

Editorial

An extensive corpus of literature on the phenomenon of the Islamic movement as a reaction to modernization and modernity has appeared during the past two decades. In this important category of research, Islamic discourse and its sociopolitical impact may be explained in terms of the growing sense of alienation and exclusion generated by the changes of modern times. As a result, a dichotomous model of analysis has been widely employed in many of the recent approaches to Islam and Muslims, a model that pits the "modern," "progressive," and "rational" against the "traditional," "reactionary," and "emotional."

In contrast, only a few attempts have been made to understand contemporary Islamic discourse(s) and movements as the quintessential products of the modernization process in the Muslim world. The case for this alternative, though complementary, approach can be formulated on the basis of a sociocultural analysis of the views and backgrounds of modern Islamists.

For more than thirteen centuries of its history, Islam was defined intellectually and practically by the ulama class. This vital and pervasive social force, although open and accessible to various sections of society, was not without its own boundaries in the areas of culture, education, or piety. Progressively, of course, and for reasons that cannot be dealt with here, the ulama class was transformed into an established social institution and preserved by families with long scholarly traditions and a complex network of a particular kind of power.

Twentieth-century Islamists are, by and large, graduates of modern (western?) schools who have received intensive training in modern disciplines and methodologies. Their breeding milieu, in most cases, are modern urban centers in the Muslim world and modern social classes. Thus they have little to do with the ancient institution of the ulama. In fact, their advent has marked an era of decline for the ulama class. Traditional Islam, or that of the ulama, has been and will always be a strong tributary to contemporary Islamic thought and its world vision. But the latter's idioms, logic, symbols, structural relations, inner dynamics, and ultimate goals are necessarily of modern genealogy.

In this issue of *AJISS*, A. I. Tayob presents a brilliant study on the "Paradigm of Knowledge of the Modern Islamic Resurgence." Grounding his analysis on Foucault's themes of power relations between disciplines,

knowledge, and modern society, and on Kuhn's discussion of paradigm and paradigm shift, Tayob embarks on a compelling journey to unmask the intellectual system of modern Islam. Tayob observes conclusively that, as a paradigm, this system "has the power to legitimate, explore, and exclude." A. A. Abdel Rahman ("An Islamic Perspective on Organizational Motivation"), L. Safi ("Leadership and Subordination: An Islamic Perspective"), and M. I. Anjum ("An Islamic Scheme of Equitable Distribution of Income and Wealth") are all Muslim social scientists with a special focus on the Islamization of Knowledge concept. Their approach to their subject matter is rooted, on the one hand, in Islamic texts and traditions while, on the other hand, it branches out to respond to the demands and imperatives of modern times. More importantly, one can discern easily in their essays, as well as in that of T. J. al 'Alwānī ("Missing Dimensions in Contemporary Islamic Movements"), the evolving convergence of Islamic thought and the study of Islam, as the borders between the two fields are becoming increasingly insignificant.

This issue's final article is by M. A. Chaudhary, who writes on "Orientalism on Variant Readings of the Qur'an: The Case of Arthur Jeffrey." With a great deal of patience and erudition, Chaudhary dissects, questions, and responds meticulously to the old-fashioned orientalist's analyses of variant Qur'anic codices. No less important is Chaudhary's mastery of Qur'anic Arabic and his knowledge of the early Islamic geo-cultural environment. These features distinguish this pertinent contribution within the field of Qur'anic studies.

We would like to take this opportunity to clarify a matter in the last issue. Dr. Zafar Ishaq Ansari, who authored the article "Islamic Thought in the South Asian Subcontinent: The Eighteenth Century," extends his deepest apology for an error committed in his paper. Dr. Ansari has informed us that the idea of the seminar arose in several discussions with his colleagues but that the actual statement was drafted by Professor Muhammad Khalid Masud of IIU Pakistan's Islamic Research Institute. He not only ably expressed the basic idea of the seminar but also added a great wealth of detail. It is a contribution for which the credit should go to him. We would also like to mention that the research note "Islamization of Social Sciences in Nigeria: Problems and Prospects," which appeared in the last issue, had a co-author whose name was omitted: Umar Chika Aliyu, Lecturer, Department of Economics, Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Sokoto, Nigeria.

In conclusion, we would like to inform our contributors once again that they must follow the manuscript guidelines outlined at the beginning of this journal. Such articles will be given precedence over all others due to the time required to prepare each issue of the journal.