INTRODUCTION

It is hardly necessary to emphasize that the conflicts within Muslim countries have several causes. Various countries have different complexes of conditions that lead to social conflict. Each Islamic country has its special problematic. One may focus upon a variety of conditions when approaching the political tensions and violent phenomena in different Muslim countries: weak economic development, lack of modernisation, weak state institutionalisation, restricted political freedom, lack of competition, patronage and clienteleism, clan rule, etc.

It is a usual to encounter approaches that focus upon retarded modernization or the onlingering legacy of traditional or semi-authoritarian rule involving sometimes charismatic rulership. Recently, much attention among scholars have dealt with political Islam. The perspectives upon political Islam differs from one scholar to another. One may distinguish between at least three basic views.

− According to the positive perspective, the Muslim Brotherhood and other Salafist groups are in reality highly modern, functionally speaking. They add to social capital, fuelling trust in neighbourhoods, assisting people in need.
− On the contrary, the negative view looks upon the MB as reactionary and anti-democratic forces that hinder social progress and economic development.
− Finally, the neutral perspective upon these fundamentalist groups see them as undeniable social facts and they are to be provided a definitive role in any process of democraatisation.

In the literature, it is often pointed out that the different movements labelled “Salafis” or “fundamentalist” display great variety in terms of both tactics and strategy. The belief system of various salafist groups can be analysed from various points of view. Thus, for instance it has been much debated whether MB is reconcilable with the priciples of contributional democracy. The actual experince of combining islamisatin with democracy differs from one country to another, often in a manner that express different country legacies as much as the choice of strategy and tactic by the actors involved. One may contrast Turkey with Egypt or Tunisia with Pakistan.

Instead of looking at the idea of Islamisation from the part of view of a Western political ideology, one may see these nations from the perspective of Islamic philosophy. The philosophy of islam is vart, complicated and much more intriguing than the religion Islam, according to the standard for the interpretation in the figure. The aim of these short notes, of necessity incomplete and abstract, is to employ an insight by Italian A. Gramsci on the so-called superstructure of society, from the idea of social hegemony.

Islamic philosophy ranges from complete identification with religion to an aleistic perspective, according to which the koren is entirely man made. Philosophical speculation form an integral part within Islamic sciences. Just as great progress was made in areas such as medicine, astronomy, arithmetics and geography, so also philosophy. The question that one has to pose is the following: Does the ideological hegemony of the MB and Salafist groups give islamic philosopgy its proper place? If the fundamentalist movements aiming at Gramscian type political hegemony, like the ISIS or ISIL fail to recognize the relevance of Islamic philosophy then an entirely different type of critique will be highly relevant.

ALEPPO : ON THE BRUTAL POLITICAL STRUGGLE IN ISLAMIC COUNTRIES

When reflecting upon the policies conducted in Islamic countries, especially from the point of view of conflict, one cannot refrain from the observation of the almost omnipresence of violence. The occurrence of political violence is extremely high not only in countries in civil war – Afghanistan and Syria – but also in a number of other Islamic countries: Iraq, Egypt, Lybia, Iran, Pakistan and Indonesia. Conflict among interests is to be found in each and every country, but one needs to distinguish between violent and peaceful evolution of conflict of interests. Why such brutality inMuslim conflicts ?

We must now ask : Why do Muslims kill each other, men, women and children? For political reasons that is. It is a most pertinent question, as other civilisations like the Christian or Buddhist ones, have found a set fo stable mechanisms for the handling of conflicts of interest. What is ven worse is that some of these conflicts are handled in a most brutal manner – against Moslem women, children and innocent men.

Conflicts among human beings have either materialistic
or idealistic causes or reasons. In the very violent confrontations in Islamic countries, materialistic motives no doubt play a major role: economic advantages or opportunities, political power and influence, social prestige and veneration from others, etc. Here, however, we shall concentrate upon the idealistic motivation, i.e. The ongoing ideological struggle in the Islamic civilisation.

RELIGION: INNER-WORDLY AND OUTER-WORDLY PERSPECTIVES

The most debated and referred to book in the social sciences ever is without doubt Max Weber's study on Protestantism and Capitalism. The first presentation of the so-called Weber thesis came in 1904 and many new editions have been published, with one as recently as this year 2016. Presented in German, it has been traslated into the major langages of the world, Debated endlessly and criticised at length, the final evaluation is still to come. Weberians like Talcott Parsons and Edward Shils (« idealists ») as well as many compaative religion scholars s (von Glasenapp) support his thesis, whereas Marxists tend to reject it straightforward completely, preferring to turn him upside down (« materialists ») - Tawney, Rodinson. A fine study by Swedish economist Kurt Samuelsen (1964) took the position in-between, saying there was no relationship at all, neither from Protestantism to Capitalism nor the other way around.

Here, I will suggest an entirely different solution and approach to the analysis of civilisation differences today, recasting the Weber thesis about the rise of modern capitalist spirit from the ethics of Beruf, i.e. Calvinism and Lutheranism. What forces us to entirely rethink Wber's civilisation argument is the ongoing implosion of the biggest civilisation in the world, Islam. Islam is at war with itself in many Muslim countries with unimaginable suffering for Moslems. And it has started a most violent vendetta against the West for interfering in the wars of Muslim civilisation.

WEBER'S UNIQUE METHODOLOGY

Following the 1904 booklet on Prostantism and Capitalism was a long series of publications on religion and its social consequences, collected after his death in 1920 into a 3-volume publication, re-edited in 1988. One finds passages on religion and social systems in other major works by Weber, as he was convinced that religious had a profound impact upon social action, not reducible to the Marxist thesis of ideological rationalisation and camouflage off the « real » and true economic interests at stake. Thus, to defend his thesis about the rise of modern capitalism, he engaged in vast studies of the world religions and their business ethics. Islam was examined in his opus major: Economy and Society (1978) – to this unsurpassed inquiry in political sociology.

He engaged a set of methodological principles, derived from German post-Kantian philosophy of science that are to found in almost all his enquiries, although never explicitly put down in a text-book form. Weber mastered universalhistory, German economics, jurisprudence and the social sciences. Thus, we have the following steps in his conduct of any inquiry:
1) Modelling : Weber's ideal-types or “ideal-typus” ;
2) Intention and motivation : the rejection of English behaviourism and the emphasis of subjective meaning : « Sinn » and « Sinnzusammenhänge » ;
3) Empirical verification : grasping the essential features, outlined in the ideal-types, as they unfold empirically, i.e. in the myriad of data.

This is Kantianism writ large : no model, data is amorphous ; no data, the model is empty. Completely neglected is Weber's anti-behaviourism of the standard American kind: social life consists of words and objects, ideas are just attitudes or signs, etc. Weber claimed that ideas play a major rôle in social life, and one must pay attention to the content and logic of the human ideas, i.e. Sinnzusammenhänge. Yet, Weber certainly also rebutted Hegelianism, as ideas are important to real life only through their actual impact upon real behaviour and real human relationsips.

Consequently, he changed the study of religious beliefs by underlining the necessity to grasp their logicness on the level of subjective meaning. Of course, religious believers adhere to the notion of objective meaning for their notions, but this Weber regarded as mere superstition. Thus, his inquiry comprised the following steps, when approaching the world religions :
a) Subjective meaning of the religion, to be found among its virtuosi ;
b) Subjective meaning of modern capitalism ;
c) Degree of logical coherence between a) and b) ;
d) Empirical verification through data on believers and capitalists, micro /famous people) as well as macro (countries).

He death lengthy along these lines a)-d) with Protestantism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism and Taoism as well as Judaism. But in his many books one finds similar type arguments about Islam, Orthodoxy and Catholic religion. He shared many of the prejudices of the time against animism, sharmanism and the Orient (« orientalism », regarding monoetism as more rational than other kinds of religious belief

ZWEI “HEIDELBERGER FEHLER »

Weber focussed upon the economic effects of the world religions, searching for the origins of modern capitalism, which he equated with the requirements of rationality or modernisation. Of the link he suggested in 1904-05 – Protestantism and market economy, there remains nothing today, as other civilisations or economic centres display presently as much, if not more economic dynamism than the Western ones. Let us instead search for civilisation effects outside of the global economic system, within politics, following another Weberian piste, and a more fruitful one.

Weber saw modern capitalism, or the institutions of the market economy, as the giant difference maker among the civilisations of the world, resulting in economic rationality meaning affluence and power. If capitalism is merely a motivation force (greed), then it has always existed as the
incessant search for economic advantages, profits and success. However, if “capitalism” stands for a set of institutions, or rules, then one may wish to enumerate a number of different types of capitalisms during known history: ancient, state, feudal, prebendal, modern, financial, etc. Weber summed up his position as follows:

“It is only in the modern Western world that rational capitalistic enterprises with fixed capital, free labor, the rational specialization and combination of functions, and the allocation of productive functions on the basis of capitalistic enterprises, bound together in a market economy, are to be found.” (Weber, 1978: 165)

But the institutions of modern capitalism can be exported and adopted by other civilisations, learned and refined, which is exactly what occurred in the 20th century. Thus, even if Protestantism, or Protestant ethics had something to do with the origins of modern capitalism in the West – i.e. economic rationality or overall rationality (“Entzauberung der Welt”), which tough remains an essentially contested issue, it could never guarantee any persisting advantage. Today, modern capitalism, at least when measured in terms of output, is perhaps stronger in East and South East Asia, with a few strongholds also within Islam, like for instance the UEL, Koweit and Qatar.

Now, let us turn to Weber’s chief accomplishment in political sociology, namely that he identified four types of political regimes: naked power, traditional, charismatic and legal-rational authority – a most often used typology also today. However, he was not clear about the nature of the last type, linking wrongly - I wish to argue - legal-rational authority with his ideal-type model of bureaucracy. Typical of legal-rational authority is, I would wish to emphasize, government based upon rule of law. Let us first state the definition of “legal authority” from Weber:

“The validity of the claims to legitimacy may be based on: 1. Rational grounds – resting on a belief in the legitimacy of enacted rules and the rights of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands (legal authority).” (Weber, 1978: 215)

The key terms in this general definition is rules or institutions. Yet, he moves on to equate legal-rational authority with bureaucracy:

“The purest type of exercise of legal authority is that which employs a bureaucratic administrative staff.” (Weber, 1978: 220).

Yet, bureaucracy, as a mechanism for carrying out the policies of rulers has, historically speaking, never operated according to the Weberian ideal-type. Bureaucracies have been invaded by affective ties, embezzlement, tribal loyalties and opportunistic selfishness in search of turf. 20th century research into the bureaucratic phenomenon has resulted in numerous findings that question the applicability of Weber’s bureaucracy model. As a matter of fact, bureaucracies can support traditional domination, as within Chinese Empires or Ottoman Rulership. It may also figure prominently in charismatic rulership, as with The Third Reich or the Soviet State.

Legal-rational authority emerges in a state that honours rule of law. This involves the employment of LAW, both in high politics and in low politics. It differs from all other forms for the exercise of political power by complying with norms and by offering ways to correct abuses of these norms. Thus, this regime is not only legal but also rational in the meaning of the introduction and observation of a set of norms that are secular in nature, protecting the common best of the political community. Kant called this state a Rechtsstatt. It is the core meaning of the model of legal-rational authority, and not bureaucracy as with Weber. And rule of law is the great difference make among the civilisations in today's world.

UNIVERSAL RULE OF LAW AND THE DEVIANT CIVILISATIONS

The World Bank with its Governance Project of has made a tremendous effort at quantifying the occurrence of rule of law, employing all the indices in the literature – see the methods Appendix in Governance project (Kaufmann et al.). The findings are summerized in a scale ranging from +2 to -2 that is a ratio scale. Table 1 presents the aggregated scores for the civilisations, introduced above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civilisations</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>-.75477454</td>
<td>.38326537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>-.53253257</td>
<td>.64282829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Muslim NON ARA</td>
<td>-.72383263</td>
<td>.56132328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>-.8007729</td>
<td>.62152856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>-.36380348</td>
<td>.71516745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>.67479719</td>
<td>.96326657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>-.18484119</td>
<td>.78842261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>-.00737586</td>
<td>.35506152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>-.18705963</td>
<td>.63026857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>1.1971761</td>
<td>.66793566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.10664712</td>
<td>.96442144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: World Bank: Governance Project

One may employ Diagram 1 to portray the same findings as in Table 1. It should perhaps be pointed out that poverty accounts to some extent for the disrespect for due process of law – see Diagram 1.
However, culture also matters in the form of civilisations, especially Islam and Buddhism, and Orthodoxy – negatively – as well as Calvinism and Lutheranism – positively.

RL cannot be introduced or upheld in a country with considerable tribalism and clan structures. Similarly, RL is not feasible in a country where Sharia has constitutional status. In many countries in the African and Asian civilisations there is both ethnic diversity and Islam.

One may employ the regression technique in order to examine the impact of these factors upon rule of law RL:

- Ethnicity: The fragmentation of a country into different ethnic groups (language, race);
- Religion: The proportion of Muslims in country population; the proportion of Buddhist/Confucians in the country population;
- Affluence: GDP in 2010.

Table 2 displays the findings from an estimation of a regression equation.

### Table 2. Regression model for rule of law (RL) (N = 162)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B   Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta   t   Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-4.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln2010</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>-1.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budd2000</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rule of law, whether combined with any form of democracy – referendum type, parliamentary type, presidential dispensation – or not, as in semi-democratic countries that are one pary states, comprises (Raz, 2009):

Predictability: Public law when properly implemented makes it possible for people to increase the rationality of behaviour. They know what rules apply, how they read as well as how they are applied consistently. This is very important for the making of strategies over a set of alternatives of action.

Transparency: Societies operate on the basis of norms prohibiting, obligating or permitting certain actions in specific situations. Rule of law entails that these norms are common knowledge as well as that they are not sidestepped by other implicit or tacit norms, known only to certain actors.

Due Process of Law: When conflicts occur either between individuals or between persons and the state, then certain procedures are to be followed concerning the prosecution, litigation and sentencing/incarceration. Thus, the police forces and the army are strictly regulated under the supervision of courts with rules about investigations, seizure, detainment and prison sentencing. No one person or agency can take the law into their own hands.

Fairness: Rule of law establishes a number of mechanisms that promote not only the legal order, or the law, but also justice, or the right. For ordinary citizens, the principle of complaint and redress is vital, providing them with an avenue to test each and every decision by government, in both high and low politics. Here one may emphasize the existence of the Ombudsman, as the access to fairness for simple people. People have certain minimum rights against the state, meaning that government respects obligations concerning the protection of life and personal integrity. Thus, when there is due process of law – procedural or substantive – one finds e.g. the habeas corpus rights.

The civilisation that deviates the most from the Koranic fundamentalism or radical Islam. It remained like this for centuries with fighting manly between Sunnis and Shias, as well as among Sunnis and among Shias. Or conflicts between states adhering to Sunni or Shia creeds, like Ottomans against Iran.

Three scholars changed entirely this pattern in the 20th century. Neglecting them, and you cannot account for the rise of Islamic terrorism in e.g. France. They are:

- Maududi: complete islamisation of society;
- Qutb: re-introduction of Caliphate;
- Faraj: total jihadism.

Their texts are read all over the Moslem civilisation: prisons, madrasa, universities, colleges, mosques, etc. Until new Muslim scholars step forward rejecting their teachings, presenting a strong case for some secular version of The Koran, Koranic terrorism will only gain strength and spread, despite the war efforts against the ISIS.

Of course, Maududi, Qutb and Faraj dismiss entirely rule of law, because law can only be the Sharia: Human made law cannot trump Divine Law.

NO CULTURE HEGOMENY IN KORANIC CIVILISATION NEVER (GRAMSCI)

What the Salafist groups search – cultural hegemony – in Moslem countries and among Muslims in the West is an illusion, a mere figment of the imagination of Maududi, Qutb and Faraj. What the Gang of Three, re-interpreting The Koran completely in the second half of the 20th century, aims at is the total hegemony of Islam over Moslems everywhere, no matter what sects they belong to. This idea of ONE culture hegemony stems from Marxist Gramsci, explaining the onlingering capitalist bourgeoisie in the West and its total economic dominance. Gramsci emphasized the “Überbau” and its negative impact upon social struggle at the detriment of the poor classes.

However, Gramsci's theory of a homogenous cultural hegemony stems from his negativ fate with Italian fascism. After World War II, Western countries have open societies, according to the philosophy of Popper, where ideas are in contestation. Likewise, there has never been and will never come in to existence ONE creligious hegemony in the Koranic civilisation, because no civilisation is so split, so argumentative, so divisive into a variety of sects.

What the ISIS or ISIL is attempting is unfeasible, only resulting in unmeasurable misery for Moslems and other humans. Their blue-print of total islamisation of state and society as well the employment of total jihad against anybody, also children – DEOBANDI ISLAM – will only result in human sufferings on an un-imaginable scale. And it may not even be true Islam – who knows?
CONCLUSION

The coming of high level political violence in connection with the Moslem civilisation – inside as well as outside - has shocked the world. Its victims are to be found both in the Middle East, South Asia and in the West. Explaining ISIS and other similar factions, scholars talk about return to Medieval Salafism, expansion of Saudi Wahhabbism, and the mixture of monotheism with pre-prophet tribal practises. Wrong!

The theological and philosophical revolution by Maududi, Qutb and Faraj is legitimating Koranic terrorism today as well as the groups like ISIS. Only the Sunnis can deliver an appropriate philosophical and theological response, launching tolerant and semi-secular Islam in education facilities and society at large. Even the very knowable French experts on Islam express their surprise and indignation against political Islam they declared loosing, as well as still state their “passion” for Arabia (Syria, Egypt, Tunisia, Irak?). In general, life is badly supportable in civilisations where rule of law is absent, and there is no end to all the political violence among the Moslems. Rule of law in the sense of due legal process, rights and judicial autonomy is the difference maker between civilisations in a globalised world today. And it forbids the senseless killings of both Shias and Sunnis as well as Westeners by Moslem terrorists. With rule of law, the tragedies in Afghanistan, Ieaq and Stria would have much less likely, but the teachings of the Gang of Three continue n madrasas and universities and new martyrs are forthcoming.

Muslim beliefs can only flourish in an Open Society, where Moslems are protected by the rule of law, which is the greates invention in political thought with universal ramificatins.
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