

Strategy for Global Revolution: Revisiting Mawdudi's Theory of Reformative Wars

Ahmad Khalid Hatam
Dean Faculty of Social Sciences, Kardan University Kabul
(k.hatam@kardan.edu.af)

Abstract

Mawdudi's theory of Jihad and explanation of different terms in a peculiar style, especially his notion of Islam as a revolutionary system and Muslims as members of the revolutionary party are in fact aimed at paving ground for his theory of reformative wars—the most innovative and contentious idea of Mawdudi in the discourse on Jihad. Mawdudi seems to have evolved this theory in an attempt to reconcile the theoretical discussion on aggression (muharabah) as jus ad bellum ('illat al-qital) in Islam and the actual wars of the prophet (peace be on him) and his companions (may Allah be pleased with them). In other words, this is the dilemma faced by everyone who studies Fiqh and tries to reconcile it with the Sirah. The paper raises another aspect of the discussion as well. It claims that prevalent political scenario in the world might have played a role in helping Mawdudi refine his thoughts on the issue of Muslihana Jang.

KEY WORDS: *Islamic State, Jihad, Reformative Wars (Muslihana Jang), Global Revolution*

Introduction

Mawdudi's exposition of reformative wars is a direct and necessary corollary of his larger notion of Islam as a Global Revolutionary Movement which is designed to rule the world. Muslims, as *Hizbullah* and the *Ummat Wasat*¹, in his view, are born to accomplish the ultimate goal of performing *Amar bi 'l Ma 'ruf* and *nahy 'an al-Munkar* (enjoining virtue and forbidding evil). He concedes that it might not be easy for rest of the world to agree with; nevertheless, Muslims as a nation are entrusted with the task of serving mankind by inviting them to the right path and ensuring their success in the hereafter.²

It appears that logic, as against revelation, forms the basis of this point of view. Mawdudi claims that uprightness and profundity requires a person not to tolerate persecution and tyranny anywhere in the world. For a human being to be considered virtuous and honorable he should fight against persecution with all that he owns, including his life, without any expectation and profit in return because his reward is due in the afterlife.³

In yet another logical premise, Mawdudi holds that not expecting any gains in the struggle against persecution is very vital because that is the only way human beings can be distinguished from animals. He explains that, principally, a human's consideration of his impulses is merely means to an end and not an the

end *per se*.⁴ A Muslim, he declares, meets his basic needs to enable himself meet the responsibility he is entrusted with, i.e. serving his family, nation, country, mankind, and pleasing Allah Almighty.⁵

If this is not the case and some people allow a tyrannical government to rule and they spend their lives under the writ of such a regime without a feeling of guilt and a need to launch a comprehensive struggle for toppling and replacing it with a system that promotes peace and justice, they are “disgraceful” human beings. He declares that these humans are being wrong to themselves and shall remain hopeless for their entire life.⁶

Part One: Meaning and Scope of *Muslihana Jang*

To support his theory, Mawdudi claims that campaigns launched by the Companions fall into the category of *Muslihana* wars. He argues that they fought these wars only to liberate other humans from tyrannical regimes that had no respect for humanity.⁷ Islam does not believe in national and alien governments; it instead believes in division of systems into honest and dishonest where it ordains that honest governments must be supported while dishonest governments must be ousted from power because they do not qualify to rule any territory whatsoever.⁸

Hence, when companions were done with regulating affairs of their State in *Madinah*, they observed that humans in the neighboring states were ruled by tyrannical regimes who did not believe in human rights and fundamental freedoms; instead, they treated their people as commodities. Hence, the Companions invited them to embrace Islam, or leave the throne to those who are eligible to rule, or get ready to fight that will oust them from the power.⁹ The tyrannical regimes who did not want to liberate the poor citizens opted for war, and defeat was their destiny.¹⁰

The Qur'an addresses these people and prescribes punishment for those who “wage a war against Allah and His apostle and strive for bringing chaos and anarchy onto the land”. It declares that such people should be killed, or hanged till death, or their hands and feet should be cut across.¹¹

Mawdudi holds that the phrase “onto the land” used by the Qur'an denotes the territory of Islamic State and “wage a war against Allah and His apostle” refers to fighting against the faithful government established in a State.¹²

Such severe punishments are prescribed, he adds, to illustrate that making efforts for toppling-down a just government that promotes human rights, ensures peace in the world, and utilizes resources of the world for advancing interests of the human beings is but a heinous crime.¹³ Also, it indicates that these people cannot be forgiven for their actions, unless they repent before being arrested and being held accountable for their deeds.¹⁴

1.1 Muslihana Jang and the Notions of Fitnah and Fasad

Mawdudi's connotation of *fitnah* is very wide in scope. He relies on the usage of the word '*fitnah*' in different verses of the Qur'an for asserting that the following acts amount to *fitnah* and hence attract application and legitimacy of the reformative wars:

Snatching rights of the poor, weak and oppressed and persecuting them;¹⁵

Impeding righteousness and justice through power and barring people from accepting that which is right;¹⁶

Prohibiting people from opting to go through the path of Allah—the right track;¹⁷

Forcing people to go astray and getting involved in conspiracies against righteousness;¹⁸

Exerting extreme power in support of injustice and causing bloodshed for unjust purposes;¹⁹ and

Overpowering the believers.²⁰

As far as *fasad* is concerned, the notion of *fasad*, ant. *Salah*, in Mawdudi's view stands for 'things crossing and transgressing their legal and justified limits', hence, by this literal interpretation, every act which is against justice and good amounts to an act of *fasad*.²¹ The Qur'an, however, uses the term to denote overall deterioration in ethical, social and political system of a nation.

Mawdudi, trying to get support for his view from the Qur'an, presents cases of *Pharaoh*,²² *Thamud*,²³ '*Ad*,²⁴ nation of Lut,²⁵ and residents of *Madyan*²⁶ who are held by the Qur'an to have committed *fasad* and enlists acts they were found guilty of according to the Qur'an.

Mawdudi is of the view that all these nations were guilty of *fasad* and were therefore punished with extermination for their evil deeds. In addition, he enumerates the following acts to qualify, if committed, as *fasad*:

Stealing;

When imperialistic hegemony obliterates ethical and moral values of an occupied nation;²⁷

Flagging relations that are vital for development and welfare of the humankind. These relations include ties between spouses, relatives, friends and neighbors as well as mutual trust between friends, business contacts, States and governments. These relations are such that if they are established and protected, they will lead to welfare of the humanity. However, if someone or a nation tries to disconnect and sever them, the world will get into war and unrest, hence causing *fasad*;²⁸

Using State power for oppression and inflicting tyranny instead of using it for wellbeing of human beings;

Preventing people from accepting the virtuous path recommended by Allah Almighty;²⁹ and

Wrongs which dismantle individuals' morality and affect a society, accepting bribes and usury, exploiting people, promoting enmity, hatred and supporting wars simply for material benefits and interests.

Building up his case, Mawdudi claims that the list of these abhorrent acts suggests that *fitnah* and *fasad* are characteristics and offshoots of a tyrant (*na haq shinas*), non-God-fearing (*na khuda tars*) and rogue (*bad asal*) State. Because these acts cannot be committed unless allowed, tolerated or encouraged, expressly or impliedly, by a State.³⁰

This conclusion and linkage between the list and express or implied approval by the State however is not supported by texts of the Qur'an and *Sunnah*. Instead, Mawdudi tries to support this by quoting different verses from the Qur'an and tailoring an interpretation to support his view.

For instance, he holds that verse of the Qur'an calls upon Muslims that "if you turn away, He will replace you by a people other than you, and they will not be like you"³¹ and it asserts that "if you twist or turn away from (the truth), know that Allah is well aware of all that you do"³². These, in his view, indicate that leadership and authority are dependent on the capability and potential to rule, hence, if someone loses the potential, he shall lose the right to rule.³³

1.2 Un-Islamic Political System as the Root Cause

In Mawdudi's view, the un-Islamic political system instigates and supports its adherents to avoid Islam's invitation and stops them from following the right path. It is a system that ensures justice does not prevail; encourages moral and social degradation, and all these acts of *fasad* then lead to wars taking place in the world.

Hence, if Muslims are commanded to eradicate *fitnah* and *fasad*, they shall by means of an organized struggle stop such a State from emerging on the map of the world and they may, if necessary, opt for *qital* (war) to achieve this goal.³⁴ In other words, Mawdudi holds the un-Islamic system of government to be automatically a supporter of *fitnah* and *fasad* and hence subject to the reformative wars he is an advocate of.

Explaining the next phases, Mawdudi holds that once such a State is toppled, the Muslim force must then focus on establishing a just and fair system of government on the principles prescribed by Allah almighty.

The State so established shall promote and protect interests of human beings overall instead of vested interests of a person or class of persons. It shall aim at promoting good and eliminating bad, and its inhabitants shall consider *amar bil Ma'ruf* and *nahy 'an al-munkar* as their mission. Ultimate goal of such a State shall remain to be welfare of the mankind and blessing of Allah.³⁵

Hence, expounds Mawdudi, the only way of eliminating persecution and disorder from the face of earth is to eradicate corrupt regimes from around the world and install governments which theoretically and practically³⁶ are righteous, honest and just.³⁷

In case, these people will not consent to entering the righteous *din* (religion);³⁸ they can live with their 'mistaken' beliefs but cannot be allowed to establish a

government of their own. This, in his view, is the second kind of situation where Allah Almighty dictates Muslim to take arms and fight for His cause.³⁹

1.3 Historical Narrative

For bringing historical evidence to support this theory, Mawdudi relies on the aftermath of the conquest of *Makkah* and claims that once this holy city was conquered and the Islamic State was completed, Muslims stepped in to the second stage of their global mission. Important features of this stage were as follow:

Arabia should be a genuine *Dar al-Islam*, hence, this territory must be cleared from infidelity and polytheism by annihilating existing moral, social, political, economic and financial systems and paving ground for making it purely an Islam-dominated territory with no threat from other systems and no chance of internal insurgency against the newly established regime.

Once the mission of Islam was completed within Arabia, Muslims should then focus on Islam's expansion outside the Arabian Peninsula. Two major threats in the way of achieving this end were the Roman and the Persian Empires; hence, encounter with both of them was inevitable.

In addition, other non-religious, political and social cultures were also declared potential threats and Muslims were asked to remain prepared to overpower them and topple their regimes.

It was nonetheless declared that the goal is not to force them convert to Islam, instead, it is to overwhelm them and destroy their political power. Mawdudi concludes that embracing Islam was totally their choice, but they shall not be allowed to hold control of affairs in their hands, to impose their evil agenda on humans and create *fasad* for other human beings.⁴⁰

1.4 Cessation of Muslihana Jang

This war, says Mawdudi, shall continue till non-Muslims express their willingness to pay *jizya* (poll-tax) to the Islamic State. Once they have agreed to pay *jizya*, their life and property will become protected and legally immune.⁴¹

He quotes the Qur'anic verse which declares a war against those amongst People of the Book (*ahl al-kitab*) who neither have faith in Allah and the day of hereafter, nor avoid acts prohibited by Allah and His Apostle, nor consider it their obligation to follow the true *din*.⁴²

He concludes that, if they do not have faith in the true religion, they are not qualified to have a government of their won and to put their unjust laws into operation on the face of earth thereby committing persecution and causing disorder in the world.

To ensure that this interpretation does not violate the principle of prohibition of coercion in religion, Mawdudi clarifies that even in such a case, non-Muslims will have the right to follow their 'mistaken' beliefs and act according to their own customs.⁴³

For the same reason, he declares, *dhimmis*⁴⁴ will attain protection once they accept authority of the Islamic State over them to the extent that Muslims will protect their life, liberty, property and will defend them against internal and external threats at the cost of their own lives.⁴⁵

He is of the view that these rules apply to all *dhimmis*, i.e. those who have entered into a pact with Muslims⁴⁶ and those who have accepted the authority of Islam without any such pact, in return of which the Islamic State has awarded them the status of *dhimmi*.⁴⁷

Interestingly, however, Mawdudi asserts that the rule of payment of *jizya* proves that reformative wars are not fought for any religious reason or for faith related advantages. Otherwise, the life of a non-Muslim would not have received protection simply by his submission to Islamic rule and payment of *jizya* despite being faithful to an ideology other than Islam.⁴⁸

Part Two: Critique Of The Doctrine Of MuSliHAna Jang

Mawdudi does not believe in the division of war into defensive and offensive wars, instead, he has categorized wars into defensive and reformative wars. This second category devised by Mawdudi needs critical review because he believes that it gives Muslims an opportunity of toppling non-Muslim governments and replacing them with Islamic governments.⁴⁹

Mawdudi declares that Islam intends to liberate human beings from worshipping other humans and to let them follow the law laid down by Allah Almighty in letter and spirit. He, however, identifies a spoiler — the political systems of the world. In his view, they do not allow common people to have access to the message of Islam and are forced to follow the laws made by the State.

It is due to State's interference with the people and their choices that people become unfaithful and corrupt, living a wicked and aimless life. This indicates that, in reality, people do not embrace Islam and waste the opportunity of success in this as well the afterlife due to a tyrant, arbitrary and evil system of Statehood and government.

Mawdudi concludes that it is the institution of State which creates and supports *fitnah* and *fasad* in the world. Therefore, if the goal is to eliminate these evils, un-Islamic political systems, or States for that purpose, must be removed as the first step towards achieving the goal. Only then will non-Muslims have an opportunity of thinking freely about Islam and its message and the States will no more control their minds and choices.⁵⁰

Reading Islam's mission, it becomes evident that this theory is Mawdudi's brainchild and is not supported by Islam's overall mission and spirit. The truth is that Islam advocates peace with those who do not wage war against Muslims, the Islamic Faith and the Islamic State. Even Mawdudi himself confirms that Islam is the religion of peace and aggression by non-Muslims is the *jus ad*

bellum. He spends ample energy on refuting the point of view of those that deem *kufir* as the reason and cause for war between Muslims and others.

In support his particular interpretation, Mawdudi comes up with various rational arguments which at times are vague and elusive. As is elaborated below, he often tries to support his view by presenting verses and traditions that deal with completely different discussions.

Last but not the least, if it is accepted that *kufir* of the State and disobedience to the religion of Islam amounts to *fasad*, and *fasad* then justified resort to jihad and use of force, it is automatically accepted that *kufir* is the *jus ad bellum*. This is a conclusion that Mawdudi himself does not agree with.

2.1 Islam Advocates Peace

Mawdudi feels that Islam shall not cry for peace whilst other tyrant (*taghut*) systems prevail in the world.⁵¹ The message of Qur'an, he declares, is clear in this regard. It instructs the Prophet (peace be on him): "if they incline to peace, incline you as well to it, and trust in Allah. Surely He is All-Hearing, All knowing. And should they seek to deceive you, Allah is sufficient for you".⁵²

Mawdudi interprets the verses to mean that even if Muslims are powerful, they should accept the offer of peace made by non-Muslims. He highlights that Allah Almighty asks the Muslim commander to "trust in Allah" and avoid disquiet about the consequences of opting for peace, because "Allah is All Hearing, All Knowing". Mawdudi concludes that Muslims cannot wage war against all non-Muslims and should therefore prefer peace whenever a serious opportunity of peace exists.⁵³

This opinion in juxtaposition with his views on reformative wars and declaring that Islam asks Muslim strive for toppling non-Muslim governments indicates that the two are in contradiction with each other. Mawdudi's views on reformative wars warrant that such war could be waged against non-Muslim governments merely because they are non-Muslim even if they prefer peace in their relations with Muslims and do not commit acts which could be termed as hostile.

Moreover, if a non-Muslim political entity is peaceful in its international relations; has not committed persecution; and has not prohibited Muslims from practicing their religion and persuasion, Mawdudi's theory of reformative wars even then regards such an entity as a legal and justifiable target. He declares that Muslims should try to topple such a political entity and replace it with one that is just, pious and led by *Hizb Allah*.

This contradiction leads to confusion since at the one hand, Mawdudi's discourse on Jihad revolves around peace, Islam's preference for peace and Allah's commands to prefer peace even when Muslims are strong. On the other however, he asks Muslims make efforts for toppling peaceful regimes that are led by non-Muslims. This theory therefore lacks integrity.

2.2 Problem of Inconsistency

Mawdudi's theory suffers from self-contradiction in principles as well as details. He emphasizes that Muslims should not only concentrate on their own success in this world and the hereafter; they are required to remain concerned for success of other human beings.

In addition, he presents rational arguments to suggest that in order to be perfect and not just ordinary followers of the faith, Muslims should be concerned with welfare and interests of other nations more than they should be concerned with their own. To ensure that Muslims care for all human beings, including non-Muslims, Mawdudi calls upon Muslims to take out non-Muslim political entities so that ordinary non-Muslims could be allowed to hear the word of Islam and accept its system.

In *Tafhim al-Qur'an* however, he specifically denounces the attitude of acting like police force in the world and believes that if non-Muslims choose a wrong path for their journey, they should be allowed to move in that direction. He adds that Muslims are only preachers towards good and they are required to fulfill their duty in the best possible manner. They are not mandated to make all non-Muslims believe in the "truth" or that they should try to bring everyone into the fold of Islam.⁵⁴

Also, Mawdudi is found to proclaim that he principally is against efforts for dominating other nations politically or economically. He opines that every nation on the face of earth has the right to have political and economic freedoms and to choose their representatives without any compulsion. On this basis, he sought political independence for Muslims in India and declared it one of their fundamental rights.⁵⁵

Hence, if he considers political freedom and liberty of choosing representatives, his idea that Muslims should try to topple down the political entities or governments of other nations cannot be accepted and is in contradiction with his earlier thoughts.

In addition to the above, the theory of reformative wars of Mawdudi does not fit within the system of international relations devised by him. He holds that as part of that system, the Qur'an made it clear that Muslims should not hesitate in helping their non-Muslims relatives or others who are needy and destitute even if they have not embraced Islam..⁵⁶

Moreover, he holds that Islamic State's foreign policy is based on its commitment to international justice and friendly relations with those nations that have not committed acts undermining peace with Muslims.⁵⁷

Now and expanding the opinion and argument of Mawdudi, if non-Muslim political entities have not violated peace with Muslims and have not committed aggression against Muslims, Islam or Islamic State; their right to rule their own people cannot be curtailed.

Additionally, one category of non-Muslim citizens of *Dar al-Kufr* and *Dar al-Harb*, according to Mawdudi, is of those who pay tribute to the Islamic State in return for their freedom and enjoying political power and autonomy.

Taking the above two scenarios together, Mawdudi holds that Islam demands abolition of non-Muslims political institutions and it's the primary duty of all Muslims to topple down non-Muslims political regimes, unless they pay a sum of money as tribute, in which case this primary responsibility of Muslims is fulfilled.

In simple terms, Mawdudi holds that all non-Muslim States should be knocked down because it is primary responsibility of all Muslims, but if these institutions pay money to the Islamic State, their existence could be tolerated. Money at the cost of a goal which, according to Mawdudi, Muslims are created and trained for is certainly not a deal that Islam will fall for.

Can it be accepted that although Islam obligates Muslims to topple down all non-Muslims regimes, it even then allows un-Islamic States and governments to govern their people with their own laws, in contrast to Islam's law and system, after paying a sum of money as tribute to Muslims?

Additionally, he has tried his best to reject the claim of those who believe in *kufr* as *jus ad bellum*, Mawdudi does not realize that in his conclusion; he himself deems lack of faith in the true religion or unbelief (*kufr*) as the cause of war.

The only difference is that those he denounced believed in war against non-Muslims because they were not followers of Islam whereas Mawdudi believes in war against them because they are trying to establish their government when they do have the potential to do so and their government is destined to cause *fitnah* and *fasad*. For difference reasons though, war will be fought against non-Muslims in both cases.

Finally, in the discussion on *jizya*, he forgets to elaborate how does payment of *jizya* eliminate *fitnah* and *fasad* which he believes are the underlying reasons for reformative wars. Translation of Mawdudi's idea will read that Muslims will wage a war against non-Muslims because they have committed *fitnah* and *fasad* and have submitted to laws other than those laid down by Allah but at the end, charge only the male potential combatants amongst them a very nominal amount to be paid as *jizya* and allow them carry on with *fitnah* and *fasad* in the manner they used to do.

The claim that *fitnah* and *fasad* has been eliminated seems illogical when Mawdudi holds that such a nation shall be allowed, after payment of money, to have their own government established on principles they deem fit.

He also forgets to appreciate that *Ahl al-Kitab* had no option but to embrace Islam or pay *jizya* which denotes that they were coerced to choose one of the two options even if they had not committed *fitnah* and *fasad*. That is the reason that wars against them were fought on the basis of them simply being *Ahl al-Kitab*.

2.3 Analyzing the Meaning of *Fitnah*

Mawdudi relies on “keep on fighting them until mischief ends and the way prescribed by Allah (*din*) prevails”⁵⁸ and asserts that *din* (religion) means submission and accepting a system as dominant and following the laws devised by it.⁵⁹ He concludes that a society where man rules another is an instance of mischief (*fitnah*) and should therefore be replaced with “the way prescribed by Allah”.

This argument needs a careful evaluation. The verse does indicate that efforts shall be made to ensure only Allah’s law is submitted to, but it does not instruct Muslims to install Muslim governments over non-Muslims.

The reasons being, even if Muslims are in control of political system of a Christian population, for instance, they cannot prohibit them from following the Bible which in Mawdudi’s view is a book containing some abstract ethical norms and ideas while the rest of their lives will be regulated by guidelines issued by priests and clerics.⁶⁰ If this is the case, man-made system in the form of Christianity is still in control and the goal for which Mawdudi advocated establishment of a State seems to fail.

In addition, they shall continue with their habits and beliefs which in Mawdudi’s view are grounds for break-out of *fitnah* in the society. In this case, if the “law of Allah” is imposed on them, this shall amount to coercion, and if they are allowed to follow their faith, values and customs, then the purpose for which the Islamic government was set up loses its goals. In view of the above detail, it cannot be claimed that jihad against non-Muslims aims at ensuring that only Allah’s law prevails even in case of the non-Muslim communities.⁶¹

In relation to the verse which Mawdudi holds as an argument, its context suggests that it relates to pagans of Makkah only. The preceding verses instruct that:

“Fight in the way of Allah against those who fight against you but do not transgress, for Allah dose not love transgressors.

Kill them whenever you confront them and drive them out from where they drove you out. (For though killing is sinful) wrongful persecution is even worse than killing. Do not fight against them near the Holy Mosque unless they fight against you; but if they fight against you, kill them, for such is the reward of such unbelievers.

*Then if they desist, know well that Allah is Ever-Forgiving, Most Compassionate. Keep on fighting against them until mischief ends and the way prescribed by Allah prevails. But if they desist, then know that hostility is directed only against the wrong-doers”.*⁶²

The context indicates that these verses were regulating the relations of Muslims with Pagans of Makkah because Muslims were instructed to “drive them out” from “where they drove you out” and hence were not general rules of procedure against all non-Muslims. As the whole world has not drove Muslims out of their

homes and has not fought them near the Holy Mosque, a war cannot be waged against the entire world.

2.4 Parameters of Corrective Efforts

Mawdudi argues on the basis of the principle of “enjoining virtue and forbidding evil” as the fundamental duty of Muslims that the Qur’an obliges Muslims to approach every corner of the world where vice (*munkar*) exists with the goals of bringing reforms. He believes that Muslims should strive, individually and collectively, to fulfill this task. He holds that Muslims are created to act according to this principle.⁶³

Moreover, Mawdudi argues that one part of the principle, i.e. “enjoining the virtue”, is not a task that could be achieved through use of force hence emphasis should always be on *Da‘wah* (persuasion). But the second part of the principle, i.e. “forbidding evil” is different. *Munkar* in his view is of two types: *munkar* of faith and mind and *munkar* of acts and deeds.⁶⁴

He holds that *munkar* of faith will be remedied and resisted through persuasion as is the case with enjoining virtue; however, *munkar* of acts and deeds must be forbidden through use of force. He takes his argument further and declares that, in addition to eliminating *munkar* from their own States, if Muslims have enough strength to ensure that *munkar* does not exist anywhere in the world, they should use the power and force they have at their disposal to achieve the goal.

This argument has been presented as a principle applicable even in international relations of Muslims with others. The fact remains that the principle of “enjoining virtue and forbidding evil” is applicable in intra-Muslim relations only and cannot be extended to international level. Although the Qur’an has stated that implementing this principle is one of the traits of Muslims, but it has not stated that Muslims must follow this as a universal obligation and against everyone even if they follow a faith other than Islam.

Mawdudi’s method in extending this principle is also interesting. He claims that as a society’s wellbeing and welfare depends on *Amar bi ‘l Ma‘ruf* and *Nahy ‘An al-Munkar*; the success and well-being of the entire universe too depends on this principle.⁶⁵

As far as the success of the Muslim society is concerned, it could rely on this principle, but this principle certainly is not applicable in a non-Muslim society or State. Because drinking, consuming pork, gambling, extra-marital relations and some other acts which are common among non-Muslims are considered proscribed by Islam and shall amount to *fasad* in Mawdudi’s view.

These are instances of *munkar* of deeds, but can Muslims use force and wage a war against non-Muslims to eradicate these evils, e.g. drinking, gambling, consumption of pork or living out of the wedlock and procuring children? This is a conclusion that even Mawdudi will not agree with since he deems aggression the *just ad bellum* and not unbelief and *kufr*.

Also, non-Muslims in an Islamic State shall have the right to drink and consume pork with certain conditions and the Islamic State itself will protect them, therefore, Mawdudi while discussing *fitnah*, *fasad* and forbidding evil generalizes the concept so much that he unknowingly rejects his opinion regarding rights of *dhimmis* in an Islamic State.

To elaborate it further, how can an Islamic State wage war against a nation on the ground of them being involved in these evils, but then the State itself guarantee these rights to those non-Muslims that live inside its territory? Would not that mean that Islamic State is permitting people live in evil and thus reformative war could be waged against such a State?

Another problem in his dealing with this principle is that the entire edifice of his interpretation is based on rational arguments focused on changing the genuine connotation of this principle.

Importantly, the division of *munkar* into two kinds and the idea that persuasion is a means of forbidding the first kind while use of force could be adopted in forbidding the second kind are conclusions that Mawdudi has arrived at for promoting his own notion of reformative wars.

Another instance of his ingenuity is the argument that the Qur'an mentions *Amar bil Ma'ruf* and *Nahy 'An al-Munkar* subsequent to the obligation of offering prayers and paying *zakat* (alms) denotes that a human must become a good person before he could ask others to become good, and he should personally avoid evil before he could get involved in forbidding it.

Realizing that this interpretation does not help him get his desired conclusion, Mawdudi molds the concept and asserts, though the verse denotes otherwise, "however, as feeding other humans is preferable than one feeding himself, prohibiting vice is preferable to avoiding it personally".⁶⁶ Feeding other human being is preferable because *Shari'ah* has explicitly stated so, but evidence to suggest that encouraging others avoid vice is preferable to one performing virtue cannot be found. The Qur'an has instead condemned those that although speak good do not act accordingly by asserting "Believers, why do you profess that which you do not practice?"⁶⁷

2.5 Context of the Verses and Traditions

Mawdudi was a tremendous scholar and an exegete who is quoted as an authority on Islamics; hence, he uses his logic and *dhawq* (discretion) to infer meanings from verses to support his view. At times, however, it changes the context and meaning that the verse intends to convey.

Mawdudi argues that Muslims should wage a war against mischief and disorder in every corner of the world on the basis of, among others, "unless you act likewise, there will be oppression in the world and great corruption."⁶⁸

This however is only part of a verse, the complete verse reads as "and those who disbelieve, they are allies of one another; and unless you act likewise, there will be oppression in the world and great corruption".⁶⁹

Hence, the verse instructs Muslims to fight as allies against non-Muslims because they too fight against Muslims as a unified group. It does not relate to the discussion of *fitnah* or *fasad* at all and does not relate to whether Muslims should wage a war against all non-Muslims.

Interestingly, he uses the same verse in two places in two different senses. In the first place, Mawdudi translates it to mean “if you do not act in this manner, *fasad* shall be the result”⁷⁰ while in another, he takes the verse to mean “if you do not come to the rescue of other Muslims, *fitnah* and *fasad* shall be the result (meaning that they shall be persecuted by evil forces).⁷¹

Moreover, he presents another verse in support of his view that *fitnah* and *fasad* must be eliminated even if that is through use of force, he quotes “he who slays a soul unless it be (in punishment) for murder or for spreading mischief on earth shall be as if he had slain all mankind”.

This is also just part of the verse. It basically elaborates instructions of Allah Almighty issued to Bani Israel and asserts that “[T]herefore, We ordained for the Children of Israel that he who slays a soul unless it be (in punishment) for murder or for spreading mischief on earth shall be as if he had slain all mankind”.⁷² It is obvious that this verse does not deal with *fasad* and cannot be an argument for Mawdudi in the context he has relied on the same.

Another verse quoted by Mawdudi for his idea of use of force for forbidding evil is “surely they sought even earlier to stir up sedition”. The verse informs the Prophet (peace be on him) regarding hypocrites by stating that “surely they sought even earlier to stir up sedition, and turned things upside down to frustrate you until Truth came and the decree of Allah appeared, however, hateful this may have been to them”.⁷³

This verse too does not deal with the issue of *fasad* and *fitnah* as is argued by Mawdudi. Nonetheless, he concludes after quoting these verses that “it is but true that among all, *fitnah* and *fasad* are the only evils that cannot be forbidden and eliminated without sword”.⁷⁴

‘Ammar Khan Nasir, a contemporary scholar, believes that Mawdudi is trying to avoid a faith based interpretation of jihad and presents a theory of just war of Islam on the basis of some ethical and moral norms such as eliminating tyranny, injustice, persecution and disorder.

In his view, the verses Mawdudi relied upon are not listed by the Qur’an as grounds for conducting jihad; instead, they are indicators of corruption in different nations. Since the Qur’an has permitted using force to eliminate “*fasad fi ’l ard*” (corruption on the face of earth) through use of force, Mawdudi believes that elimination of *fasad* and establishment of Islamic State too are the ends of jihad. Nasir however believes that *fasad fi ’l ard* is not the same as *fasad* which forms the basis of Mawdudi’s theory of reformative wars.

Nasir suggests that Mawdudi has misunderstood the *ishtirak al-lafz* (commonality of words) for *ishtirak al-hukm* (commonality of the applicable rule). Explaining his argument, he agrees that *fasad* has been mentioned in

various texts of the Qur'an to denote mischief and disorder, but jihad and use of force cannot be accepted to be the response to all of instances that are called *fasad*.

He explains that where the term of *fitnah* or *fasad* is mentioned as *jus ad bellum*, it is clearly established from the context that both the words refer to "religious persecution" of a community by others.

Nasir also believes that Mawdudi has selected verses from the Qur'an which support his view and has ignored others which though contain the words of *fitnah* and *fasad* but are against his view. For instance: *His is the creation and His is the command. Blessed is Allah, the Lord of the whole Universe. Call upon your Lord with humility and in secret. Surely He does not love transgressors. And do not perpetrate mischief in the earth after it has been set in order, and call upon Him with fear and longing. Surely Allah's mercy is close to those who do good.*⁷⁵

This verse contains the phrase "*wa la tufsidu fi 'l ard*" which is an instruction issued to non-Muslims not to commit mischief in the earth by worshipping lords other than Allah. If, Nasir holds, we adopt the methodology of Mawdudi in declaring *fasad* to be the *jus ad bellum*, this verse indicates that unbelief is also a form of *fasad* and jihad should therefore be waged against all unbelievers. However, even Mawdudi does not agree with this conclusion and emphasizes that corruption of faith should be kept aloof from the *jus ad bellum* in Islam.⁷⁶ Similarly, in relation to the verses of changing the leadership where Mawdudi concluded that "if someone loses the potential, he shall loose the right to rule", Nasir says that these verses are totally irrelevant to the matter in question.

He asserts that the first reference by Mawdudi is part of a scheme and the context clarifies the real position. "All that is in the heavens and all that is in the earth belong to Allah. We enjoined upon those who were given the Book before you, and also yourselves, to have fear of Allah. But if you disbelieve, then bear in mind that all that is in the heavens and all that is in the earth belongs to Allah. Allah is Self-Sufficient, Most Praiseworthy. To Allah belongs all that is in the earth; and Allah suffices for help and protection. If He wills, He has full power to remove you, O mankind, and bring in others in your place".⁷⁷

Nasir claims that these verses neither contain the meaning of political leadership nor they lay down rules for Muslims, they instead explain that Allah needs none in His Kingdom, and that He Alone is the Owner of this universe. If He chooses a nation for a cause but they fail, He will bring another nation in their place and the process will go on without affecting His Might.⁷⁸

2.6 The Scope of *Fitnah* and *Fasad*

Nucleus of Mawdudi's theory of Jihad is the existence of *fitnah* in the world, which in his view should be eradicated through war and use of force. He relies on two verses where *fitnah* is mentioned as the reason for jihad and concludes that the second category, i.e. *munkar* of acts, is titled as *fitnah* and *fasad* by the Qur'an and has advised use of force for eradicating it.

Perusal of the two verses however clearly establishes that the word “*fitnah*” in both the verses does not refer to evil deeds of the people and are instead instances of religious persecution of Muslims.⁷⁹ Even Mawdudi himself has used them to infer that *fitnah* in these verses means persecution.⁸⁰

In addition, Mawdudi’s connotation of *fitnah* is wide in scope and relying on the use of the word in different verses of the Qur’an, even in different contexts, he concludes that no matter what form a *fitnah* adopts, reformatory wars must be waged to contain and defuse the same.

But a closer look at the elements counted by Mawdudi to denote *fitnah* proves that they are not related to what Mawdudi called “*munkar* of deeds”, instead, they are simple acts of persecution committed by an authority and hence does not have a necessary link with a non-Muslim government and/or political entity. Interestingly, a Muslim government can commit some or all of these acts despite the fact that the rulers believe in Islam as a religion and have faith in all its fundamentals. Hence, Mawdudi’s idea that the problem in non-Muslim societies is a by-product and off-shoot of an unfaithful political system proves baseless.

It is also noteworthy that in case non-Muslim political entity has not committed persecution on its territory and has not supported evil in the community, Mawdudi’s theory even then requires that Muslims should try to topple that political entity. On the basis of Mawdudi’s interpretation of *fitnah* and *fasad*, the government though is not supportive of these acts; the system is subject to removal.

This shows that *fitnah* and *fasad* are not the *jus ad bellum* in his view; instead, political autonomy and unbelief are the reasons for war against them. This forms a logical conclusion of Mawdudi’s opinion which he is not willing to accept because, in his view, it amounts to compulsion in religion.

The fact is that the Qur’an has not obligated jihad in any verse for eliminating *fasad*. Numerous verses of the Qur’an encourage Muslims to perform jihad but they have not been asked to perform it so that *fasad*, *per se*, is eliminated from the face of earth.⁸¹ Instead, jihad has been permitted against *fitnah* and *fasad* which are causes of religious persecution.

2.7 Mixing Up Criminal Law with the Law of War

Mawdudi’s connotation of *fitnah* and *fasad*, taken together, results in mixing up issues of criminal law, and even some ethical problems, with international law. He has declared jihad as a tool for and means of taking care of such problems. For instance, he includes ‘stealing’ in his interpretation of the notion of *fasad*, while it is clear that Islam has prescribed a punishment for ‘stealing’ in the form of amputation of hand of the culprit. However, it has not permitted waging wars against non-Muslims, or Muslims, who are in the habit of stealing from one another.

Also, he believes that acts and omissions that undermine relations which are essential and vital for development and welfare of the humankind including ties

between relatives, spouses, friends and neighbors, mutual trust between friends, contacts in business, States and governments amounts to *fasad*. These matters too are issues which do not warrant any attention on the part of an Islamic State, if ties between spouses of a non-Muslim community are undermined even by the State, it does not provide any ground to Islamic State to wage war.

Wrongs which dismantle individuals' morality and those which affect a society, like accepting bribes and usury, exploiting people, promoting enmity and hatred also amount to *fasad* in Mawdudi's view and serve as ground for reformative war. In case Muslims sign an armistice with non-Muslims with a condition that they shall be governed by non-Muslim government, all these "evils" shall remain as they are excluding usury, can it be claimed then that the purpose for which the global revolutionary party was created has been achieved? The answer seems to be in negative.

5.2.8 Reformative War against Muslims

In view of above, Mawdudi encourages Muslims, individually and collectively, for war against other Muslims. He even argues in another place that "Islam cannot remain indifferent if someone theoretically claims allegiance to its law but in practice prefers unIslamic laws as systems of managing affairs", and hence a war could be waged to compel them accept Islam's law in practice as well.⁸²

This argument cannot be taken to refer to non-Muslims, because obviously they have rejected Islam's law even theoretically, therefore, they cannot be asked to follow it in practice. Muslims, however, have accepted this law in theory but sometime act in its violations. It therefore seems that Mawdudi advocates waging a reformative war against Muslims to compel them follow the Allah of law in practice as they accept it in theory.

2.8 Problems in 'Humanitarian' Support

Mawdudi has considered offering humanitarian support to Muslims outside *Dar al-Islam* in the forms of defensive wars as well as form of reformative wars. This needs to be seen carefully.

The verse where the Qur'an inquires "how is it that you do not fight in the way of Allah and in support of the helpless-men, women and children- who pray: "Our Lord, *bring us out of this land whose people are oppressors* and appoint for us from Yourself, a protector, and appoint for us from Yourself a helper"?⁸³ suggests that the ultimate end is to bring the oppressed people "out of this land" where they are oppressed and persecuted.

This contention is supported by yet another verse. The Qur'an states that "while taking the souls of those who were engaged in wronging themselves, the angels asked "in what circumstances were you?" they replied: "We were too weak and helpless in the land." The angels said: "*Was not the earth of Allah wide enough for you to emigrate in it?*" For such person their refuge is Hell – an evil

destination indeed; except the men, women and children who were indeed too feeble to be able to seek the means of escape and did not know where to go—may be Allah shall pardon these, for Allah is All-Pardoning, Most Forgiving”.⁸⁴ Even here the emphasis is on emigration of these persecuted people. Therefore, Mawdudi's view that a war will be waged in to support them or that these people should strive to topple the regime remains a matter of contention.

Conclusions

The foregoing discussion shows that Mawdudi's concept of reformative wars stems from his belief in Muslims being the best nation chosen to perform the task of enjoining virtue and forbidding evil and of rendering testimony against all other nations of the world. Their status as torchbearers of truth and justice, in the opinion of Mawdudi, justifies wars for eliminating all un-Islamic political systems which he considers as the root-cause of all evils in the world.

This chapter also shows that the problem lies in his methodology for interpreting the texts. Thus, instead of taking a holistic approach and considering all the texts collectively, he reads them separately and uses them selectively to substantiate his theory which, resultantly, faces problems of analytical inconsistency. This despite the fact that he emphatically asserted that the Qur'an must be read as a whole and that verses must not be read out of their context.

Collecting various texts about *fitnah* and *fasad* and interpreting them differently in an effort to widen the scope of jihad is the hallmark of Mawdudi's theory of reformative wars. His critics point out that instead of widening the scope of *jihad*, these texts confine it to elimination of religious persecution.

References & Notes

-
- ¹ Hizb Allah or the Ummat-i-Wasat is a party comprising those who are joined together on the basis of faith, mandated to stand witness against all human beings in the hereafter. The Qur'an expressly states that this Ummah has been granted the status of Ummat Wasat so that on the day of resurrection, the Prophet (peace be on him) will render his testimony against them and affirm that he has communicated, without any discrepancy, the message he was bestowed with. Later on, this Ummah, as Prophet's representative, will stand witness against all other nations of the world and avow that the message they had received from the Prophet (peace be on him) was communicated to all human beings in the world. Mawdudi infers from this task of "providing testimony" against all the nations that Muslims are given the status of ruler and leader for the rest of the world. Another reason is that Ummah of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him) is a preferred and chosen group which is established on the virtues of justice and equity, which has occupied the

central place among all the nations, which has an equal and just relationship with all and who avoids unjust relations with everyone including members of its own party. In contradistinction to this respectable position, if this Ummah will fail in proving that they have communicated to others what was communicated to them by the messenger of Allah, they will be held responsible for omission in accomplishing the mission they were assigned to, and the Ummah will be questioned as to why did not they meet their liability when malevolence, ignorance, and impiety had occupied the entire world. For details on this notion: See; Mawdudi, *Tafhimat*, 01:87; Idem, *Khilafat-o-Mulukyat*, 75; Idem, *Shahadat-i-Haq* (Lahore: Islamic Publications (Pvt) Ltd., 2000), 06; Idem, *Islami Riyasat*, 556-7; Idem, *Tafhim al-Qur'an*, vol. 1, note 144, at 119-120; Idem, *Al-Jihad fi 'l-Islam* (Lahore: Idara Tarjuman al-Qur'an, Reprint, 2005), 91.

² Mawdudi, *Al-Jihad fi 'l-Islam*, 86.

³ Ibid., 45.

⁴ Ibid., 86, 87.

⁵ Ibid., 87.

⁶ Ibid., 46-47. The Qur'an calls them *zalimun* for they oppress their own self.

⁷ Ibid., 44, 145.

⁸ Ibid., 147.

⁹ Ibid., 148.

¹⁰ Ibid., 149. It is important to mention, however, that these wars were not fought to compel them convert to Islam, instead, the only mission intended to achieve through these was, clarifies Mawdudi, overthrowing the regimes who were found involved in barring their citizens from listening to and accepting the message of Islam. Idem, *Rasa'il wa Masa'il* (Queries and Responses), 04:189-192

¹¹ Mawdudi, *Islami Riyasat*, 576.

¹² Ibid., 577. Mawdudi believes that *khuruj* (rebellion) against a just ('Adil) regime is prohibited and a major sin, however, tyrant regimes can be overthrown only when chances of establishing an Islamic government are bright, while the jurists have differed as to what would be the duty of Muslims if a regime is tyrant but chances of establishing a just regime are gloomy. Some jurists are of the view that rebellion is not permissible and merely speaking the right words or truth in front of such a tyrant shall suffice, while others believe that Muslims should opt for rebellion and change the regime no matter what are the chances of establishing a just regime. There is also a third group who believe that Muslims are bound to infiltrate the system and strive for its reformation from within. In case Muslims take up arms against a just regime and then take shelter in *Masjids*, they can be cordoned and if they become violent, Muslim army can also retaliate. However, if this situation arises in the Holy *Masjids*, then the only option is that blockade should continue till the rebels prefer laying down their weapons and coming

out. Idem, *Islami Riyasat*, 442-443; Idem, *Rasa'il wa Masa'il*, 04:236-237. He nonetheless concedes that opinion of Abu Hanifa (699-767), who allowed rebellion and supported Zayd b. 'Ali (695-740) and Muhammad Nafs Zakiyyah (for rebellion against tyrant regimes, is different than the preferred view of the Hanafi school of thought. He refers to the first view as *maslak-i-Hanafi*, while the later, in his view, is *madhhab-i-Hanafi*. For further details: See; Idem, *Rasa'il wa Masa'il*, 05:247-260.

- ¹³ Mawdudi, *Islami Riyasat*, 577 ¹⁴ Ibid., 579.
¹⁵ Mawdudi, *Al-Jihad fi 'l Islam*, 106. ¹⁶ Ibid., 107.
¹⁷ Ibid. ¹⁸ Ibid.
¹⁹ Ibid., 108. ²⁰ Ibid.
²¹ Ibid., 109. It is interesting to note that Mawdudi relies for his views on munkar and reformative wars on a single hadith reported in *Sahih Muslim* by Abi Sa'id al-Khudri "Whoever amongst you sees an evil, he must change it with his hand; if he is unable to do so, then with his tongue; and if he is unable to do so, then with his heart; and that is the weakest form of Faith". For the English Version: see; Muslim b. Hajjaj al-Nishapuri, *Sahih Muslim*, The Book of Miscellany, Hadith No. 184.
²² The Qur'an calls the Pharaoh 'mufsid', i.e. corrupt and the ground for this title are: he was arrogant and used to discriminate among citizens leading to unrest and creation of a class system which he then exploited in his favor; he used to kill those who were weak and poor; he used to prevent people from accepting the truth and following the right path; he conquered a defenseless and helpless nation and enslaved them; he used to declare himself the lord of his people and was ruling over them merely by virtue of his power while the rule is that the right to lead belongs to those that fear Allah and are just and fair in their dealings; he diluted intellectual and moral status of his nation to an extent that they lost the sense of right and wrong and accepted to live as his slaves; his government was established on unjust and wrong foundations. See, Ibid., 109, 111.
²³ Thamud were called corrupt because their leaders and rulers were tyrannical and unjust but they used to follow their commands without feeling of guilt; they never wanted to know the truth and to see their real face so much so that they planned to kill a messenger who was sent to them. The messenger wanted to prevent them from committing wrongs and guided them to the right path. See, Ibid., 112.
²⁴ 'Ad's charge sheets contained these crimes: they used to follow unjust and despot leaders; they themselves were tyrant and had no hope of doing justice. Ibid.
²⁵ The nation of the Prophet Lut is also declared to be a mufsid because they, as a nation, were involved in acts of unnatural lust or sodomy, committing dacoity on highways, and proudly and openly discussing their immoral acts.

- No one was permitted to stop them from doing any of these acts. Ibid., 113.
- ²⁶ Residents of Madyan are declared mufsid because they were corrupt and fraud and their businesses were run through corrupt and unfair practices. They used to rob convoys on highways passing through their territory, prevent people from following the right track which their Prophet (peace be on him) used to preach and invite people to, and they conspired to stone to death the Prophet (peace be on him) sent to them only because he stopped them from committing these immoral and unethical acts and invited them to the track of haqq (righteousness). Ibid., 114.
- ²⁷ Ibid.
- ²⁸ Ibid., 115.
- ²⁹ Ibid., 116.
- ³⁰ Mawdudi, *Al-Jihad fi 'l Islam*, 117; Idem, *Khutbat 5—Haqiqat- i-Jihad* (Lahore: Idara Tarjuman al-Qur'an, 1989), 4-5.
- ³¹ The Qur'an 47:38.
- ³² The Qur'an 04:133. This discussion raises a question. If the status of ruler of the world is given to the nation of the Prophet (peace be on him) by Allah Almighty, how can it be given to some other nation? Hence, for the sake of argument, even if Muslims fail in fulfilling their duty, they will remain to be the "incompetent" leaders for at least they have faith in Allah Almighty and the last Prophet (peace be on him). The issue of replacing them by a people who will be different does not fit here and weak Muslims will be replaced by committed Muslims and therefore the leadership will remain within the same nation.
- ³³ Mawdudi, *Al-Jihad fi 'l Islam*, 146-147. It is important to highlight that in these arguments and others like these, Mawdudi has ignored the Qur'anic style of discussion and its particular methodology. The Holy Qur'an uses a word and elaborates its traits and particulars in different place as per the demands of context of the verses; Mawdudi takes them to mean that every trait or feature is in itself equivalent of the term being used which is not the case. For instance, if the holy Qur'an declares a community to have been guilty of fasad (corruption), and then asserts that they were robbers, and, they were cheating each other, and, they were used to commit fraud in scale/weighing goods, Mawdudi would conclude that fasad means committing robbery, cheating, fraud and everyone who committed any one or more of these acts are guilty of fasad and hence are enemies of Allah. This is not always the case.
- ³⁴ Mawdudi, *Al-Jihad fi 'l Islam*, 117; Idem, *Haqiqat-i-Jihad*, 7.
- ³⁵ Mawdudi, *Al-Jihad fi 'l Islam*, 118.
- ³⁶ Ibid., 119; *Haqiqat-i-Jihad*, 7-8.
- ³⁷ Mawdudi, *Al-Jihad fi 'l Islam*, 120.
- ³⁸ He, in another place, claims that the word din has four major literal connotations: **a.** sovereignty, authority, subduing others to respect one's

authority; **b.** submission, respect for master's authority, feeling subdued to one's authority; **c.** system, Law, custom and traditions and finally; **d.** sanctions, settlement of disputes, accountability. For more details: See; Mawdudi, *Qur'an ki Char Bunyadi Istilahain* [Four Fundamental Terms of the Qur'an] (Lahore: Islamic Publications (Pvt.) Ltd., 2009), 99-101.

³⁹ The first kind of situation where Muslims are obliged to take up arms and defend their faith, territory and autonomy according to Mawdudi is when Muslims army will have to fight in the way of Allah against those that destabilize Islamic States and demoralize Muslim communities. *Ibid.*, 81.

⁴⁰ Mawdudi, *Tafhim al-Qur'an*, vol. 2, at 172.

⁴¹ Mawdudi, *Al-Jihad fi 'l Islam*, 121.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 120.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 121.

⁴⁴ Islam divides the citizens of Islamic State into two categories: Muslims and dhimmis. While Muslims are those citizens who have attained citizenship of Dar al-Islam via their faith; dhimmis are those citizens who have attained it through permanent residence in Dar al-Islam. In other words, dhimmis are non-Muslim citizens of an Islamic State who take an oath of allegiance to its laws irrespective of whether they were born therein or have been given the said status upon request. For a detailed analysis: See; Mawdudi, *Islami Riyasat*, 323.

⁴⁵ Mawdudi, *Al-Jihad fi 'l Islam*, 122. ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 123. ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ Mawdudi relies on his peculiar interpretation of Qur'anic texts, the notion of 'enjoining virtue and forbidding evil', and the principle of 'doing for others what one prefers for himself' to justify his theory of reformative wars. This notion has been used by militants and violent groups in the world as means of legalization of violence against Muslims and non-Muslims alike. They claim that fitnah and fasad everywhere must be stopped through use of force. In the context of Afghanistan for instance, the Armed Opposition Groups (AOGs) claim that due to rampant corruption in the government, indecency portrayed on media and explicitly or impliedly approved by the people and widespread immoral activities justify their war and fight against the government as well as the people.

⁵⁰ Mawdudi, *Al-Jihad fi 'l Islam*, 117-118

⁵¹ Mawdudi, *Islami Riyasat*, 58; *Idem*, *Tafhimat*, 108.

⁵² *The Qur'an* 08:61-62

⁵³ Though it is claimed that this verse has been superseded, there exists no evidence to this fact, and Imam ||abari has denounced such claim as being against the Qur'an, Sunnah of the Prophet (peace be on him) and dictates of reason.

⁵⁴ Mawdudi, *Tafhim al-Qur'an*, vol. 01, note 71-72 at 570-571.

⁵⁵ *Tarjuman al-Qur'an*, July-October 1944.

- ⁵⁶ Mawdudi, Taffhim al-Qur'an, vol. I, note 313, at 209.
- ⁵⁷ Mawdudi, Khilafat o Mulukyat, 52-53.
- ⁵⁸ The Qur'an 02:193.
- ⁵⁹ He, in another place, claims that the word din has four major literal connotations: **a.** sovereignty, authority, subduing others to respect one's authority; **b.** submission, respect for master's authority, feeling subdued to one's authority; **c.** system, Law, custom and traditions and finally; **d.** sanctions, settlement of disputes, accountability. For more details: See; Mawdudi, Qur'an ki Char Bunyadi Istilahain [Four Fundamental Terms of the Qur'an] (Lahore: Islamic Publications (Pvt.) Ltd., 2009), 99-101.
- ⁶⁰ Mawdudi, Rasa'il wa Masa'il, 04:146, 03:24-25.
- ⁶¹ Muhammad Yahya Nu'mani, Islam ka Tasawwur-e-Jihad: Chand Tawdihat, in Jihad: Klasiki aur 'Asri Tanazur Main (Jihad between Classic and Contemporary Thought) (Gujranwala: Al-Shari'ah Academy, 2012), 26-27.
- ⁶² The Qur'an 02:190-193. (Emphasis added).
- ⁶³ Mawdudi, Al-Jihad fi 'l Islam, 93. Idem, Tahrik Azadi Hind aur Musalman (Lahore: Islamic Publications (Pvt.) Ltd., 2013), 02:352. In other place however, Mawdudi confines this obligation to society and State than being a universal duty that Muslims shall fulfill in every corner of the world. Idem, Khilafat-o-Mulukyat, 77.
- ⁶⁴ Mawdudi, Al-Jihad fi 'l Islam, 109.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid., 98.
- ⁶⁶ Ibid., 93.
- ⁶⁷ The Qur'an 61:02
- ⁶⁸ Ibid., 104.
- ⁶⁹ The Qur'an 08:72-73.
- ⁷⁰ Mawdudi, Al-Jihad fi 'l Islam, 104.
- ⁷¹ Ibid., 109.
- ⁷² The Qur'an 05:32.
- ⁷³ The Qur'an 09:48.
- ⁷⁴ Mawdudi, Al-Jihad fi 'l Islam, 105.
- ⁷⁵ The Qur'an 07:54-56.
- ⁷⁶ Ammar Khan Nasir, Jihad: Aik Mutali'ah, 314-316.
- ⁷⁷ The Qur'an 04:131-133.
- ⁷⁸ Ammar Khan Nasir, Jihad: Aik Mutali'ah, 320-321.
- ⁷⁹ Muhammad Yahya Nu'mani, Islam ka Tasawwur-e-Jihad: 26-27.
- ⁸⁰ Mawdudi, Al-Jihad fi 'l Islam, 106.
- ⁸¹ Muhammad Yahya Nu'mani, Islam ka Tasawwur-e-Jihad, 35-36.
- ⁸² Mawdudi, Khilafat-o-Mulukyat, 15.
- ⁸³ The Qur'an 04:75.
- ⁸⁴ The Qur'an 04:97-99. Qaradawi, Fiqh al-Jihad: Dirasah Muqarana Li Ahkamihi wa Falsafatihi fi 'l Qur'an wa al-Sunnah (Cairo: Wahba Library, 2009), 02:934.