FOREWORD

The Kulliyyah Research Bulletin was first introduced in 1994. Assoc. Prof. Mustansir Mir was the first editor. Then the Bulletin was revised in 2006 under the editorship of Prof. M.A. Quayum, Assoc. Prof. Ishtiaq Hussain and Asst. Prof. Akram Laldin. In 2009 it was placed on a moratorium owing to certain unavoidable reasons. It is time to recommence publication of the Bulletin as it has an important role to play within the Kulliyyah’s academic and research ambiance.

The objectives of the Bulletin are two-fold. Firstly, it is to provide a forum for an ongoing discourse on the Kulliyyah’s reciprocally related mission of Islamicisation of Human Knowledge (IOHK) and Relevantisation of Revealed Knowledge (RRK). It is believed that it is through this continuing and incremental dialogue and exchanges of views on this philosophically rich and intricate issue that our understanding of what this University and the Kulliyyah stand for and aim to achieve would be sharpened, enhanced and brought to fruition. We therefore invite all staff, especially those who are engaged in research in the area, to share their knowledge, understanding and insight on matters relating to IOHK and RRK, by contributing articles in the publication.

The second objective of the Bulletin is to share the research and findings of staff in the Kulliyyah’s various academic disciplines. The Kulliyyah has eleven disciplines and many of us are actively involved in research in our respective specialities. Having a publication like this will help us to be informed of the activities of fellow members in their specific fields and keep us abreast of the overall academic developments and achievements in the Kulliyyah.

The Bulletin will be published triannually, in February, June and October of every year, with the inaugural issue of the new series due in October 2013. We intend to publish 2-3 short articles in every issue, at least one of which is expected to address the mission and vision of the Kulliyyah, i.e. Islamicisation and/or Relevantisation. We will also publish articles in the various academic disciplines of the Kulliyyah, as well as book reviews, information on research and research findings, conference reports and PhD thesis abstracts of staff who have completed their doctoral work recently.

Insha’Allah the Bulletin will play a significant role in cementing academic links among members of the Kulliyyah and become a regular feature in its publication profile. I would like to take this opportunity to register my heartfelt thanks to Prof. Quayum for taking serious measures to revitalise this academic platform.

PROF. DR. IBRAHIM M. ZEIN
Dean, Kulliyyah of Islamic Revealed Knowledge and Human Sciences
The Oriental and Occidental Worlds: A Bird's-eye View on the Attempts for Estrangement and Rapprochement in the Aftermath of the 9/11, 2001 Events

Hassan Ahmad Ibrahim and Afiz Oladimeji Musa1

The Drive for Estrangement
Being shocked and dismayed by the devastating attacks on the two symbolic institutions of US economic and military might, the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon, and charged with the inflammatory speech of "either you are with us or with the terrorists" that the "warrior president" George W. Bush gave to a joint session of the Congress and the American people, many Western influential quarters and individuals forcefully and persistently argued that the relationship between the two worlds is deeply rooted in hostility; they are at loggerheads and therefore bound to clash owing to their profound historical differences in religious convictions, lifestyles and cultural orientation.

Similarly, a small but vocal group of Muslims perceived the 9/11 attacks as a natural repercussion to the West's arrogance and hegemony on the Muslim world, particularly the destructive and double-standard American foreign policy. Some even sought (and still seek) to project them as a divine punishment inflicted upon the US in particular and the West in general. They (mostly the youth) even conveniently twist some verses of the Holy Qur'an to reinforce their argument.

However, given the limitation of space for this article, it may be appropriate to briefly explore this extensive post 9/11 estrangement drive through a few examples from the two worlds. The analysis of the Western paradigm is confined to two groups of western intelligentsia and misinformed political activists. In the Muslim world, the narrative focuses on the so-called "Jihadist-Salafists."

Western Paradigm
A group of Western intellectuals, of whom Prof. Bernard Lewis is the most prominent, rushed to describe the 9/11 attacks as a dramatic expression of the inevitable clash of civilisation between Islam and the West, and the empirical indicator of Huntington's forecast. In an attempt to give a political significance to this notion of clash of civilisations, Lewis wrote the following in his article, "The Root of Muslim Rage":

It should by now be clear that we are facing a mood and a movement far transcending the level of issues and policies and the governments that pursue them. This is no less than a clash of civilizations – the perhaps irrational but surely historic reaction of an ancient rival against our Judeo-Christian heritage, our secular present, and the worldwide expansion of both. (26)

Another academician of the same calibre is the "anti-Arab propagandist" Daniel Pipes, who has built his many years of career on distortions, twisting words, quoting people out of context and stretching the truth to suit his purpose (McNeil). Despite their erudition, this group departs from objectivity whenever their subject matter is Arabs and Islam or the Jewish interests. While emphasising the Arabs' "ingrained" opposition to Israel, Bernard Lewis, for example, never tells his readers that it is an imperialist creation and an expansionist colonial settlement state founded on terror, war and ethnic cleansing (Alam M). However, with this cunning approach, they have managed to attract the attention of many enlightened as well as ignorant people in the West. Moreover, their discourse provides the intellectual basis for the anti-Islam/Muslim policy of the neo-conservatives, and was at the centre of the Bush Junior administration.

The second group differs from the first in terms of their popularity, close-mindedness and unwillingness to yield to the truth. They are arrogant, less knowledgeable and more determined to achieve their goal through whatever means, no matter how abhorrent they may be. They include individuals like Pat Robertson, Terry Jones, Wayne Sapp and Robert Spencer, to name a few.

These people often boast about their ability to incite public sentiment against Islam, a practice which has become in recent time an easy, comfortable and profitable means adopted by some people to achieve their vested political goals. It is not surprising therefore to learn that the views of this group, no matter howspacerious they are, are all culled from some erroneous mental representations of Islam promoted by biased media and the literatures of some orientalists like Bernard Lewis and Daniel Pipes, and are by no means based on their familiarity with Islam or the Arabic language or on their acquaintance with the Islamic world. The members of this group are very much like the medieval theologians who had been dismissed by Richard William Southern (1912-2001) to have been suffering from two types of ignorance: the ignorance of
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a confined space and that of a triumphant imagination (Southern 14; Zachary 34-35).

An investigation conducted by the Center for American Progress Action Fund on the rise of Islamophobia in America further corroborates this fact. According to the report of this investigation, there “is a small, tightly networked group of misinformation experts guiding an effort that reaches millions of Americans through effective advocates, media partners and grassroots organizations” (Ali and Eli Clifton). The report also confirms that the spread of hate and bigotry is masterminded by five key people, namely Frank Gaffney of the Center for Security Policy, David Yerushalmi of the Society of Americans for National Existence, Daniel Pipes of the Middle East Forum, Robert Spencer of Jihad Watch and Stop Islamization of America and Steven Emerson of the Investigative Project on Terrorism (Ali and Eli Clifton). Effort of this tiny group of bigots would not have gained wide audience had it not been for the generous funds flowing to it from a select group of foundations and wealthy donors, who are branded as the lifeblood of the Islamophobia network in America. The top seven foundations contributing to the anti-Islamic movement in America, according to the report, are:

- Donor Capital Fund
- Richard Mellon Scamifree Foundation
- Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation
- Newton D & Rochelle F. Becker Foundation
- Russell Berrie Foundation
- Anchorage Charitable Fund and William Rosenwald Family Fund
- Fairbrook Foundation.

Islamic World Paradigm

Similarly, a vocal but marginal group of Muslims indiscriminately hate the West as Dar al-Kufr (the abode of disbelief) and consider that Muslims should by no means be accommodative with, let alone be loyal to, anything that comes from it. Their bitter hostility is not restricted to the West only, but extends to Muslims who do not share their ultra-extremist views. This phenomenon of sweeping and uncompromising hatred for the West started with verbal violence, but quickly evolved into “justifiable” killing and massacre of innocent lives. The 9/11 violent attacks represented a turning point in this respect, and the ongoing Boko Haram atrocities in Northern Nigeria is perhaps the most recent example of this destructive tendency.

At the cutting edge of this Salafist-Jihadist trend stands Sheikh Ayman al-Zawahiri, an Egyptian Muslim medical doctor who has recently assumed the command of al-Qaeda movement after the assassination of its founder, Osama bin Laden. To al-Zawahiri, Islam and the West are by no means compatible. They have never been and will never be, and any attempt to bring them together would be futile as they are destined to clash till the Day of Judgment. Among the most prominent theorists of the Salafist-Jihadist movement is Sheikh Abu Muhammad al-Maqdisi, director of the Minbar al-Tawhid wa al-Jihad site, and Sheikh Abu Mariam Abdul Rahman bin Talal—the most brutal of them all in condemning his adversaries. They have followers among youth all over the world, including the Western countries, who vie to carry out their orders. Other militant Islamic organisations are Abu Sayyaf group of the Southern Philippines, al-Shabab of Somalia and Boko Haram of Northern Nigeria. This trend in the Islamic world, like its western counterpart, does not only support the prophecy of Bernard Lewis and Huntington but also energetically helps in translating it into action.

Attempts towards Rapprochement

Though on the whole disappointed with the West, particularly the USA, largely for its unlimited backing of Israel, despite the latter’s shameful and never-ending atrocities in Palestine, the majority of Muslims often distinguish between the Western governments and their people. This is because, many Westerners maintain a mild disposition towards Islam and the Muslims, and often hold them in high esteem and defend them and their rights.

Thus, following the confusion and chaos resulting from the steadily growing estrangement in the aftermath of 9/11, a collaborative network of intellectuals/activists from both parts of the world have engaged in activities to counteract this destructive trend which may lead to another tragedy of the same or even greater magnitude to that of the 9/11, 2001 attacks. They, thereby, advocate a new relationship between the Occidental and Oriental worlds that is based on the common and shared values between the two civilisations, which may, hopefully, serve as a framework for the desired cooperation between all civilisations, the so-called “Clasp of Civilisation.” This notion, which urges humanity to embrace moderation, dialogue and cooperation, was originally initiated in 2005 by Spain and Turkey under the auspices of the United Nations. Hence was the institutionalisation of the international body, The Alliance of Civilisations, to galvanise international action against extremism through the forging of international, intercultural and interreligious dialogue and cooperation. The Muslim World League also responded to this call through organising a series of interfaith dialogues, which King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia has actively and generously funded.

These initiatives have been well received in both the Islamic and the Western worlds, and
sparked such an interest among academicians and philanthropists that they launched many similar attempts in order to emphasise the role of moderation and tolerance as the foundation for any inter-faith dialogue that will hopefully yield promising results. Prominent among these good initiatives are Al-Waleed Bin Talal Centre for Muslim-Christian Understanding (ACMCU), based at Georgetown University, USA; The Centre for the Wasatiyyah in Kuwait; Muslim-Christian Dialogue Centre, founded in 2007 with a view to fostering mutual understanding and cooperation among Muslims and Christians through academic and community dialogue grounded on the Qur'anic and Christian traditions; Doha International Centre for Interfaith Dialogue; the Global Movement of Moderates Foundation, founded in Kuala Lumpur in 2012 at the initiative of the Malaysian Prime Minister, Dato' Sri Mohd. Najib Tun Abdul Razak; and the initiative of the Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King Abdullah bin Abdul Aziz, for intercultural dialogue.

Conclusion
The relationship between the Islamic world and the West is generally characterised by tension due to deeply rooted historical, religious and cultural factors. Thus, foreseeing the prospects of these relations requires full consciousness and comprehensive understanding of the fundamental causes of this antipathy. Perhaps the closest turning point we may refer to in this relationship is the fall of the Soviet Union late in the twentieth century, where the Islamic movement (or the so-called political Islam), in the theories of contemporary globalisation, is nominated to replace what was described as the alarming communist danger. The steady growth of extremism and violence in the Muslim world, which eventually culminated in the tragic events of September 11, 2001, has been overexploited by some Western circles to promote their agenda that Islam is the “Green Menace” that should be curbed by all means and at any cost.

However, no matter how biased the Muslims see the Western policy towards them, they should not relent in promoting their religion and its tolerance to the West, and also to familiarise themselves with the West and its cultures. They should not let the tiny religious extremist group hijack the beautiful and universal values promoted by their religion, on the pretext that the “West asks for it.” They should not also fail to note that the West is not a single anti-Islamic bloc, hostile and inimical to Islam, rather there are people of goodwill who advocate a balanced relationship with Muslims and are sincerely working for peaceful co-existence between the two civilisations.

The Muslim World and the West should know that an indefinite perpetuation of tension between the two worlds would not be beneficial to either side; but would rather complicate the situation. While the Western vital strategic interests in the Middle East and elsewhere in the Islamic world would be threatened directly or indirectly, the Muslim world will also be exposed to a round of political instability and poverty, which may trigger a new set of extremism and violence.

Endnotes
1 Dr. Hassan Ahmad Ibrahim is Professor in the Department of History and Civilisation, IUM and Afitz Olaladeji Musa is a PhD candidate in the same department.
2 President George W. Bush was described as such by Ron Greaves and Theodore Gabriel in their introduction of the book they co-edited with other scholars entitled, *Islam and the West Post 9/11*.
4 This conclusion is reached through the researchers’ observatibook on the attitude of some Muslims in the aftermath of the collapse of the Twin Towers. The phrase Allah Akbar (God is Great) was then chanted in many places in the Islamic World.
6 Muddathir Abdel-Rahim, “Islam and the West: Striving for More Effective Dialogue and Cooperation for Peace.” Keynote address delivered at the opening session of the Seventh Annual Conference on “Globalisation for the Common Good: An Interfaith Perspective, from the Middle East to Asia Pacific-Area of Conflict or Dialogue for Cultures and Religions?” 30 June-3 July, 2008. Trinity College, University of Melbourne, Australia.
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Foreign Aid and Corruption in the Muslim World: A Preliminary Analysis

M. Moniruzzaman and Botagoz Kulakhmet

Foreign aid has been considered as an important accelerator for development in the poor and developing countries since the end of the Second World War. Whether foreign aid has achieved its objective is a matter of serious debate. Some studies have found a positive relationship between foreign aid and development, while others have found negative or no relationship at all. However, within the discourse, a body of research has focused on foreign aid and corruption in these countries. The question asked is: Does foreign aid reduce corruption or does it generate more corruption? Again, a host of studies show either a positive or a negative correlation. This article, which is an abridged version of a larger project, presents a preliminary analysis on the question of foreign aid and corruption in the Muslim world during 1990-2011.

Literature Review

With regard to foreign aid and corruption, a review of the existing literature suggests that it mainly deals with the determinants and effects of foreign aid, or with the measurement and consequences of corruption found in the empirical studies (Aleu, Alesina and Weder, Azfar et al; Hansen and Tarp). In particular, the main argument in these studies lies in the understanding that aid does not affect growth; rather it contributes to the spread of corruption (Easterly and Pfutze). Alesina and Weder have found that more corrupt countries receive more aid. However, they noted some interesting differences among donors with regard to aid allocation; that the Scandinavian countries tend to give more aid to less corrupt governments, whereas the US provides more assistance to more corrupt governments. However, the authors admit that they could not find any evidence that foreign aid reduces the level of corruption.

Chheang's seminal study on 67 countries has found that aid is positively related to corruption. Werlin, too, expressed the view that corruption undermines aid effectiveness; he stressed on how an institution functions in dealing with receiving and distribution of aid, which later leads to corruption due to the nature of "inelastic political power" in certain countries. In a case study of Nigerian experience, Aluko and Arowolo have also confirmed that foreign aid increases corruption in the country due to improper personal usage, external control and manipulation of the domestic economy, along with the elevation of primordial interest rather than the promotion of national interest and overall socioeconomic development.

Tavares has found that the amount of aid depends on the level of corruption and is affected by bilateral or multilateral relationships. Another study (EP 2012) suggests that aid affects corruption and corruption affects aid, but the latter is determined by the type of aid being administered. It is not all in one direction. This makes it difficult to determine the direction of bias on the coefficient for aid. The results of this study tacitly support the notion that multilateral aid is an important tool in limiting corruption and encouraging economic development.

In contrast to the above views, a second set of literature has argued that foreign aid decreases corruption. The rationale behind this argument is as follows: firstly, foreign aid is associated with conditions that limit the discretion of government officials in the recipient countries, which is called conditionality effect; secondly, foreign aid compensates financial shortages in public sector and facilitates pay rise for public employees, known as the liquidity effect. Based on these arguments, Grosflebert and Bouchet in their attempt to investigate whether corrupt countries receive less foreign aid or if the foreign donors take corruption into...