurah*, as Qutb asserts, 'all people, the ruler and the ruled', are bound to keep within the boundary of the *shari'ah* of God, the only legislator. The Islamic *shari'ah* is the 'founder of the Islamic community', not the community the founder of the *shari'ah*. The Islamic community then, in the shade of the *shari'ah*, has developed in all spheres, political, economic, social, moral, and 'in all other characteristics which signifies the shape and identity of their society'. The *shari'ah* did not come to exist through the evolution of Islamic society; it has existed in its complete and constant form since it was divinely revealed. Therefore, the system of government in Islam cannot really coexist with any other systems in general.¹²¹

With regard to the second point, which is that the government in Islam is constitutional. Qutb sees governmental activity as restricted within the limits of *shari'ah* ordained by the *hakimiyyah*. This means that the government can act only within the framework of these limitations. This principle, as Qutb asserts, is a Qur'anic order expressed in clear words and in positive terms of law such as 'do this and do not do that'. In his *Zilal*,¹²² for instance, Qutb shows that the Prophet himself was not empowered to exceed or overstep these limitations. Qutb based his argument on the Qur'an, for example on these verses: 'These are the limits ordained by Allah; so do not transgress them. Those that transgress the limits ordained by Allah, those indeed are the unjust.'¹²³ 'O you who believe, obey Allah and obey His Apostle and those from among yourselves who hold authority. Then if there is any dispute between you concerning any matter, refer it to Allah and His Apostle if you truly believe in Allah and the Last Day. This is the better course [in itself] and most just [regarding the result].'¹²⁴

Qutb's view, in the light of the above Qur'anic injunctions, suggests that the government in Islam is limited to the regulations laid down in the Qur'an and the *Sunnah*: the primary and secondary sources of *shari'ah* respectively. The legal implication of this is that the government in Islam is bound by a constitution that is divinely inspired and that the Muslim community agreed upon. Islamic government is not, therefore, a kind of absolute government, nor it is an autocracy or an authoritarian form of government; it is a government limited to a constitution. According to al-Zalabani, 'Limitation of the governmental power in regulating the affairs of

the people is a great principle for constitutional rule. The basis for explaining the methods and the means of these limitations is called constitutional polity.¹²⁵ This means that the Qur'an and the *Sunnah* are the constitution, and the method which facilitates the application of the constitution is constitutional polity.

Loyalty or obedience to the government, in Islam, is equated with obedience to the constitution, namely the Qur'an and the *Sunnah*. Qutb articulates this argument in clear terms saying: 'Every government that is based on the principle that *hakimiyyah* (absolute sovereignty) belongs to none but Allah and then implements the *shari'ah* is Islamic government. Every government that is not based on the principle that *hakimiyyah* belongs to Allah and does not implement the *shari'ah*, is not recognized by Islam, even if the government is run by an official religious organization. The obedience of the people is to be given only if and as long as the government recognizes that *hakimiyyah* belongs to Allah alone and then implements the *shari'ah* without any other condition than justice and obedience.'¹²⁶

The limitation of Islamic government to the *shari'ah* does not mean that such a government is, or ever has been, theocratic. This is because, according to Qutb, the chief executive¹²⁷ of the Islamic state receives no religious authority directly from heaven, as was the case with some rulers in ancient times. In Islam the Chief Executive cannot assume his position except by the free choice of the Muslims.¹²⁸ The Muslims as Qutb asserts, are not bound by any choice made by a former chief executive or predecessor, nor is the position inherited within a family. The authority of the chief executive is derived from his undertaking to implement the *shari'ah*, without claiming any personal authority to initiate legislation. This characteristic of the executive of the Islamic state is one of the characteristics which distinguishes the Islamic State of *hakimiyyah* from any state of *jahiliyyah*, including what is known as theocracy. The Chief Executive, as Qutb asserts, can only rule so long as he applies the *shari'ah* and recognises that the *hakimiyyah* belongs solely to Allah.¹²⁹

This point reveals two concepts that have received minimal or no attention to date. For Qutb, there is a difference between (i) the source of authority and (ii) administration of authority. These two points, individually or collectively, also differentiate between Islamic government and the government of *jahiliyyah*. To Qutb, the source of governmental authority in the Islamic state is not the Muslim community or the result of an election, but the enforcement of the *shari'ah* (law). In other words, enforcing the law is the source from which the government derives its authority. This means that, in Islam, if the Muslims do not accept the chief executive he has no authority, and if they do endorse him, and he then abandons the *shari'ah*, no obedience is due to him.¹³⁰ According to Qutb, those who do not enforce the

shari'ah are called in Islam *taghut*, or transgressors, and Muslims are commanded to strive against them.¹³¹ This reveals that Islamic government does not mean that the rulers should be a religious or military organization. Islam does not recognize any 'official religious body', such as the clergy of the Christian Church.¹³² Islamic government, as explained by Qutb, is not something carried out by a particular official body.¹³³

In view of this, the concept of *hakimiyyah* distinguishes between the Islamic system of government and any other systems before or since Islam.¹³⁴ Qutb puts this directly: 'It may happen in the development of human systems that they coincide with Islam sometimes and diverge from it sometimes. Islam, however, is a complete and independent system and has no connection with these system, neither when they coincide with it nor when they diverge from it for such divergence and coincidence are purely accidental and in scattered parts. Similarity or dissimilarity in partial and accidental matters is also of no consequences. What matters is the basic view, the particular conception from which the parts branch out. These parts may coincide with or diverge from the parts of other systems but after each coinciding or divergence Islam continues on its own unique path.'¹³⁵ Therefore, efforts that seek out similarities or dissimilarities are, according to Qutb, a sign of a 'defeatist attitude'. Those who interpret the Islamic system of government as 'imperial', or who present the Islamic system under any other label, such as Capitalism, Socialism, or Democracy, display a *jahili* attitude.¹³⁶

The question now arises as to the concept of *hakimiyyah* meant by *shari'ah*. This issue is of great importance, as confusion between *shari'ah* and *fiqh* (jurisprudence) means confusion between the will of *hakimiyyah* and the opinions and judgements of humans, a point that Qutb repeatedly underlines. According to Qutb, the limitation of Islamic government to *shari'ah* essentially militates against the possibility of human dictatorship, despotism, autocracy, monarchy and similar labels.¹³⁷ In an Islamic system, family structure and individual rights of all members of the state are integral to *shari'ah* and constitute a comprehensive defence mechanism against oppression.¹³⁸ This means that *shari'ah* functions as a 'protective shield in defense of the rights and liberties of the citizen against arbitrary power'.¹³⁹

By its nature, Islamic *shari'ah*, according to Qutb, is distinct from *fiqh* (jurisprudence). The *shari'ah* and *fiqh* 'are not equal in their source and argument'. The *shari'ah*, as Qutb asserts, comprises the clear cut commands and prohibitions which are conveyed through the Qur'an and explained in the *Sunnah* of the Prophet.¹⁴⁰ This, however, is not the case for *fiqh*. Muslim jurists, Qutb continues, have, after deep and conscientious study of the Qur'an and the *sunnah*, enunciated important legal principles with regard to many problems. Those jurists intended to 'facilitate the application of

shari'ah principles to specific problems faced them during their time'. Their findings were 'influenced by their personal approach to the legal source of *shari'ah*; the Qur'an and *sunnah*, as well as by the social environment of their time'.¹⁴¹ With time, these rulings in *fiqh* have acquired in the public mind a kind of divine authority similar to that of *shari'ah*, and have come to be regarded as a part of the divine *shari'ah* itself. As Qutb asserts, *fiqh* is different from *shari'ah*, and 'cannot be a divine part of the *shari'ah* laid down by the Qur'an and the *sunnah*. Other than the two sources, namely the Qur'an and the *Sunnah*, is *fiqh*.'¹⁴²

The two major branches of *fiqh*, that concerning '*ibadat* (worship), and that concerning *mu'amalat* (dealings) have, according to Qutb, 'firm and intimate interrelationships among their Islamic nature'. The branch of '*ibadat*, however, is concerned with Islamic rites which 'cannot be affected by the requirements of any time or any generation'. For this reason the branch of '*ibadat* is more 'constant' than that of *mu'amalat*, which deals with 'issues the like of which are subjected to the change in accordance with human requirements and social conditions'.¹⁴³ What is irrefutable, according to Qutb, is also that figures such as Abu Bakr, Umar, Ali, Ibn Abbas, Ibn Umar and others of the companions of the Prophet, were masters of *shari'ah*. After the Prophet, they were strongly grounded in the knowledge of the practical enunciation of accurate legal principles from *shari'ah*. They were facilitating the application of *shari'ah* to specific questions arising from the change of social conditions of their time. Social circumstances, according to Qutb, are unrepeatable in history, only their similarity may be repeated. Therefore, copying a judgement or legal rulings of the past is not of the order of *hakimiyyah* and not of the way of the Prophet.

This does not mean *fiqh* or its sciences should be disregarded. *Fiqh* stimulates research in this field, as an Islamic source whose past legal rulings and decisions are useful guidance for the present generation to enunciate accurate legal principles from *shari'ah* in similar cases.¹⁴⁴ Qutb emphasizes *fiqh* as no more than a human opinion concerning the *shari'ah* of *hakimiyyah*, not a part of the constant *shari'ah*, which cannot be made dependent on scholarly deductions or inferences of a subjective nature. This must be considered as laying down in its entirety the definite ordinances of the Qur'an and the *Sunnah*. These ordinances are known among Muslims as *nusus* (singular *nass*). They are the explicit directives of the Qur'an and the *Sunnah*, and these alone collectively constitute the primary and the constant law of the *shari'ah*.¹⁴⁵ According to Qutb, Muslims have a choice of only one system; the system of the *shari'ah* of *hakimiyyah* and any system based on or ruled by other than the law of *hakimiyyah* is a *jahili* system.¹⁴⁶

Qutb's distinction between *shari'ah* and *fiqh*, based on *hakimiyyah*, puts an end to the confusion and to the slogans designed by the secularists to

separate religion from worldly affairs. According to Qutb, such people call themselves Muslims but confuse *shari'ah* and *fiqh* 'in a ridiculous way' so as to mean the Islamic rule includes the implementation of *fiqh*. They then claim that the legal rulings of *fiqh* are influenced by the personal and social circumstances of the past, so that Islamic rule is inconsistent with modern society.¹⁴⁷

The significance of the concept of *hakimiyyah* in relation to the concept of *jahiliyyah* is based on two fundamental ideas upon which the Islamic system, in general and in detail, is based. These two ideas are derived from the comprehensive and integrated Islamic concept concerning the nature of the relationship between the Creator, the creation, the universe, life and humankind. The first idea is the unity of humanity in race, nature and origin. The second is the general world order accepted by God. God does not accept any system other than Islam, because He accepts no other religion than Islam. Islam, in Islamic understanding, is the general system that governs life. The particularities of these two fundamental ideas apply to all spheres of the Islamic system.¹⁴⁸

The legal implication of the two ideas, then, is the testimony that there is no God but God. The one who confesses that divinity (*'uluhiyyah*) belongs to God alone, and thus confesses that *hakimiyyah* (sovereignty) in human life belongs to God alone. God exercises sovereignty in human life on one hand by directly controlling human affairs by His will (*mashi'ah*) and determination (*qadar*), and on the other hand by establishing basic order in human life, and in human right, duties, relationships and mutual obligations via His *shari'ah* and His programme (*manhaj*).¹⁴⁹ This testimony means that in the Islamic system there is no association other than with God, neither in His will (*mashi'ah*), and His determination (*qadar*), nor in His *shari'ah*, and programme (*manhaj*). Any other theory is *jahiliyyah*.¹⁵⁰ Based on these fundamentals, it is not possible for human beings to create, on their own authority, systems with *shari'ah*, laws and ordinances, for to do this is to reject the divinity of God and at the same time claim the characteristics of divinity for themselves, and this is clearly unbelief (*kufr*).¹⁵¹ Having accepted the sole divinity and sovereignty of God, the government in Islam, then, is based on justice on the part of the rulers, obedience on the part of the ruled, and consultation between the rulers and the ruled.¹⁵²

The significance of the concept of *hakimiyyah*, in relation to the concept of *jahiliyyah*, is articulated by Qutb, who explains the nature of *jahiliyyah* as follows: 'The *jahiliyyah* is a condition and not a period in time. The

jahiliyyah today has spread all over the world, in every corner on the face of the earth – in all systems and thought (*fikr*), in all human ideologies and convictions. It is primarily based on the foundation of the ‘*hakimiyyah* of the people by the people’ (*hakimiyyat al-‘ibad li al-‘ibad*), and rejection of the sole and absolute *hakimiyyah* of Allah over people. It is based on the foundation that human desires of all types and forms are the sole governing god (*al-ilah al-mutahakkim*), rejecting the *shari‘ah* of Allah as *al-qanun al-muhkam* (compact, coherent and exact law). Although the *jahiliyyah* differs in its types and form, its flags and symbols, its names and descriptions, its allies and adherents, its systems and ideologies, all, however, returns back to its distinctive foundation that defined its nature and essence.’¹⁵³

The study suggests the following points:

- (1) Etymologically, the term *hakimiyyah* is a verbal noun derived from the Qur’anic term *hukm*.
- (2) Lexical and religious meanings of the term *hakimiyyah* signify the highest legal and governmental authority, clearly defined in several places in the Qur’an, for example 67: 1.
- (3) Translating the term *hakimiyyah* by the political term sovereignty as used in practice without further definitions is not appropriate.
- (4) Qutb’s concept of *hakimiyyah* suggests that Islam is a religion and a state.
- (5) The government in Islam is not theocratic or autocratic and not similar to any other form but it is government by *Shura* (constitution).
- (6) Government in Islam is constitutional and limited to a constitution that is divinely inspired and that the Muslim community has agreed upon.
- (7) In an Islamic system of government, there is a difference between the source of authority, and administration of that authority.
- (8) The source of governmental authority, in the Islamic state, is not a political party or all political parties, nor the Muslim community; authority derives from the activity of facilitating the application of the *Shari‘ah*.
- (9) The concept of *hakimiyyah* implies that there is a difference between the concept of *Shari‘ah* and that of *fiqh* (jurisprudence).
- (10) Practising *Shari‘ah* is the natural outcome of belief in *hakimiyyah*. There is no Islamic life prior to believing that Allah is the only *hakim* (sovereign).

NOTES

1. Among the fundamental concepts utilized by Qutb in developing his theory of *jahiliyyah* appears to be *hakimiyyah*, *'ubudiyyah*, and universality of Islam. The socio-political and religious implications of these concepts are interrelated, interdependent and have one thing in common. These basic principles, politically and religiously, define the concept of *jahiliyyah* as to mean neither a particular period in time before or after the advent of Islam nor a particular place or society. *Jahiliyyah* is a condition of any place or society where Allah is not held to be the ultimate Sovereign '*Hakim*'.
2. Ibn Durayd, Abi Bakr Muhammad, *Kitab Jamharat al-Lughah* (Beirut: Dar al-'Ilm Li al-Malayin, 1978), Vol.1, p.456; Ibn Manzur, *Lisan al-'Arab* (Beirut: Dar Sadir, 1994), Vol.12, pp.141-5; Ahmad Rida, *Mu'jam Matn al-Lughah* (1958), Vol.2, pp.139-40; Abdullah al-Bustani, *Al-Bustan* (Beirut: Matba'ah Amrikiyyah, 1927), Vol.1, pp.559-60.
3. Edward W. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon* (1955), Vol.1, Part 2, p.618.
4. Ibn Manzur, *Lisan*, pp.140-45.
5. Rohi Baalbaki, *Al-Mawrid: Arabic-English Dictionary* (Beirut: Dar al-'Ilm Li al-Malayin, 1996), p.447.
6. Abd al-Aziz Al-Maraghi, 'Al-Tashri' al-Islami fi 'Asr al-Khulafa' al-Rashidin', *Al-Azhar Magazine*, Vol.18, No.7 (1947), pp.27-31, 410-15; Rizq Al-Zalabani, 'Al-Siyasah al-Dusturiyyah al-Shar'iyyah', *Al-Azhar Magazine*, Vol.18, No.7 (1947), pp.130-36, 251-5; Majid Khadduri, *The Islamic Conception of Justice* (London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), pp.18-19; Qutb, *Fi Zilal al-Qur'an* (Cairo: Dar al-Shuruq, 1992), Vol.1, p.210.
7. Muhammad Abd al-Baqi, *Al-Mu'jam al-Mufahras li-Alfaz al-Qur'an al-Karim* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, 1992), pp.269-73.
8. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.3, p.1194.
9. Qur'an, 32: 5; *Zilal*, Vol.5, p.2807.
10. Qur'an, 25: 2; *Zilal*, Vol.5, p.2548.
11. Qur'an, 6: 57; *Zilal*, Vol.2, p.1110.
12. Qur'an, 18: 110; *Zilal*, Vol.4, p.2297, also see Qur'an, 18: 57; *Zilal*, Vol.2, p.1111.
13. Qur'an, 4: 64; *Zilal*, Vol.2, pp.695-6; see pp.688, 690.
14. Muhammad Zayid is a professor at the American University of Beirut and he is the one who revised the Penguin Classics translation by N.J. Dawood. Umar Farrukh is Professor of Islamic philosophy at the Islamic Maqasid schools and member of the Islamic Research Association of Bombay. Zayid and Farrukh, with others, translated the meaning of the Qur'an and the first edition was published in 1980 with permission from the Supreme Sunni Council and the Supreme Shi'i Council of Lebanon, see pp.3-9 and surah (67: 1), p.423.
15. Qur'an, *Mushaf al-Madinah al-Nabawiyah*, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (1410 AH) No.10278.
16. George Sale, *The Qur'an* (London: Thomas Tegg, 1992), see especially the translation of the title of *Surah*, 67.
17. Ibn Manzur, *Lisan*, Vol.10, pp.491-7.
18. Qur'an, 3: 26.
19. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.2, p.898.
20. Qutb, *Al-Adala al-Ijtima'iyya fi al-Islam* (Cairo: Dar al-Shuruq, 1993), p.75.
21. Yvonne Haddad, 'Sayyid Qutb: Ideologue of Islamic Revival', in John Esposito (ed.), *Voices of Resurgent Islam* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), pp.67-98; Gilles Kepel, *Muslim Extremism in Egypt* (California: University of California Press, 1986), p.47.
22. Muhammad 'Umarah, *Al-Islam wa Usul al-Hukm li Ali Abd al-Raziq* (Beirut: al-Mu'assasah al-'Arabiyyah, 2nd Edn. 1988), pp.75-6.
23. As'ad Abukhalil, 'The Incoherence of Islamic Fundamentalism: Arab Islamic Thought at the End of the Twentieth Century', *Middle East Journal*, Vol.48, No.4 (Autumn 1994), pp.677-94.
24. Ibid.
25. Gilles Kepel, *Muslim Extremism*, p.62.
26. William E. Shepard, 'Muhammad Sa'id al-Ashmawi and the Application of the Shari'ah in Egypt', *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.28, p.39; Nazih Ayubi, *Political*

- Islam: Religion and Politics in the Arab World* (London: Routledge, 1991), pp.54, 65, 130.
27. Gilles Kepel, *Muslim Extremism*, p.62; Yvonne Haddad, Sayyid.
 28. See Abd al-'Aziz Fahmi, *Hadhihi Hayaty* [This is My Life] (Cairo: Dar al-Hilal, 1963), pp.153–8. Fahmi was born in 1870. He graduated in law in 1890, two years before his friend Lutfi al-Sayyid (1872–1963). Fahmi entered government service. He read European authors widely. He dabbled in politics as founder of the Constitutionalist Party. He was one of the delegation led by Sa'ad Zaghlul (d.1927) at the European conference in 1918 seeking Egyptian independence. He drafted the Egyptian Constitution of 1923. He was the Minister of Justice who dealt with the issue of Ali Abd al-Raziq in 1925 and later wrote about it in his *This is My Life*.
 29. Muhammad 'Umarah was born in 1931 in Egypt, educated at al-Azhar, obtained a Ph.D. at Dar al-'Ulum in 1975. He is currently Professor of Islam and the philosophy of governance at Cairo Universities and occasionally at Universities in Arab countries. His interests in this field can be seen in his works. He has published 16 books in addition to commentaries on medieval and contemporary works including all the works of al-Rafi'i (d.1966), al-Tahtawi (d.1873), al-Afghani (d.1897), Abduh (d.1905), al-Kawakibi (d.1902), Ali Mubarak (d.1893) and Qasim Amin (d.1908). He has received several awards including the First Class of Literature Prize in Egypt.
 30. 'Umarah, *Al-Islam wa Usul Al-Hukm li-Ali Abd al-Raziq* (Beirut: al-Mu'assasah al-Arabiyyah, 1988), pp.8–16.
 31. Muhammad Salah al-Sawi, *Al-Muwajahah* (Cairo: al-Afaq al-Dawliyyah, 1992), pp.32, 39.
 32. For further details see Fahmi, *Hadhihi Hayaty* [This is My Life], pp.153–8.
 33. Gilles Kepel, *Muslim Extremism*, p.62.
 34. Yvonne Haddad, 'Sayyid Qutb: Ideologue', in John Esposito (ed.), *Voice of Resurgent Islam*, pp.67–98.
 35. As'ad Abukhalil, 'Incoherence of Islamic Fundamentalism'.
 36. Edward Mortimer, *Faith and Power: The Politics of Islam* (London: Faber and Faber, 1982), p.245.
 37. 'Ali Abd al-Raziq, 'Islam wa 'Usul al-Hukm', *Al-Siasah*, No.882, 2 Sept. (1925), pp.8–21.
 38. Muhammad 'Umarah, *Al-Islam wa 'Usul Al-Hukm li-Ali Abd al-Raziq*, pp.71–2; Ali Abd al-Raziq, see also his book *Islam wa 'Usul al-Hukm*, pp.35, 36, 84, 103.
 39. Gilles Kepel, *Muslim Extremism*, p.47.
 40. Fu'ad Allam, 'Akhtar Kutub Hasan al-Hudaybi min Ta'lif Mabath al-Dawlah', *Rose el-Youssef*, No.3507, 28 Aug. 1995, p.58.
 41. Ibid., pp.56–9.
 42. Currently, Professor of Anthropology and Sociology and Chairman of the Ibn Khaldun Institute for Sociological Studies at the American University of Cairo.
 43. After his release from jail in 1971, Shukri Mustafa led an Islamic group *Jama'at al-Muslimin* (The Society of Muslims) which was later labelled by the press, *al-Takfir wa al-Hijrah* (Excommunicate and Migration), see Muhammad Mahfuz, *Al-Ladhina Zuulimu: al-Tanzimat al-Islamiyyah fi Misr* (London: Riad el-Rayyes, 1988), pp.94–5.
 44. Executed with Qutb in 1966.
 45. Gabr Karam, 'Mina al-Manshyah ila al-Minassah: Mudhakkirat al-Liwa' Fu'ad 'Allam', *Rose el-Youssef*, No.3507, 28 Aug. 1995, pp.56–9; cf. pp.57–8.
 46. Ma'mun, the son of al-Hudaybi born 1920, in 1942 graduated from the School of Law at Cairo University. He worked as prosecutor and then judge and president of Cairo's appellate court and retired in 1981. See al-Sawi, *al-Muwajaha*, p.51. This indicated that Ma'mun was 45 years of age at the time when these events concerning the book occurred in 1965. At that time his experience in his field was 23 years. Until 1998, there is no answer from Ma'mun and there is no answer from al-Azhar concerning the involvement in this matter. It is not also known that those men of al-Azhar who prepared the book were of the known officials of the time or others graduated from al-Azhar. Were the officials of al-Azhar of 1995 aware of the published information and its significance?
 47. Gilles Kepel, *Muslim Extremism in Egypt*, p.62; Yvonne Haddad, 'Sayyid ...'.
 48. Qutb. *Al-'Adalah*, pp.78–80, 182–3; *Zilal; Ma'alim* (1993), pp.21, 68, 92, 126, 146.

49. See Qutb, *Al-Shati' al-Majhul* [poetry collection] (Egypt: el-Minya: Mataba'at Sadiq, n.d.), pp.4–6, 19.
50. Qutb, 9, *al-Shati' al-Majhul*, see Introduction, pp.3–15.
51. Qutb, '*Adalah*'; *Zilal*, Vol.2, pp.887–900; *Ma'alim*, pp.21, 68, 92, 146.
52. Qutb, *Kutub wa Shakhsiyat* (Cairo: Dar al-Shuruq, 1981), pp.90–97; *Fi al-Tarikh* (Cairo: Dar al-Shuruq, 1991), pp.11–14, 17–19; Qutb, '*Ahdafuna wa Mabadi'una*', *Al-Alam Al-Arabi*, Vol.1, No.4 (July 1947), p.53; Qutb, *Dirasat Islamiyyah* (Cairo: Dar al-Shuruq, 1993), pp.149–50.
53. Qutb, *Naqd Kitab Mustaqbal al-Thaqafah fi Misr*, pp.11, 28, 134.
54. Qutb, *Fi al-Tarikh*, p.13, see also pp.12–15.
55. Qutb, '*Adalah*', p.20.
56. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.4, p.1937.
57. Qutb, '*Adalah*', p.21.
58. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.4, p.2373, see also p.2374.
59. *Ibid.*, Vol.1, p.556; '*Adalah*', p.23.
60. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.1, p.349; Vol.4, p.1939; Vol.5, p.3090; Vol.6, pp.3360–67.
61. Qur'an, 35: 41; Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.4, p.2441.
62. Qur'an, 11: 6; Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.4, p.1852.
63. Qur'an, 50: 16; Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.6, p.3362.
64. Qur'an, 40: 61; Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.5, p.3093.
65. Qur'an, 40: 64; Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.5, p.3094.
66. Qur'an, 67: 15; Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.6, p.3637–40.
67. Qur'an, 67: 20–21; Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.6, p.3643.
68. *World Book Encyclopedia*, Vol.18, p.689; *World Book Dictionary*, p.2001.
69. J. Austin, *Lectures on Jurisprudence* (London: Murray, 1873), Vol.1, p.227.
70. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.3, p.1149; Vol.1, p.210.
71. *Ibid.*, Vol.4, pp.2477–8; Qur'an, 23: 84.
72. *Ibid.*, *Zilal*, Vol.4, p.2477; Qur'an, 23: 88.
73. *Ibid.*, *Zilal*, Vol.4, p.2477; Qur'an, 23: 86.
74. *Ibid.*, *Zilal*, Vol.1, p.384; Qur'an, 3: 26.
75. See Qutb, *Adalah*, pp.126–81.
76. *Ibid.*, p.79.
77. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.3, pp.1216–7; Vol.2, p.1004.
78. *Ibid.*, Vol.2, pp.887–8.
79. *Ibid.*, Vol.3, p.1217.
80. Qutb, *Adalah*, p.197.
81. *Ibid.*, p.80.
82. *Ibid.*
83. *Ibid.*
84. Al-Maraghi, '*Al-Tashri 'al-Islami*', *Al-Azhar Magazine*, Vol.18, No.7 (1947), pp.27–31, 410–15.
85. Al-Zalabani, '*Siyasah Dusturiyyah Shar'iyyah*', *Al-Azhar Magazine*, Vol.18, No.7 (1947), pp.130–36.
86. Al-Zalabani, '*Al-Siyasah al-Shar'iyyah*', *Al-Azhar Magazine*, Vol.18, No.7 (1947), pp.251–5.
87. Qur'an, 5: 44.
88. *Ibid.*, 45.
89. *Ibid.*, 47.
90. *Ibid.*, 50.
91. Mahmud Al-Nawawi, '*Nizam al-Islam al-Siyasi*', *Al-Azhar Magazine*, Vol.66, No.6 (1993), pp.878–84.
92. Ibn Kathir, *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-'Azim* (Cairo: Dar al-Hadith, 1988), Vol.1, p.518.
93. Al-Jassas, *Ahkam al-Qur'an* (Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-'Arabi, 1355 AH), Vol.3, p.181.
94. Muhammad Al-Ghazali, '*Ihris ala Qawl al-Haqq wa Law ala Nafsik*', *Sabah el-Kheir*, No.1828, 17 Jan. 1991, p.18.

95. Muhammad Salah Al Sawi, *Al-Muwajaha*, p.35; see al-Qurtybi (1985), *Al-Jami'*, Introduction.
96. Al-Mawardi, *Al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyyah* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, n.d.), p.5.
97. Al Sawi, *al-Muwajaha*, p.35.
98. Ibid., p.36.
99. Al Sawi, *Fiqh al-Imamah al-'Uzma*, p.25.
100. Muhammad 'Umarah, *Al-Islam wa 'Usul al-Hukm li Ali Abd al-Raziq*, pp.75–6.
101. See Muhammad Naguib, *Egypt's Destiny* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1955), p.201; *Majallat al-Azhar*, Vol.67, Part III (Aug.–Sept. 1994), pp.280–82; *Akhir Saa* (Cairo), 4 July 1990, No.2663, pp.12, 13, 60.
102. Al Sawi, *Fiqh al-Imamah al-'Uzma*, p.41.
103. Mustafa Sabri, *Mawqif al-'Aql wa al-'ilm wa al-'alam Min Rab al-'Alamin*, cf. al-Sawi, *al-Muwajahah*, p.36.
104. Khalid Muhammad Khalid, *Al-Dawlah al-Islamiyyah* (1981), p.37; see pp.37–104.
105. Muhammad al-Bahayy, *Al-Fikr al-Islami al-Hadith* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, 1972), p.205.
106. Muhammad Abduh, *Tafsir Al-Manar* (Cairo: al-Hay'ah al-Ammah li al-Kitab, 1972), Vol.1, p.11.
107. Bakr Abu Zayd, *Hukm al-Intima'*, pp.72–3.
108. *Akher Sa'a*, No.2663, 4 July 1990, pp.12–13; *Akher Sa'a*, No.2663, 6 Nov. 1985, pp.12–13, 60; see *Al-Azhar Magazine*, Vol.67, Part III (Aug.–Sept. 1994), pp.280–82.
109. The United Arab Republic, *Mawsu'at Gamal Abd al-Nasser al-Fiqhiyyah* (Cairo: The Supreme Council of Islamic Affairs, 1961), Vol.1, p.16, see pp.17–19.
110. Qutb, *'Adalah*, pp.76, 80; *Zilal*, Vol.1, p.406; Vol.2, pp.1004–15; Vol.3, pp.1194, 1211, 1216–17, 1259, 1266.
111. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.1, p.501; Vol.2, p.3165.
112. Qutb, *al-Salam al-'Alami*, pp.122–3; *Ma'rakat al-Islam wa al-Ra'smaliyyah*, p.72.
113. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.5, p.3165; al-Nawawi, Vol.66, No.6 (Dec.), pp.878–84.
114. Qutb, *Nahwa Mujtama Islami*, p.141; *'Adalah*, p.83.
115. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.4, p.2009; *al-Salam al-'Alami*, p.122.
116. Qutb, *Nahwa Mujtama Islami*, p.141.
117. Qutb, *al-Salam*, p.123.
118. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.2, p.891.
119. Qutb, *Ma'alim*, p.26.
120. Ibid., p.10; *Zilal*, Vol.2, p.10823.
121. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.1, p.211; Vol.2, pp.891, 904–5, 1083; Vol.4, p.1991; *'Adalah*, pp.75, 76, 82, 198; *al-Salam al-'Alami*, pp.124–5; *Nahwa Mujtama Islami*, p.63.
122. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.1, pp.248–9; Vol.2, pp.685–7; *'Adalah*, pp.80–81.
123. Qur'an, 2: 229.
124. Qur'an, 4: 59.
125. Al-Zalabani, 'Siyasah Dusturiyyah Shar'iiyyah'. *Al-Azhar Magazine*, Vol.18, No.7 (1947), pp.130–36.
126. Qutb, *'Adalah*, p.82.
127. The leader of an Islamic state can be called president. To refer to the Prophet the leader of the Islamic State, the companions used the term president (*ra'is*). See Ibn Kathir, *Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah* (Cairo: Dar al-Raiyyan, 1988), Vol.2, p.344, especially the expedition of *Ta'if*.
128. Qutb, *al-Salam*, p.122; *'Adalah*, p.82.
129. Qutb, *'Adalah*, pp.14, 15, 82; *al-Salam al-'Alami*, p.123.
130. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.2, pp.692, 696; Vol.4, p.1990; *al-Salam al-'Alami*, p.124.
131. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.2, pp.693, 695; Vol.3, pp.1217, 1195.
132. Ibid., Vol.2, p.755.
133. Qutb, *Ma'rakat al-Islam wa al-Ra'smaliyyah*, p.72; *'Adalah*, pp.14–19, 82.
134. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.2, pp.690, 751–3; *Dirasat Islamiyyah*, pp.187–212.
135. Qutb, *'Adalah*, p.76; *Nahwa Mujtama Islami*, p.88.
136. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.2, pp.1083–4; *'Adalah*, pp.76–8, 198.

137. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.4, p.2008.
138. Abd Rabbuh, *Al-Thawrah al-Ijtima'iyyah fi al-Islam* (Cairo: Dar al-Kitab al-Misri, 1980), pp.94–9.
139. Qutb, *Nahwa Mujtama Islami*, p.65.
140. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.3, p.1216; *Ma'alim*, p.111.
141. Qutb, *Nahwa Mujtama 'Islami*, p.50.
142. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.2, p.849; *Nahwa Mujtama Islami*, pp.50–51.
143. Qutb, *Nahwa Mujtama Islami*, pp.51–52; *Zilal*, Vol.2, pp.988, 1010.
144. Qutb, *Nahwa Mujtama Islami*, p.5; *al-Salam al-'Alami*, pp.163–5.
145. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.4, pp.2009–11.
146. *Ibid.*, Vol.1, pp.132, 211; Vol.2, pp.89, 904.
147. Qutb, *Ma'rakat al-Islam wa al-Ra'smaliyyah*, p.67.
148. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.1, p.132; Vol.2, pp.888–91; *'Adalah*, pp.32, 78; *al-Salam al 'Alami*, pp.122, 123.
149. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.3, p.1434; Vol.4, pp.2019, 2020.
150. Qutb, *'Adalah*, p.76; *Zilal*, Vol.1, p.211, Vol.4, pp.2009–10.
151. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.1, pp.38–81; Vol.3, p.1220.
152. Qutb, *al-Islam wa al-Ra'smaliyyah*, pp.72, 74; *Zilal*, Vol.1, pp.210, 501; Vol.4, pp.2007, 2009, Vol.5, p.3165; *'Adalah*, pp.83, 153, 154.
153. Qutb, *Zilal*, Vol.3, pp.1256–7.