CHAPTER V
CLOSING

A. Conclusions

Qutb’s writings show his uncompromising commitment to the sacred text. It is self-evident to Qutb that if the Qur’an contains a message, then human beings must implement that message. Qutb was so clear on this in his own mind that it never occurred to him that Muslims, living in historical time, reinterpret their tradition and their past in the context of their contemporary historical circumstances. Qutb plainly held the view that Islam is timeless body of ideas and practices. Thus, there is no excuse, in his mind, for people’s failure to adhere to it. This failure is a matter of brazen. Self-conscious refuses to accept God’s word and not a question of hermeneutical discourse.

One key to Qutb’s overall social and political program is its organicism and connotation of corporatism. This is interesting in view of his explicit rejection of Greek thought and Islamic Neoplatonic philosophy, themselves steeped in corporate and organic assumptions about society. More specifically, Qutb believed that Muslims cohere in a quid deity, which he calls al-tajammu’al-harâki (dynamic concrescence). This entity is in fact the embodiment of the ummah, which is reified into a living organism with attributes of thought and behavior. The success of this dynamic concrescence lies in its acceptance of the trust given to it by Allah to master the world and benefit for its resources, but the purpose of this mastery is to obey the sovereign commands, the hâkimiyyah, of Allah.

Reflecting the ideas of Mawdudi, Qutb focused on the so-called hâkimiyyah verses of the Qur’an (5.44, 45, and 47): “Those who do not judge according to what Allah has revealed are unbelievers…oppressors…sinners”. Qutb, in what his opponents regard to be a reprehensible innovation (bid’ah), given centuries of precedent set by commentators on the Qur’an, reinterpreted
these verses by changing the meaning of the verb *yahkumu* from “judge” to “rule”, thereby implicitly sanctioning collective action to dismiss a ruler who failed to apply Allah’s revelations. Muslims who are actively engaged in the dynamic community of faith are thus mandated not only to apply Allah’s laws as he has revealed them, but they are authorized and even commanded to replace any leaders who fail to do so. Invoking authoritative opinions of jurists from earlier centuries, especially those of Taqi al-Din Ahmad ibn Taymiyah (d. 1328) against the Mongol ruler of the time, Qutb and his supporters came to the view that Islam made armed resistance to nominally Muslim rulers who were deemed to be anti-Islamic not only permissible or laudatory but mandatory.

Qutb holds that although the dynamic concrescence is a very real phenomenon acting in society and the world, and that it experiences change has practical purposes, and is thoroughly enmeshed in the immediacy of everyday existence, the sources for its existence and behavior lie entirely outside itself and are rooted in revelation.

Qutb is not an advocate of the majesty of human reason. The apprehension of knowledge is not a matter of intellectual activity but of the reception of truths that are absolutely divine in their origins. In his perspective, the workings of discursive logic or inductive analysis are not necessary for, and are actually inimical to, the triumph of humankind in Allah’s universe. Rather, that triumph is vouchsafed by the ability and willingness of the human mind to absorb self-evident truths whose secrets are unlocked by divine texts.

Ultimately, Qutb worldview rests on a manifest ahistoricity. He is not interested in a historically grounded analysis of the development of law in Islam, for example. Rather, on finds repeated references to the primary sacred text, overwhelmingly the Qur’an, and to a much lesser extent the *hadîts* Qutb does not acknowledge that Qur’anic and *hadîts* texts might not be self-evident and that, as they are interpreted over and centuries, people might come to different conclusions as to their meanings.
Qutb agrees with the view that *nasakh* is prerogative rights of God. Admittedly, *nasakh* is associated with the dynamics of human welfare. It is considering the condition of the Prophet as model (blueprint) for the development of human society throughout the ages. The movement of human history would not be out of the frame of Arab community. For Qutb, the universality of the message of Al-Qur'an requires the existence of dynamics community patterns, during the revelation of Al-Qur'an. It is assessed by Abou Hamid Zaid ash as *Hâkimiyyah*, reinforcing the hegemony of text itself. As a consequence, the Qutb was putting the stock the historicity of revelation in social reality-with religious discourse. The whole picture of problems and answer in human history we can be found in the sacred text through the understanding of the community when the Qur'an has been sent down. The standard model is negating the human rationality relativity of the historical-structural. This view also denies the local-style in the "body" of sacred text. The implication is claiming the conceptuality of remaining superficial teachings and its message, because there has been standardization of the "material" and the applications of understanding methodology toward "the past" model. Because of such views, Qutb called a thinker who only has been romanticism of the past and the totality of the Islamic image on the past to realize the Muslims will become. Idealized image of classical Islam that "universal", is believed can be applied anytime and anywhere. Therefore, Muslims should not lean toward the West in the face of modernity, but rather should be the model of life that has been practiced in the Islamic period. Qutb would not have qualified under a classical understanding of the criteria are needed to have when writing *tafsîr*, but Qutb has different methodological and stylistic approach when commentating on the Qur’an.

How did Sayyid Qutb form the concept of *Hâkimiyya*? If we applied some of the theories that we have discussed, we should conclude that he started from the scripture because he wished to reject modernism and secularism; thus, his argument derived from theology. Others may suggest that Qutb’s ideology is the result of the political oppression existing in Egypt under the presidents
Nasser and Sadat, so that Qutb’s religious rhetoric ends in being a necessary manipulation.

Finally, Sayyid Qutb, as a member of the Muslim Brotherhood, would have behaved as a group member, so that Qutb’s ideas and actions are not actually his, but rather an expression of the in-group formed as a response to the out-group (that is, the argument of Islam versus jahiliyya). Scripturalism, in all of them, would remain the main source of Qutb’s ideology. Certainly, the Qur’an has privileged positions within Qutb’s discourse and ideology. Yet Sayyid Qutb has used it and its verses as a context rather than actually deriving his ideology from them; so much that even a scholar such as Yusuf al-Qaradawi has criticized his approach to the Qur’an as selective and unsophisticated extremely, if not misleading. The impression, while reading Qutb’s works such as Social Justice in Islam (1970) and the most famous Milestones (2005), is that he juxtaposes particular verses to his way of thinking and viewing the world. Several in-depth studies have been devoted to the ideas, terminology and ideology of Qutb both in the form of extended articles and recently in specific monographs, which explore the formation of his ideology. The writer suggests, however, that to understand Qutb, we need to look at his life and his environment.

It is during this captivity that Sayyid Qutb would continue to write and update previous works. Among them, he started to plan ma’alim fi al-tariq (Milestones, Qutb 2005), which he successfully published between 1964 and 1966, while he was enjoying a brief period of freedom. However, it was a freedom that Milestones itself would bring to a tragic end. In this book, what was Qutb’s Manichean vision of the world became fully developed, with ordinary Muslims being included in the category jâhily (barbaric, part of jâhiliyya) other than if they demonstrated being fully the slaves of Allah. This total surrender to Allah’s law (that is, Sharia) does not exclude the leader of the nation, who cannot be considered above the divine law. To obtain this, Qutb says, the ummah needs an elite, a vanguard, which detaching from the jâhili society, emotionally rather than physically (’uzla shu’âriyya) can then lead the
society towards the real dignity of being a human being. This dignity can only exist if justice is implemented, and justice can only exist if Allah’s law is respected. Qutb was re-arrested, despite his very precarious health condition and, after a trial, sentenced to death by hanging.

B. Suggestions

Sayyid appeal rests on its author’s adroit use of literary methods to generate interest in an ideologically charged interpretation of the Qur’an. It conditions its adherents to see a bipolar world of difference and division pit between pure Islam and modern paganism. Great appreciation given to Sayyid Qutb by the Islamic world because of his contribute towards Islam, both in thinking and leadership, but does not preclude suggestions of his thought.

1. The implementation of the assessment of jāhiliyyah by Qutb is something that does not fair those found in contemporary Muslim society, in history is not appropriate, if it is equated with ignorance in Mecca Muslim when the first da’wah appeared. If we must use the terminology of jāhiliyyah, it must be not total but partial. There is the light of Islamic teaching in the body of this ummah. The key word between Jahl (unknown) and jahiliyyah (ignorance) are different.

2. Qutb did not need an opinion about the development of fiqh. Da’wah did not have to be elitist (just aspect vanguard cadre ranks), but also touched the masses. Massa, society in general, has the actual problems themselves. This actual problem must find its solution in Islam. Is the task of jurisprudence to guide them and provide solutions in Islamic corridor for the actual problems? Fiqh with his instruments is a principle of ijtihad as a movement within Islam. Muslim communities cannot escape from the common problems to humanity of mankind. Problems of poverty, unemployment, political justice as is the humanitarian problems that will always are an integral part of a community. Therefore, that is the responsibility for providing direction of fiqh for the problems.
3. Debate between defensive or offensive to the concept of jihad, for writer is a debate that was not positive. Jihad has his own rules, based on *fiqh*. Who is entitled to move the jihad, how the jihad carried out, it is be regulated by *fiqh*.

4. If we apply the conception of Qutb (without prudence) on the history of Islam then we could fall on the assessment or unfairly harsh on the history of the race. We could fall on the assessment that Islam in its history only applies to the prophetic or *Khulafaur Rasyidin* or just until the time of Umar only, because after that is not found in the history of Muslims that in the contemporary ideal. This is of course a contradiction with the substance of Qutb's thought on Islam as a solution to the problems of humanity.

5. We must also note Social implications of the implementation of the concept the Qutb. Without be careful, we can be easier to do *takfir*. *Takfir* could easily become the basis for the violence. Of course, the social implications rather than deliberate planned by the thinker. Social implications arise because of many factors that we cannot control directly.