

Pro-Islamic Neophytes Regarded as Existential “Failure” of Globalization Processes

Abstract

The article observes the modern ethno-political and religious situation formed in today's world. In the context of globalization and trans-cultural processes, the new unexplored forms of the ideology that influences social policies and procedures in the various regions of the world occurred. Primarily, these are quasi-Islamic marginalized group movements. In a pilot study, the author ponders the theme of the phenomenon of marginal quasi-religious entities.

Keywords: globalistics, multiculturalism, transculturation, quasi-confessionality, the ideology of a new terrorism.

In the Modern World, in the environment of the open and continuously widening informational space, marginalized streams emerge which transform the objects of their influence into the subjects with the deviant orientation of the ideology (world view). Such tendencies existed throughout the entire history in all the religious confessions. Most of these anomalous effects are described in literature quite thoroughly which frees us from the necessity of analyzing them scrupulously.

The problem of so called “Islamic terrorism” (it must be noted here by the way, that this term is fundamentally wrong) has always been the most important and under-investigated theme which became especially challenging and crucial nowadays. We suppose that in the basis of the problem lies the self-identification of those people who do not perceive themselves as Muslims in the traditional understanding of this term; those who either do not accept much out of the basic and normative tenets of the notion “Muslim” or do not profess any religion though identify themselves with the cultural traditions of Islam. (on the actual basis of their birth or of purely subjective reasons, which have nothing in common with the basic values of Islam).

The most general characteristics of the mentioned stratum of “non-Islamic” mode of life automatically show the essence that accepts the traditional Islam as a norm and all the rest - as deviation from this norm. In other words, those who do not follow the strict norms of the traditional Islam in their everyday life are simply excluded from the Islamic cultural discourse.

This group of people are perceived as “others” and not only in the traditional preaching houses - mosques but also in routine life.

At the same time manifestation of Islam, which penetrate existentialistic mindset of those people on the genetic and historical-cultural levels create quite specific difficulties to their sense of being. On the one hand, the life of those people passed through in endless trying “run away from the shadow of Islam” in order to adapt more easily with Western values, make re-estimation of social and cultural values and, as a result, become the subject of the really diverse community - “the open society”.

On the other hand they have to undergo explicit non-acceptance from the real followers of Islam who excommunicate them as “ the others” that hinders the process of their historical and cultural self-identification, all the more that from the viewpoint of “ the others” Islamic culture and politics significantly differ from the orientologic or any other approaches to the mentioned issues.

In “ the others” mind, Islam is first of all a historical-cultural phenomenon and as for the politics of Islam, it is a part of the system of political culture as a whole. This opinion is backed up by the fact that the majority of modern concepts “defending the Islamic culture” are based on such non-confessional features as ethnic belonging which gives us a reason to speak about Islam spreading out of its own religious boundaries.

We can agree with the opinion that among others, protection of Islam is the priority for the national movements though we do not think it possible to compare and all the more to mix nationalism with “Islamic terrorism”.

We can consider the events taking place in Iran after the Islamic revolution of 1979 as an example of the mentioned misunderstanding and mixing of the notions. Those events were related to the activities of the Opposition of the Islamic republic of Iran, as a result of the violent persecution of the political figures and well known cultural luminaries, who did not share the clericalists’ views.

In the Islamic environment “the others” are noticed but ignored; heard but not considered, as they often are not even able to articulate and formulate in the terms of Islamic lexis their discourse of social and cultural diversities to which they belong.

In accordance with the norms of the religious piety anything that the Muslim people do during all their life should be considered in the context of the Muslim religion. The assertion: “If we take the way of Islam this way will be the way to Islam despite its end” has been widely spread over Muslim people. The political constituent of this categorical imperative may be interpreted as follows: only the Muslim part of East (not other historical, ethno-cultural and confessional areas of the world) conduct the search for diversities [exclusively] within the framework of the Islamic rules aiming the development of the cultural exclusiveness of their adherents. The statement about “Islam has no alternative in the East” sounds similarly unsubstantial and contradicts with the historical realm and real interrelations of religious confessions with their cohabitation.

In the occurred situation the issue of what is exactly going on with the non-Muslim people in the East while they are looking for their cultural self-identification within the frames

of Islam remain open. And what happens with the Muslim people born in non-Muslim environment?

Trying to answer these questions resulting from the “Islamic discourse” we inevitably enter the complicated overlapping of fields of the “diversity of Islamic law.”

Intellectual activity in such “lexical-terminological labyrinth” is extremely difficult as out of the overall non-coordinated spectrum of the conflicting interpretations of any event or fact taken to analyze, we are to choose “better Islam.” On this pass an investigator (or anyone with reflecting mind who simply looks for the answers) finds only a metaphoric set of definitions: “regressive Islam”, “progressive Islam”, “quasi-Islam” and “the true Islam” and the real meaning of such definitions are no subjects to the rational interpretation.

In the given situation the intellectual energy of the inquiring reduces to quotidian and meaningless announcements of the type “this explanation differs essentially from the others”; “this explanation enables to get surprising results;” and so on. Such approaches and judgments can be illustrated by the interpretation of the notion related to the quite worn-out cliché of “Islamic feminism” in which the interpretations are not authentic to the original as far as in the Koran in the form of verse, far more ideas are articulated about the gender equality than in the Islamic-feministic interpretations of the Islamic rules and laws.

For example, what - more equal rights for women, means? Why should the rights of women be based on the edicts which give no results, only slightly normal level of equality? What supports such guideline?

The verses speaking about restrictions for women are interpreted in accordance with the official tenets. But it is known that the semantics of any word contains several meanings. Does not it mean that with regard to liberalization of the canonic definitions for the “others” the very synonyms are always chosen which bear less restrictiveness than the authentic meaning?

The notes we spoke about here by no way negate the possibilities of changes in the Islamic laws. We do not negate either the probability that future generation will introduce necessary aberrations into the institutionalized Islamic law so that the law would reflect more authentically the real situations of the modern world.

But we address our objection to those of “ the others” in Islam, who perceive the forthcoming truth only in denying the Islamic discourse as the single alternative of the existential and social life, as for them such bifurcation means splitting and losing the genetic and cultural-historical self-identification.

Actually belonging to the values based on the cultural-historical discourse of Islam, “the others” in Islam can search for the alternative to the traditional Islam only within Islam itself. However, “the others” are forced to approach the human rights and freedom only in Islamic interpretation as to the postulate without consideration of cultural relativity. By reference to the principle which is based on the assertion that “beyond the Islamic world, for sure, there the objections to our decisions can be found, nonetheless they respond to our way of life.” So called “the others” do not have any rights to object such assertions as far as the followers of the “true

Islam” are very suspicious to the attempts of re-interpretations of the canonic postulates of Islam, as to the precedents allowing manipulations with the basic Islamic values and they consider “the others” as renegades.

Liberally oriented researchers from the “non-Islamic world” should realize that “the others” in Islam have a longtime attempt to overcome the intellectual and ethic barriers and despite all the difficulties related with defending their own cultural-historical identification, adhere to the different, non-Western mindset and behavior model. However, the silent pluralism for the best case or insulting indulgency for the worst, deprives “the others” the chance to enter the discussion in the process of which they could assert their intellectual and ethic problems and reach constructive correction of their ideas.

The existing situation of intellectual vacuum provokes some kind of “cultural xenophobe” as the problems being (even unconsciously) ignored unilaterally usually tend to self-realization primary in the negative context. Maybe, such disregard of the existing problem which lays in overcoming visually nonlimited intellectual-ethic barriers is exactly the factor which provokes extreme forms of respond from the marginalized “ the others” when it seems that the intellectuals integrated in the Western society - “ the others” in Islam, commit irrational terrorist acts under egis of Islam to which such actions have nothing in common and moreover - interdict with its basic values.

The phenomenon of the modern terrorism as a social-psychological manifestation is not investigated so far either from criminal or from psychopathologic approaches. Nevertheless, there are sufficient arguments enabling to admit the factors of intellectual bifurcation and estrangement which affect the psychopathic stereotypes of potential and actual terrorists may occur not the last link in the cause-effect relations provoking the acts of aggression which cannot be motivated in rational way.

However, we admit that the situation can be far more complex than it seems from our interpretation.

“The others” on Islam do not lay their account for the imitations from the Western liberals about their participation in discussions on the issue of the place and the role of Islam on the parity conditions. Though they would not oppose to such polemic in the form of dialogue as in the process of such equitable dialog on the actual issues the characteristic supercilious condescension is not viewed as a productive method for stating the truth. At least, such dialog could be helpful in reaching patience for the opposing considerations.

Reality and effectiveness of presumable discussions are potentially guaranteed also by the fact that many of “the others” have much more in common with the representatives of the other countries, nations and religious confessions than with the citizens of the own countries. Though namely this situation creates the atmosphere of mutual suspiciousness and stable distrust.

This is the reason for which we think that the political and cultural barriers can be overcome only when the Islam defines and in articulated manner delivers its official credo

expressed in the terms and notions consistent with the categories understandable for non-Islamic science and politics.

Special attention should be paid to the correlation of the categories which stand relative to each other such as state institutions and religion. As inconsistency of their relations is the fact, nevertheless, the state institutions and religion often resort to mutual help when the full scaled crisis takes place in the society. But it is the society itself, the average citizens, who have to pay for the services, neither state institutions nor religion.

Another problem exists in constructing the space of contact for free sharing of opinions concerning the deeds of the authorities, without fear of being accused in treason. The same can be said about the right to be doubtful about any religious postulates, without the risk of being anathematized.

Any attempt of going beyond the Islamic discourse in the process of seeking the truth comes across the objection formulated in accordance with the thesis that "we have an Islamic society, within the framework of which we should seek our cultural identity". The argument can serve as the answer to this: criticizing the Islamic law it should be considered that "actually against the background of other factors (economic, historical, political and cultural) religion cannot serve as a standard measure and as a single criterion to define trueness of the estimations of a certain phenomenon.

In that case, using the language of post-modernist authors, the problematic field moves from the object towards its interpretation. But this requires introducing some admissions according to which Islam and its interpretations exist on the different taxonomy levels and horizons, not coinciding with each other.

But will the supporters of the "true Islam" agree with it?

This is exactly that space in which the main (and unsolved) contradiction concentrates occurring in the fact that those who don't identify themselves with the Islamic world inadequately understand conceptual and properly juridical limits for application of Islam. If the Islamic law is as much universal as it can solve all collisions in adequate manner which occur in the life of the society, thus it cannot be ignored only basing on the reason that there are many interpretations which don't always correspond with each other. Otherwise the definitions of the Islamic law, blurred and unclearly formed from the point of the non-Islamic discourse, would serve only very limited objectives of the analysis from the normative legislation systems not covered by the jurisdiction of the Islamic world.

It is notorious that there are quite a number of people in the Muslim world itself who are eager to make positive changes, understanding that only religion cannot carry the burden of responsibility for numerous social diseases and the injustice can be found everywhere beyond the Islamic law.

In the given situation we should proceed from the reality that it is necessary to struggle not for reforming obsolete Islamic regulations in the framework of the Islamic law, but to

conduct such reforms in accordance with the existing processes taking place in the realm of the widening world space.

Many people despite their religious confessions oppose all forms of oppression not only those which are rooted in Islam. But the Muslim people and their relatives are to be responsible for the fact that the protest against exploration and against violation of the human rights were not heard as decisive and persistent as needed.

It should also be acknowledged that today, the main opposing force impeding the social reforms is Islamic law formulation - where the law does not directly counteracts the attempts of modernization social-legislative systems, it limits them in favor of the regimes which it supports.

This is why, on the way of overcoming the normative-legislation ties, which impede obtaining the justice, democracy and civic freedoms, it is necessary also to overcome not only the absolute power usurped by the state but its main supporter - religion as the ideological essence of this power.

Surely we don't mean moratorium for applying the Islamic law and neither the strict isolation of the Islamic ideologists from the legislative and executive processes. We mean only that it is necessary to analyze the Islamic law without prejudices in its full spectrum, as the factor the limited treatment of which should be breached.

The democratic statutes should enhance consensus between the religious believers but if the defining characteristics of such consensus stand on the Islamite accents, it seems to become impossible to build liberal-democratic society on the mentioned basis.

Resume

The main conclusion driven from the presented research is the statement that in the conditions of ongoing globalization processes in the world with its dominant features of multiculturalism and transculturation, it is necessary to avoid illusions of "common egalitarianism," of "more freedom", and of unconditioned acceptance of vulgar perception of the gender equality, which serves as camouflage of feminism loyalty to the same gender marriage. All the mentioned is necessary in order to reach the aim of building of the free society.

The same can be said about the illusion that the Islamic law in its present status has enough instruments to deal with the all above mentioned issues as well as others, of the social or existentialistic character. Herewith, we should judge by the fact that the changes in many formulas do not mean simply recoding of the old law statements into the system of the terms of new regulatory laws; it means conceptual rethinking of the whole system which was originated from the obsolete corporative sense and autonomy of all the religions in the world.

Based on the given arguments we can conclude preliminarily that reaching the goals of the social equality, civilian rights and freedoms, gender equality and others, must be viewed beyond the limits of confessional law-normative legislation and especially, beyond their political interpretations.

This requirement is related with different religious confessions and ethnical-cultural groups. The future world of globalization has no alternative way but researching and cultivation of the mainstream in direction to the social structure for everybody without exception for all social cultural and confessional strata.

Anyway, unless the representatives of religious and sub-social groups armed with the political will conduct the full-scaled revision and reforms in order to make their mental and world-view paradigms consistent to the modern realms of global world.