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Abstract: In the theories of modern Islamism, the terminology of “Islamic state” has special political meanings that include: objecting to modern nation state based on national sovereignty, reestablishing the Islamic state which carries out Islamic law and Allah’s sovereignty. This article probes the theories of modern Islamism thorough analyzing the thoughts of Islamism theorists, such as Muhammad Rashid Rida, Maududi, Hassan al-Banna, Sayyid Qutb, Khomeini, and Husan al-Turabi. The common characteristics of their theories on the “Islamic state” include: they objected to national identity and advocated religious identity; they refused the secular national sovereignty and advocated Allah’s sovereignty; they opposed the separation of politics and religion and claimed to establish the Islamic state; they rejected tyranny and despotism and advocated Islamic democracy based on the principle of “consultation”.
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In the mass media and even academia in China, the general sense of the “Islamic state” usually refers to the states whose majority of population believe in Islam, which is not a strict political and legal concept, but only facts that such countries are associated with Islam, including: firstly, the main body of the residents are Muslim; second, the head of state is Muslim; third, the state respects freedom of religion, protects and promotes Islamic culture and heritage. In addition, there is a standard established by usage: the 57 Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) members are Islamic countries.

However, from a modern Islamist (also called fundamentalist in academia) point of view, the “Islamic state” has a strict political meaning. Islamism is basically opposed to the modern nation-states based on national sovereignty, and advocates rebuilding theocracies that implement Sharia law to reflect “Allah’s Sovereignty”. One of the Islamist political pursuits is to use Islam to degrade and replace secular nationalism, and to establish theocratic Islamic states. Namely, the “Islamic state is a state whose ruling must be consistent with Sharia law”, and “whose executive and legislative function and authorities must obey and assist Sharia law” (Roberts, 1988: 557). The “Islamic state” theory constitutes the guiding ideology of the Islamic political opposition against the current secular regime, and thus has an important impact on the contemporary Islamic revival movements. Therefore, this paper uses the theories of Islamist thinkers as examples to examine the historical development of the “Islamic state” theory of contemporary Islam.

I. Rashid Rida’s “Islamic state” Ideology

Mohammed Rashid Rida (1865~1935) was a famous thinker, politician and social activist of the modern Islamic world. As a representative of the Islamic reformist and a pioneer of Arab nationalism, Rashid Rida bases his theory largely on ideological nationalism and Islamic revival thought. In terms of Arab nationalism,
the most important feature of his thinking is the use of religious language in illustrating the following ideological propositions. First, he believed that the Islamic society “Umma” is composed of Arab Muslims, not including the Turkish Muslims and that they are not an integral part of the Umma. The meaning of the Umma he proposes has been very close to the modern idea of the nation-state, that is, it has grown from a community including all Muslim nations into a community of Arab Muslims. Secondly, Rida proposed the idea of Arabs against the Turks in the Ottoman Empire's claims and explained the reasons for the Arabs to oppose the Turks. He also gradually put forward the political ideas that Arabs should be separated from the Ottoman Empire. Thirdly, Rida constantly stressed the status of Arabs in Islam and pointed out that only Arabs and not Turks can take up the historic mission of “Muslim unity” (Liu, Z., 2005: 35-36).

However, Rida’s Arab nationalist ideology remains within the traditional ideology of the Middle East based within the framework of Islam. In his mind, there is still pertinaciously a “religious Motherland” of Islam, which is embodied in his “Islamic state” theory. It is precisely this theory that made him a pioneer of Islamic ideology. As a scholar said, “When Arab nationalism flourished in the Middle East, he was the only disciple of Abdul that insisted his mentor’s belief and refused to cooperate with the nationalists” (Wu, & Zhou, 2000: 252). He was “the founder of the Islamic state theory, his idea has been extended in the tenets of Islamic fundamentalism afterwards.” (Enayat, 1982: 69).

Rida’s “Islamic state” idea was a response to Kemal’s Revolution, which abolished the caliphate, and the Sudanese regime, since the abolition of the caliphate and the Sudanese regime caused a series of ideological confusion in the Muslim world: to insist on Turkish secularism and continue on the path of secularization or return to the traditional model of medieval theocracy? Should national identity be based on nationalism and patriotism or should loyalty to religious, Muslim community continue to replace loyalty to the state? Should
the development of national culture with national characteristics be promoted, or should people continue to adhere to an emphasis on the commonalities of the pan-Islamic culture?

Therefore, the above problems were the ideological confusion placed in front of the Muslim peoples. For the Arab nation, the disintegration of the Ottoman caliphate system provided a historic opportunity to achieve national independence and establish a modern nation-state, but the nostalgia of the caliphate system kept the Arab nation from getting rid of the shackles of the traditional political culture. Rashid Rida’s thought itself reflected this ambivalence. On one hand, he became an advocate of Arab nationalism, yet on the other hand, because he proposed “Islamic state”, he became the representative of the Islamic doctrine. This ambivalence to some extent was also the portrayal of common psychological hardship of the Muslim nation.

The theory of the Islamic state was interpreted in the book *The Caliphate System or the Supreme Imam System*. The publication of the book was just on the eve of victory of the Turkish Revolution. He described three main aspects of the Islamic state theory: Firstly, he explored the foundation of the caliphate in Islamic political theory. Secondly, he analyzed the divarication between the theory and practice of the Sunni Muslim political thought. Thirdly, he proposed his views on the ideal model of Islamic countries (Enayat, 1982: 69-70).

Rida first reviewed the history of the medieval Islamic caliphate system, affirmed the traditional state system as a political consultation system based on divine law. But he thought only “orthodox Khalifa regime” (632 ~ 661) reflected the real spirit of Islam, and all kinds of caliphate system after that were not worthy of the name, but only a face-lift of the feudal system. He then analyzed difficulties under the contemporary conditions in restoring the caliphate system. It was both hard to find the caliph candidates that are popular and meet the quality requirements and difficult to find the right place to serve as the
capital of the caliphate. He had imagined a spiritual caliphate system, but found it difficult to achieve. It was precisely in this predicament that he proposed the “Islamic state” as an alternative form.

Rida proposed the “Islamic state” solution based on the transformation of the traditional Islamic political doctrine. He compared the “Ideal Caliphate” and “Actual Caliphate”, and regarded that the necessity of the caliphate system lies in the fact that it helps to overcome the chaos of anarchy. However, the utilitarian purpose to safeguard unity and stability does not imply recognition of tyranny and violence. On the contrary, the caliph regime must also serve to eliminate the role of oppression and social injustice. He believed that this sacred mission should be shouldered by the respected, knowledgeable, and just jurists, namely the Ulema class. They were not only responsible for the society, but also responsible for the monarch, including using Sharia rulings to correct the fault of the rulers. But he believed that in the history of the Actual Caliphate, the feudal monarchy and conformist Ulema class distorted the ideal caliphate system, leading to social chaos and the corruption of authoritarian rulers (Enayat, 1982: 70-76). He proposed the creation of an ideal, veritable “Islamic state” political system, precisely in order to reverse this situation. For this political system, he used a variety of areas, such as “Islamic government”, “Islamic Caliphate”, “Government of Caliphate” (Enayat, 1982: 77). The basic framework of the “Islamic state” theory he proposed is (Wu, & Zhou, 2000: 254-255):

Firstly, the state passes a constitution to implement the Islamic law. The Muslim politicians deal with the state’s political, economic and social affairs according to the Quran, the Hadiths and the experience of the Arab caliphate in history. This state proposed by Rida is clearly different from the secular nation-state. The main difference is that “the state does not recognize the sovereignty of the people, and the state denies people’s legislative power” (Enayat, 1982: 77). Here he is clearly on the basis of the “sovereignty of Allah”
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concept of the Islamic tradition.

Secondly, in political life, the state implements a “consultation” system or “Islamic democracy”. Those who are with proficient knowledge of the teachings, respected and can uphold justice should elect the head of state. The latter must be familiar with Islamic law and teachings, have the ability to judge right from wrong independently, respect public opinion, make decisions and safeguard the interests of the people. He should also jointly decide on national affairs through consultations with the jurists. The discussion on the “consultation” is clearly derived from the Islamic “Shura” principle and “public discussion” principle, and the discussion about the quality of the Head of State, reflects principles about the caliphate system in Islamic political culture.

Finally, the state uses Islamic law as the guiding principle in order to reflect the will of Allah. According to this principle, jurists have a lofty position in the state’s political life, but they must adhere to the “independent judgment” principle in the interpretation of law and give flexible interpretation under contemporary conditions to enhance the vitality of the law. This shows Rida had inherited both the rational component of Afghani and Abdul’s Islamic reformist thinking and the ingredients in the fundamentalist Islamic law. For example, although he advocated that the development of the law should be flexible according to the times, he was firmly opposed to learning from foreign laws. He said: “as the grammar of a national language cannot be borrowed from that of another nation’s language, a state cannot arbitrarily adopt the laws of another state” (Enayat, 1982: 78).

In short, after comparing his ideas to the modern Islamic thinking, especially Khomeini’s Islamic government theory, similarities and sameness can be found. Rida’s Islamic reformist ideology had a major impact on Arab nationalism, and also provided a wealth of theoretical knowledge for Islamists. “His thesis provided a starting point for a change in the concept that the modern Islamic state was formulated from its earlier spiritual character to give it a totally political nature”
II. Maududi’s “Islamic State” Ideology

Abu’l Ala Maududi (1903-1979) from Pakistan was another expert among modern Islamic fundamentalist thinkers. His thoughts touched upon religion, politics, economy, society, culture, history, law, education and other aspects. Maududi’s numerous Islamic thoughts can be summarized in 10 main areas: (1) discourses based on Islamic theory; (2) exposition that al-Hakimiyya (supreme dominion) belongs to Allah; (3) discussions on Islamic law; (4) discourse on the establishment of an Islamic state and Islamic government agency; (5) discussion about Western culture; (6) discourse on democracy; (7) discourse on nationalism; (8) discourse on women; (9) discourse on interest; (10) discourse on the road to Islamic revival (Chen, J., 1998: 126-127).

On the “Islamic state” issue, Maududi was more systematic than Rida. His theoretical innovation is especially shown in that he proposed “al-Hakimiyya belongs solely to Allah” and “modern jahiliyya (state of ignorance)” and used them as a theoretical basis for an Islamic state. He established four principles that a true Islamic state must follow: the principle of sovereignty of Allah, the principle of the Prophet’s authority, and the principle of a state in which sovereignty would be exercised in the name of Allah and the principle of political consultation system. Hamid Enayat pointed out in Modern Islamic Political Thought that the core of Maududi’s Islamic state thought is that “the ideology of Islamic state is nothing than the fact that the sovereignty and ownership all belong to Allah and Allah’s law constitutes the principles of human behavior and government’s rule” (Enayat, 1982: 6).

Maududi’s Islamic state theory is mainly based on the theory of “modern jahiliyya”. “Jahiliyya” is the Arabic transliteration, and means “state of ignorance” or “obscurantism” (Chen, J., 1998: 149).
Islamic thinkers and Islamic historians refer to the period before the birth of Islam as “jahiliyya” (obscurantism) period. Maududi believes that there are both internal reasons, namely internal “jahiliyya” as well as external reasons, namely “jahiliyya” of Western modernity for the fact that Islam has long been fading. The interior root of Islamic society being backward lies in that from the Umayyad Dynasty, the so-called Islamic state, government and society have no longer been true Islamic states, government and society, but became “Kafir (apostate) states”, “Kafir government” and “Kafir society”. The external root of Islamic society decline lies in the erosion from the “modern jahiliyya” of Western culture to the Islamic world. The main feature of the obscurantism of Western culture is its spirit of secularism and the separation of religion and state, government, society, education and science. Maududi believed that to restore and revive Islam, the true Islamic state based on the Quran and Hadith, the Islamic state must be built and it must be governed according to Islamic Sharia law. In order to achieve the revival of Islam and rebuild an Islamic state, internal and external “jahiliyya” must be eradicated and all Western and non-Islamic influence must be discarded. Islamic values should be restored through exemplary conduct of Muslims and Islamic society should be rebuilt through specific practical action.

Nationalism and the nation-state theory were deeply criticized by Maududi, who pointed out that: “the principles of nationalism are totally contradictory to the principles of Islam... which itself is contrary to Allah’s Sharia Law”, “is the source of corruption, fear and evil in the world” and “the most sharp weapon in the hands of devil”, “Islam and nationalism are contradictory in the spirit and objective.” “One of the features of Islamic state is that its creation and composition have nothing to do with nationalism. If Islam has enemies other than Kaffirs and polytheists, then the enemies are races and nation-states” (Chen, J., 1998: 191).

The fundamental goal of Maududi’s “Islamic state”, is “to create and govern the state in accordance with Islamic political principles”,
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and to “transform modern nation-states into ‘true’ Islamic states” (Wu, & Zhou, 2000: 399-400). Maududi proposed that “al-Hakimiyya belongs solely to Allah”, and on this basis, he built the “Islamic state” theory composed of the principle of sovereignty of Allah, the principle of the Prophet’s authority, the principle of a state in which sovereignty would be exercised in the name of Allah and the principle of political consultation system. This has provided not only a theoretical basis for the Islamic fundamentalism to fight against secular nationalism provides, but a legitimate basis for the political opposition to overthrow the secular Islamic nation-states. The basic framework of Maududi’s “Islamic state” theory is:

(1) The sovereignty of Allah: that is, “al-Hakimiyya belongs solely to Allah” principle. “Hakimiyya” is the Arabic transliteration and is derived from the word “Hakim”, which means ruler, governor, adjudicator, judge and the arbiter. In Maududi’s view, “Hakimiyya” means “the highest authority” and “absolute power”, and it belongs only to Allah. “The sovereignty of all things is in His hands”①, that is, “Hakimiyya belongs solely to Allah”. When this principle is applied to the Islamic state theory, it becomes the principle of sovereignty of Allah. It believes that Allah as the sole creator, nurturer and master of the universe, is the state’s real sovereign; any individual, group, class, political party has no right to formulate and enact laws, but can only comply with the sacred Islamic law; the state can only exercise its power within the boundary permitted by divine law. Therefore, the essence of sovereignty of Allah is to use the supreme sovereignty of Allah to restrain the “limited” secular power.

(2) The authority of the Prophet: This is the political principle derived from the principle of believing in Allah and his Messenger. It believed the Prophet Muhammad as the “messenger” and “agent” of Allah on earth, has the right to exert his political and legal sovereignty. In the practice of Islamic countries, as the record of words and deeds

of the Prophet, the “Hadith” is one of the main sources of legislation, whose status only second to Quran.

(3) A state in which sovereignty would be exercised in the name of Allah: on the basis of the authority of the Prophet, Maududi also proposed “people’s Hakimiyya”. “People’s Hakimiyya” embodies the will of Allah on earth, which means that Allah rule through His agents in the world. But Allah’s agents have no legislative power, only executive power. The legislative power belongs to the supreme ruler Allah.

(4) Political consultation system: political consultation system is an extension of the principle of sovereignty being exercised in the name of Allah. It embodies the Islamic “shura” (consultation) principle that Allah’s power of attorney should not be monopolized or passed on by individuals, groups, classes, tribes or generations. It belongs to all Muslims. All Muslims qualified to be elected have the opportunity to be granted power of attorney. Maududi called the consultation system of the Islamic tradition “Islamic democracy”, and believed that appointment and removal of heads of state, as well as decisions about national policies can be made through a wide direct negotiation system or an indirect negotiation system whose representatives are elected by the voters.

According to Maududi’s vision, an ideal Islamic state should not only respect the sovereignty of Allah, but also have full respect for public opinion. The ruler (Caliph and Imam) should be the dual representation of Allah and the Muslims. As the Supreme Head of State, he has the highest authority, but “he must abide by the laws of Allah, he did not have absolute power and authority, he is neither an authoritarian, nor a dictator” (Esposito, 1984: 147). Maududi called this ideal political system “Theo-democracy” (Esposito, 1983: 117). As the American scholar John Esposito said, “For Maududi, there is a clear distinction between the concepts of the nation-state and the Islamic state. For the former, citizenship is based on nationality, race and consanguinity. For the latter, citizenship is determined by
ideology (belief and non-belief)” (Esposito, 1984: 148).

III. Hassan al-Banna and Sayyid Qutb’s “Islamic State” Ideology

Hassan al-Banna (1906-1949) as the founder of Islamist ideology and the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, mainly demonstrated the necessity of rebuilding the Islamic state and Islamic order from the inclusiveness and self-sufficiency of Islam. He believed that “Islam is the unity of belief and leadership, religion and state, spirit and action, prayer and jihad, obedience and domination, the Koran and the sword” (Zhong, S., 1982: 39). He had such a definition of the goal of the Muslim Brotherhood: “Our duty as Muslim Brothers is to work for the reform of selves [nufus], of hearts and souls by joining them to Allah the all-high; then to organize our society to be fit for the virtuous community which commands the good and forbids the evil-doing, then from the community will arise the good state” (Zubaida, 1993: 48).

Al-Banna believed that “the secret of Muslims’ decline is that they have deviated from Islam.” In order to get rid of backwardness, the Muslim community must be reformed, and the “reform should be based on Islamic religious rules and referees” (Abdel-Malek, 1983: 46). He said that to achieve the reform goals, we must establish a real Islamic state and the Islamic order. The ideas include:

First is to oppose any forms of nationalism and to emphasize Islamic solidarity beyond ethnic and national boundaries. Al-Banna believed that Muslims around the world belong to the same nation, which is the Islamic nation. He once said: “Islam is the belief and worship, the motherland and the nation. All Muslims are one nation, and the motherland is the Islamic state” (Jin, Y., 1996: 209). He believed it is patriotism and nationalism that led to the destruction and dismemberment of a unified Islamic Umma and Islamic state, as well as the decline of Islamic civilization and the division of the
Islamic world. In Hassan al-Banna’s opinion, the ideal Islamic society is the Ummah (religious community) established by the first generation of Muslims. In this form of organization, the Quranic principle has been truly implemented, while the “gap between the present Islamic society and the true Islamic path is the product of the decline of Muslim Umma (Community)” (Aly, & Wenner, 1982: 337). He claimed: “the Muslim Brotherhood is not limited to propaganda in one Islamic country”, “as long as there is one brother on one inch of land has faith in the Koran, the land is public land of Islam, and Islam then requires all Muslims go protect it and make it full of happiness” (Wang, S., 262-263).

Secondly, the Islamic countries must have a theocracy instead of secularism. He strongly advocated restoring the caliphate system, which he considered a symbol of the Islamic unity, a link between the Islamic nation, and the natural framework to implement Sharia. In 1938, al-Banna pointed out at the Fifth Congress of the Muslim Brotherhood that “the Muslim Brotherhood considers the Islamic caliphate a symbol of Islamic unity and ties among Islamic nations, which is also an Islamic etiquette that all Muslims must respect” (Xinhua Agency, 1984: 117).

Thirdly, the Islamic state must abandon statutes and fully implement Sharia law. Al-Banna regarded the Islamic law as the manifestation of the will of Allah, which establishes the most beautiful, just and reasonable order of life for the present and afterlife. Therefore, he advocated the implementation of the universal Sharia law in civil, criminal, commercial and international relations areas.

The second-generation thinker of the Muslim Brotherhood Sayyid Qutb’s (1906-1966) “Islamic state” basis was similar to Maududi’s thought, who accepted Maududi’s new “jahiliyya” (state of ignorance) concept. Qutb believed that the contemporary world, including all Islamic countries, is still in “jahiliyya”. He believed that the present society is in the same “jahiliyya” as before the rise of Islam, and even in a darker state of ignorance. Communism, fascism, capitalism as
well as nationalism and socialism that were then popular in the Arab world, are all “jahiliyya” because they all came from a part of all people, which demands some people to obey other people, rather than obey Allah.

Qutb thought that the prominent political manifestation of “jahiliyya” is that the power of Allah was trampled on earth, so some people became privileged in the institutional, legal and ethical concept, which led to the domination and oppression of some people against others. Various “new jahiliyya” should be overturned. He pointed out that European history was constituted of a series of “jahiliyya”. This includes: ancient Greece, the Roman Empire, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, the Enlightenment and the French Revolution (Sidahmed, 1996: 23). Qutb believed that one of the evils of “jahiliyya” lies in denial of the “sovereignty of Allah”. This “jahiliyya” is established on the basis of attacking the authority and sovereignty of Allah. “This ‘jahiliyya’ supports the idea that sovereignty belongs to the humans, which shows in areas of ideas, values, customs, laws, institutions and others that depart from the way of Allah” (Wang, S., 269).

In Qutb’s view, to get rid of “jahiliyya”, the most effective way is to take action to establish full sovereignty and dominion of Allah. “To declare the sole divinity of Allah...... means any form, type and manner of people’s rule is meant to destroy the kingdom of humans on earth ...... power should be wrested from human usurpers and handed over to the unique Allah. The law of humans should be abolished, and a unique, supreme divine law should be established.” He suggested that to achieve the rule of Allah, Muslims should make a clean break with “jahiliyya” and completely get rid of the influence of nationalism, patriotism and other non-Islamic ideology. He called on Muslims to use action to fight against “jahiliyya” and join jihad [holy war] for the cause of Allah. He pointed out that to eradicate “jahiliyya”, “by preaching and prayer alone will not achieve the goal, because those who set the yoke on the neck of the people and usurped the authority of Allah on earth would not let out of their position
because of such explanation and remonstration” (Ayubi, 1991: 140).

Qutb believed that the primary task of the Muslims is to clear existing non-Islamic orders and to establish Islamic society, but for society in the future he made no systematic theoretical exposition. He believed that only when the non-Islamic social orders are cleared will it be possible to consider the specific laws and systems in the future Islamic community. Compared with al-Banna, Maududi and other people’s thoughts, Qutb’s ideas were more radical, which put more emphasis on violence and jihad. “Jihad” and “El-Takfeer Wa El-Hijra” (Atonement and Migration) and other organizations separated from the Muslim Brotherhood are deeply influenced by his thoughts, and have taken more aggressive behaviors.

IV. Khomeini’s “Islamic Government” Thought

Khomeini (1902-1989), master of contemporary Islamic revival thought, not only carried out development and innovation of traditional Islamism in theory, but miraculously successfully led Iran’s 1979 Islamic revolution, creating a modern Islamic theocracy in the contemporary world. The slight difference between him and other Islamic thinkers is that Khomeini used the “Islamic government” concept, which is embodied in the “Islamic government”, “Islam and Revolution” and other writings and its main points include:

Firstly, the establishment of an Islamic government is necessary to rebuild the Islamic order. Khomeini made a full demonstration the necessity for establishing an Islamic government, including: (1) the necessity for establishing executive agencies. Islam is all-inclusive and supreme divine law, which “requires the implementing agencies and implementers” to manage the society. (2) It is necessary for following the Prophet’s traditions. “Because the Prophet passed on Allah’s command through the appointment of a successor, it proves the necessity to establish a government”. (3) It is necessary for continuing the implementation of Islamic law. “The necessity of law enforcement
is not limited to the needs of the period of Prophet, but extended to the present times. The need to establish an Islamic government is equally self-evident”. (4) It is out of the need for political revolution. He pointed out that “Islamic law and reasons tell us that we cannot let some of the government’s anti-Islamic and non-Islamic way continue to exist, which we have no choice but to destroy the governments of corruption and overthrow ruling groups of treachery, corruption, oppression and brutality, in order to carry out the political Islamic revolution until victory”. (5) It is the need of Islamic solidarity. “To liberate the Islamic territory from the colonialists and their puppet governments from occupation and persecution, we desperately need to establish a government”. (6) It is to save the oppressed and exploited. He pointed out that “by virtue of their political agents, colonialists implement unjust economic system to bring people into the oppressors and the oppressed.” “In order to guarantee hundreds of millions of Muslims a happy life, we have an obligation to overthrow the oppressors’ government and form an Islamic government” (Khomeini, 1981: 40-51).

Secondly, the Islamic government is a constitutional government. The Islamist government is against a monarchical system. Khomeini regarded that an Islamic government is essentially different from any existing forms of government. It is not a brutal authoritarian government, but a constitutional government. Its constitutional significance lies in that the Quran and the Hadith should be obeyed when the ruler rules and runs the country. “In the Islamic government, there is no legislative body to form separation of powers, but a council to develop plans of all ministries under Islamic laws. After planned, the nature of the state’s official duties would be determined” (Khomeini, 1981: 55-56). Khomeini believed that Islam is fundamentally against monarchy, because whether in the Quran or Hadith, there was no record on the implementation of monarchy. On the contrary, there were words accusing monarchy. In his view, “the monarchy and the throne are ominous and worthless political
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systems” (Karpat: 1992: 619), “monarchy and hereditary system is absurd and ineffective. To oppose the tyrant is the primary duty of Muslims” (Khomeini, 1981: 31).

Thirdly, the Islamic revolution should be spread through establishing the Islamic world order. Khomeini considered that Islamic revolution is not only to establish an Islamic government in Iran, but also to seek to establish the “Islamic world order” in the world. Since the colonial powers have established hegemony on a global scale, following the law of the jungle, the current world system is a world system full of evil. Only by establishing an “Allah’s world government” can justice and equality be rebuilt in the world. To achieve this goal, the best way is to first establish an Islamic government in Iran, then through “exporting Islamic revolution” to spread it to other Islamic countries, and finally spread Islam throughout the world. Khomeini repeatedly stressed: “The people’s revolution, the Islamic uprising, this sacred act should not be confined to this land, but should be spread worldwide”, “Where there are weak nations, where there are small nations crying for help under the iron heel of hegemony, Iran will go to aid them” (Zhou, C., & Chen, F., & Chen, Y., 1993: 855). He even wrote to Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, advising the Soviet Union to give up the socialist ideology and convert to Islam. In the letter, he wrote: “Islam has exalted universal values which can bring comfort an salvation to all nations and remove the basic problems of mankind. So mankind must recognize it, understand it and believe in it”. “As the sole system capable of leading mankind towards a better life, a more perfect justice and a more comprehensive peace, it is worthy of the people of all countries to convert to” (Chen, J., 1998: 130-131).

Khomeini’s Islamic political thought had a significant impact on Iran’s Islamic revolution and the establishment of the Islamic Republic in 1979. His theories about the nature and function of Islamic government, the power and the role of Sharia scholars, the fight against colonialism, imperialism and secularization, as well as the
export of the Islamic revolution, have all been realized as the guiding ideology of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Moreover, Khomeini’s theory and the Islamic revolution under the leadership of Ayatollah Khomeini had a significant ideological mobilization effect on the waves of Islamic revival movement in the 1980s. “Ayatollah Khomeini’s Islamic revolution struck a chord with many people. They believed that Khomeini’s message is to oppose imperialism, to condemn a failing, unjust and oppressive government and to establish a moral and just society” (Esposito, 1999: 21).

V. Hassan Turabi’s “Islamic State”

Since Ahmed Bashir came to power in Sudan in 1989, the Sudanese government has adopted internal and external policies with strong Islamic influence. And Hassan Turabi’s Islamic political thought is often seen as the theoretical basis of a comprehensive Islamic Sudan. Turabi considered that in Islamic societies the only legitimate state system is early theocratic caliph regime; the best form of government in human society is Islamic representative republic. The Islamic state is neither capitalist nor socialist, but an Islamic theocratic democracy. The majority of the contemporary democracies, dictatorships and monarchies that claim to believe in Islam are opposed to Islam and should be overturned (Daly & Sikainga, 1993: 107-109).

Hassan Turabi believed that in the true “Islamic state”, the Islamic “Shura” principle must be implemented. He pointed out that “shura” system is a concentrated expression of Islamic democracy, which is essentially different from Western democracies. Therefore, “Shura” embodies the sovereignty of Allah. He believed that the reasons for the failure of democracy in Third World countries are economic poverty and backwardness, being politically controlled by the West, and the psychological lack of political awareness. Only through the popularity of the “Shura” system in the family, social life and religion
can true democracy be achieved. Allah’s will require people to share power, knowledge and wealth. Such sharing is democracy (Moussalli, 1994: 57-61). In the article “Islamic state”, Hassan Turabi defined the nature of “Islamic state” from a negative point of view, and made a comprehensive and clear explanation on the concept of Islamic state (Esposito, 1983: 241-251):

Firstly, the Islamic state is not a secular state. “Islamic state” used “Tawheed” Islam as the ideological basis of statehood, which means that all citizens’ public life is based on religious revelation and the state function is to fulfill duties stipulated in the “revelation of Allah”. Therefore, Islamic state is different from secular nation-states based on separation of church and state in nature.

Secondly, the Islamic countries are not nation-states. Muslim cultural identity is religious loyalty beyond race, ethnicity, geography and language. National loyalty concerning blood, geography and language can only be a “limited loyalty”, while “ultimate loyalty” belongs to Allah, and the foundation of Muslim social community lies in faith. Therefore, the Islamic state should be a community that is open to the Muslim faith - Umma.

Thirdly, the Islamic state is not an absolute sovereign entity, which means the state must submit to the will of Allah, and Allah is the “absolute sovereign”, while the state is only a tool “acting” within Allah’s sovereignty.

Fourthly, the state is not the prototype of the Islamic state. In the Muslim community, the state’s initial form is the Umma. The appellation “Islamic state” is itself a “misunderstanding”, because the state as a political organization cannot cover the entire contents of the religious system. Its authority and functions are limited. Therefore, as a political organization, the state itself has a narrow utilitarian purpose, so it is only a social organization to safeguard the welfare and interests of religious people. Therefore, the form and nature of the state are temporary and going through constant rise and fall alternately. However, the Muslim Umma born before the state is
VI. Conclusion

Through the above analysis, it can be seen that the identity of political community in the Islamist state theory is not the modern nation-state nationalist identity, but identity to the Umma, a community based on faith that transcends race, ethnicity and geography. It “refers to the concept of the Islamic Umma ….. the Islamic government based on Islamic law - Sharia is to safeguard its existence” (Roberts, 1988: 557). As to the nature of state power, the Islamist state theory strongly opposes secularist national sovereignty and nation-states based on this, calling for the establishment of the Islamic state with “Allah’s sovereignty” as its basis. On church-state relations, the Islamists are against secularism, advocating instead the establishment of a theocratic Islamic state, namely a state in which “the rule of the state must be consistent with Sharia law”, “the executive and legislative functions and authority must obey and assist Sharia law” (Roberts, 1988: 557). On the issue of democracy, the Islamists are against both autocracy and Western-style democracy. They propose to establish an Islamic democracy based on the principle of “consultation”.

In order to emphasize the religious community identity and rebuild the “Islamic state,” which embodies the sovereignty of Allah, the ideas of Islamist theoreticians share common features with the same trend. But specific to various Islamic thinkers, the focuses of their thoughts are different. For example, in the specific objectives, the early Rashid Rida, Hassan al-Banna and other people’s thoughts had a greater focus on the profound national crisis of the Islamic world when it faced colonialism and imperialism since modern times. Their Islamic ideology is linked more with achieving national liberation, while Maududi, Khomeini, Turabi and other contemporary Islamic thinkers are more focused on the development crisis resulting from
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the modernization and secularization of Muslim countries. And their Islamic ideology has more to do with getting rid of Western-style modernization and seeking the path of development with Islamic characteristics. Also, in the specific means and methods, different thinkers have different emphases. For instance, Sayyid Qutb emphasized the importance of violent struggle, Khomeini put special emphasis on “Islamic revolution” and the importance its export, while Turabi stressed moderate social change, and did not advocate violent social revolution. As another example, on the issue of opposing dictatorship, Khomeini as a Shiite Islamist thinker, held a discourse clearly richer and more profound. In addition, on the identity issue, Turabi proposed the distinction between the “limited loyalty” (nation-state) and the “ultimate loyalty” (Islam), which undoubtedly reflects that the Islamic ideology has been more flexible on the identity issue, and it is trying to coordinate the development trend of the relationship between national and religious identity.
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