When the East Meets the West: Analysing Rached Ghannouci’s Synthesis of Democracy in Islam

Fisher Zulkarnain,* Muhammad Aminu Yahaya,** Babayo Sule*** & Asep Abdul Sahid****

Abstract

Democracy is being pushed aggressively on a global scale as the best and final form of government without even an alternative offered to the opposing views by the champions of the system in the 21st century. The main arguments presented by the apologies of democracy are its feasibility of providing and guaranteeing freedom of speech, liberty of choosing a leadership, accountability and transparency. However, this view is being perceived with cynicism in other parts of the world, particularly the Islamic world where absolute sovereignty and laws are referred to from a divine source. Most contemporary Islamic scholars are not against democracy except where its principles such as man-made laws are regarded as supreme over the Shari’ah law. But, Rached Ghannouchi, a Tunisian activist and a political leader believed that there is a perfect way to synthesise the Western liberal democracy and Islamic governance through the sideline of political Islam and the full Islamisation of democracy in practice. Ghannouchi’s combination of ideology, philosophy and activism earned him a status of an Islamic democratic philosopher in the 21st century. This study critically examined the efforts made by Ghannouchi in Islamising democracy using a rhetorical analytical approach of linking and comparing the early Islamic philosophy on democracy and Ghannouchi’s ideas to arrive at a position of policy implication for democratic governance in the Muslim world.
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Introduction

Democracy is one of the academic terms in the arena of the intelligentsia that has succeeded in engaging philosophers, scholars, religious clerics, policymakers and organisations globally for many centuries. Its literal term has never stopped there. It is heralded with some principles among which consist of the acceptance. Democracy is mostly presented as a form of government where a direct or representative popular voting is encountered even in the Western scholarship on the supremacy of democracy universally. It is presented on the global platform by the modern Western world and its apologies as the best and final form of the governance system. Fukuyama¹ and Huntington² made a futile effort in convincing the world that any attempt at substituting a democratic style of governance is nothing but a battle with mankind’s destiny and a direct clash with the (superior) civilisation that presented mankind with all scientific and technological advancement that ease the conduct of life in the 21st century. However, even in the Western literature, democracy has never enjoyed such an unassailable status of unanimous acceptance. The philosophical root of democracy itself where it was earlier practised in Greek city-states dealt democracy with a huge blow of rejection by the trio of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle.⁴ The wider popularity and acceptability of democracy in the Western world gained a significant currency in the late 19th century and early 20th century when the modern European philosophers convinced their policymakers to convert democratic values into a foreign policy agenda. Nevertheless, still, resistance is encountered even in the Western scholarship on the supremacy of democracy universally.⁵

Democracy is mostly presented as a form of government where a direct or representative popular voting is allowed for the citizenry to determine and choose who leads them or represents them. Democracy in its literal term has never stopped there. It is heralded with some principles among which consist of the
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liberty to voice an opinion and freedom of speech, tolerance to opposition, accountability and transparency as well as accommodation of diverse inputs from all societal stakeholders in policymaking and project formulation and execution. Owing to the liberal and flexible approach to a democratic form of governance but most importantly by virtue of the imperialist nature of the Western world, a democratic system of governance is promoted on a global scale in some instances, by force or incentive. Military rules and monarchy are frowned at contemporarily and democracy is supported financially and logistically.6

One of the quotas in which democracy always received its opposition and resistance as a form of government in the Muslim world, particularly by experts on principles of Shari‘ah. While the Muslim world is divided into those who see democracy as Islamic and feasible, some opined the system is a rebellion against the religious practices of leadership specifically on the issues of law and constitutionalism.7 The crisis of portraying democracy as a legitimate or an illegitimate structure in Islam rest upon the approach and the design in which it is laid down in operation. Even among the early Muslim philosophers, many see nothing wrong in democracy if the Shari‘ah provisions are complied with accordingly. Yet, some have never afforded democracy a soft landing in Islam irrespective of how it will be redesigned to suit the Islamic practices. The same situation is recorded among the contemporary mujtahids of the Muslim world.8

One fundamental philosophy that succeeded in striking a balance between the Western and Eastern democratic values is the Rached Ghannouchi’s Ennahda which is a model of Islamic democracy that should be identified as a ground for bridging the gap.9 Tunisia presents a sound model where democracy can work in Islam and where Islam can accommodate democracy in modern times with less harm to Islamic practices. This study, therefore, analytically explored Ghannouchi’s model of Islamic democracy and how it can be reconciled with the Western model to give the Muslim world a balanced structure of democratising while Islamising dually.10 In doing that, the study is structured into many sections including the issues in democracy, democracy and Islam, Rached Ghannouchi’s model of Islamic democracy, identifying the point of convergence and divergence of democracy and Islam and the feasibility of its operation in the Muslim world and, the way out for the Muslim world. The study utilised documented materials in existence by subjecting them to critical and rigorous analysis and discussions for making input and contribution to the debates.

Issues and Dimensions in Democracy

The term democracy is a political structure which entails how power is acquired and controlled with the nod and active participation of the citizens. A political system, which emanates from the Greek City-States but which has not been given a favourable cover and marketability by the Greek philosophy found a strong solace and support later in the same Western world after many centuries. Plato argues that democracy is the dictatorship of the majority but it has not made a choice of leadership an excellent process due to the majority power which in essence, is not a wise choice. Aristotle in his own part while recognises democracy as good, he presents it as the least of the best of choices among the other political systems of his time. But, Locke, Hume, Bentham, Mills, Russell and several modern European and American scholars profusely argue that no system is closer or comparable to democracy because it is the most sublime form of governance which is liberal and transparent in the process of the emergence of leaders and their rule.11

In its literal conceptualisation, democracy is a form of government where certain principles are designed which enabled the emergence of political institutions such as political parties, electoral bodies that administered elections, constitution, executive, legislative and judicial arms of government and by extension, other organisations such as civil societies and donors or non-governmental agencies. In a
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democracy, whether a direct or an indirect one, leadership is sought using a competitive process where contenders, their political parties and other institutions are involved in convincing the electorates on why they should give them the mandate.\textsuperscript{12} This is actualised using a manifesto, ideology and campaign process where the politicians engage the voters in a principle of agreement known as promises. The citizens on the other hand secure liberty, strength and absolute power of being respected and considered because they determine who gets power with their votes. Getting a continuous mandate in a democratic environment is only ascertained through the satisfaction of the electorates and their popular support in the polling booths.\textsuperscript{13}

However, unlike what most of the champions of democracy are displaying that it is always the best and it has no substitute, the democratic system itself is not a unique phenomenon or a universal similar structure. Some countries adopted the full liberal system of democracy where multi-party and total freedom of speech, tolerance for opposition and civil societies are guaranteed. Such a system is dominating the democratic ruling in most parts of the world because it is backed up by the world political and economic powers of the United States, England, France, Canada, Germany, Italy and other world giants.\textsuperscript{14} The other democratic system which is not popular in current global political configurations is the socialist or communist democracy of China, Russia and other few world countries where the choice is restricted to one party or even a choiceless arrangement to such an extent that the citizens must vote for a particular party or candidates even against their will. Although their Western counterparts tackled them head-on as an undemocratic practice, it is still making a strong case and a plausible opportunity for the critics of democracy to challenge the acclaimed supremacy and universal or sacerdotal valuation of democracy.\textsuperscript{15} Thus, democracy has no universality or overwhelming acceptability as it is being depicted by its apologies. In some instances, it is super-imposed and countries were compelled either by persuasion or threats to adopt it. Most of the developing democracies stumbled across the structure when Europe was forced to intensify the search for economic survival outside Europe in the name of imperialism and colonialism (Blum, 2000). Most or almost all the Western literature in this regard forgets that Islam has practised a democracy of their type for over a century ago right from the period of the lifetime of the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) and during the period of the four pious caliphs. The Prophet (PBUH) always consulted his companions, particularly in matters of worldly and strategic decision making and the caliphs especially Usman (RTA) were elected to emerge as the 3\textsuperscript{rd} caliph through purely democratic voting after a delegation was formed by Umar (RTA) before his demise. They often present democracy as a beautiful Western idea that has not been shared or practised by any other world except that which originated from them.\textsuperscript{16}

Most of the arguments that are presented in support of democracy are its aspiration for enabling the majority to have their way and say in decisions and policymaking. Leaders are elected either in a direct voting process or through delegates which allows for those with popularity among the subjects to emerge and once they assume power, they consciously keep in mind that they are riding on a popular mandate and promises that must be fulfilled or full wrath of a protest voting await them in another forthcoming election. This keeps them on their toes in terms of respecting people’s rights and articulations.\textsuperscript{17} Another main argument is leaders are chosen freely and peacefully and are also changed in the same mode without violence or any forceful imposition. In this regard, individuals’ rights and liberty are duly respected. Additionally, democracy is considered the best because it has recognition for representation and delegation and all policymaking is subjected to public scrutiny and monitoring which is preventing fraud and enhances accountability and transparency. However, this is in the case of the US style of a liberal system, in the Chinese or Russian communist system, criticisms are not accepted widely and scrutiny is discouraged.\textsuperscript{18}

Unlike the popular common debate that democracy is the best, it is not unusual to find that it can only work or operate in a suitable environment. For instance, African scholars\textsuperscript{19} for long believed that
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democracy of a Western design be it liberal or social cannot simply work in Africa because the African traditional system during pre-colonialism was never prepared to accommodate rigmarole of democracy. The same is foreseen in Asian countries and other states. To justify this proposition, African democracy has been mocking and ridiculing democracy with acrobatic military intervention, charades called elections where popular mandate are being subverted by the incumbents against the opposition, and the hitherto, accountability, transparency, liberty and freedom are deprived of the citizens in Africa, Asia, East Europe and South America even when they profess to operate a democracy. Even some Western scholars who are experts on democracy agreed that democracy is being forced down on the throat of developing countries forcefully in many cases, against their own volition, a question which Flynn asked the Americans and the Western world sarcastically that if the democratic system is that good enough why do we find it morally right to compel them to adopt it instead of them to come begging us to collect the model for their own benefit? More so, the above scholars especially Chomsky, Blum and Von Hippel expressed their dismay at how America, the leading crusader of democracy is found at the forefront of thwarting and emasculating popular democratic regimes across the world just because the leaders in those countries are not subservient to them or are not willing to accept detrimental economic conditionalities that will throw their citizens into hardship in the name of liberal or neoliberal reforms. From this perspective, why are developing countries not allowed freely to design their own system. After all, democracy is not directly linked with development since many countries in the world managed to attain economic proficiency and buoyancy under military, monarchy and a communist democracy.

**Islam and Democracy**

Contrary to many views even by Muslims in modern times, the Islamic world is not experiencing democratic rule for the first time from Western experience. In essence, many scholars argue that the democracy, of modern times, has its root philosophically and practically in Islam right from the Quranic injunctions. For instance, the Prophet (PBUH) was enjoined by Allah (SWT) to consult mutually his companions, make a decision collectively with them and engage their views always as in:

> So by mercy from Allah, [O Muhammad], you were lenient with them. And if you had been rude [in speech] and harsh in heart, they would have disbanded from about you. So pardon them and ask forgiveness for them and consult them in the matter. And when you have decided, then rely upon Allah. Indeed, Allah loves those who rely [upon Him] (Q.3 v.159).

Many clerics and modern Islamic scholars directly interpreted the above verse as an embodiment of Islamic democracy because the Prophet (PBUH) is being encouraged not only to consult his companions but also to respect and recognise their decisions in even matters of spiritual activities which are the highest talk less of worldly governance or socioeconomic activities. Additionally, the Glorious Quran further extended the motivation for mutual consultation among all Muslims as follows: “Those who hearken to their Lord, and establish regular Prayer; who (conduct) their affairs by mutual consultation among themselves; who spend out of what We bestow on them for Sustenance” (Q.42 v. 28).

The Prophet (PBUH) is reported to have observed Shura (mutual consultation) throughout his Prophethood life. In one instance, during the Sulluh Al Hudaibiyyah, he consulted his wife, Ummah Salma on what to do next after the Ka’bah was blocked from them by the Makkans infidels. She advised him to shave his head, slaughter his sacrificial animal and make his way back to Madina.
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after the life of the Prophet (PBUH), his companions took Shura or democracy into a new stage when Umar (RTA), on the verge of his death, appointed a six-member committee of Shura in persons of Usman Bin Affan, Ali Bin Abi Talib, Dhalatu Bin Ubaidullah, Zubairu Bin Awam, Saad Bin Abi Waqqas and Abdurrahman Bin Awf, together with his son, Abdullahi Bin Umar as a witness to choose democratically the next caliph. The process peacefully turned out Usman was the elected. This is a delegated democratic principle of choice of leadership as obtained in some Western democracies such as the US-style of the Electoral College.

In early Islamic philosophical efforts, democracy is welcomed with enthusiasm and cynicism. For instance, Al Ghazali identified anything besides the system of Khilafah as a delusion and an incoherent derailing from the Islamic system of leadership and justice. Not even the neoplatonist of Ibn Sina and Al Farabi identified democracy as good for Islam but has to do with their sympathy towards the Greek philosophical subjections of leadership to either philosopher-king by Plato or aristocratic establishment like Aristotle. Al Farabi and Ibn Sina believed that the Prophethood and Khilafah are closer to philosopher-king than democracy. Unlike Al Ghazali and Al Farabi, Ibn Khaldum and Al Mawardi did not see democracy as incompatible or impracticable in Islam. For instance, Ibn Khaldum accepted that worldly matters are the subject of Ijtihad or personal efforts of leaders and they can be addressed through a modern system. The strategic geopolitical decisions, international economics, foreign policy and style of leadership can be adopted by Islamic leaders as far as they can submit all these processes to the provision of the Islamic law. A most liberal early philosophical acceptance of democracy in Islam is that of Al Mawardi who argued that since there is no Prophethood again, no pious caliph, how can the Muslim Ummah organise their government and the state? He asked many questions on leadership such as what if the leaders imposed themselves on the Ummah should they be obeyed? What if they decided to abolish Khilafah and use any other system (democracy for example), will the subjects be compelled to obey them? What if they are brutal and oppressive? What if they decided to keep divine laws aside and use their own personal discretion? In all the above questions, Al Mawardi responded that obeying them in as much as they will allow the Muslims to practice their religion is much better than any form of revolt that will lead to bloodshed or upheaval in the Muslim Ummah.

One uncompromising view on democracy in Islam is the source of law or powers. While modern clerics such as Al Qaradawi and Al Mawdudi accepted democracy in practice in Islam, no classical or modern philosopher in Islam accepts that any source of law can be operated by Muslims except Shari’ah law. Quran, Hadith, Ijma and Qiyas and modern fatwas by Ulamaas remain the main sources of law no matter the situation. It is believed that Quran is never ancient or too modern to be excelled by modern complexities or be surpassed by world history. All laws and commandments are always in full existence in the Quran, Hadith and endeavours of religious scholars. Once, a Muslim state accepted a democratic system with a modern constitution that is devoid of Shari’ah, no amount of arguments can convince us that democracy is legitimate in this perspective. Integrating democracy in Shari’ah law is necessary for its legality.

In a democratic setting, laws or constitution is forged through a man-made endeavour of conventions, norms, values and judicial proceedings. In essence, as being perceived by some Islamic philosophers, the adoption of a man-made law instead of divine laws is a man’s revolt against his Creator which is consolidated in Medieval Europe after the successful separation of the Church from the State. All sources of law in a modern liberal or communist democracy are from what each state or society initiated
and designed for themselves. A constitution is binding and supreme over all laws in the land. In the case of a theocratic state, leaders can emerge through a democratic process but all sources of law are divine and religious scriptures are referred to for judgement. The apologies of democracy felt that they had advanced enough to look at divine laws as antiquated and obsolete for a modern man who has progressed to the level of the invention of the aeroplane and going to the moon and other seemingly miraculous innovations.37

A major dilemma in Islamising democracy is some of the principles that are not congruent with Islamic morals and character. For example, opposition, which is not only tolerated but encouraged in a Western democracy is not supported by Islamic principles. Islam always advocates for the unity of all believers. Another related issue is freedom of speech and liberty of criticism. Islam, prefers and encourages obedience and distancing away from unnecessary criticisms of leadership. It instead, encourages prayers and a kind diplomatic admonish or advice to them. These and other issues are still scratching the minds of some clerics especially the Saudi-based scholars against democracy. But, the modern monarchical rulers of the Muslim world are not in any way claiming legitimacy except in alliance with clergymen to gain support. In many cases, democratic governance will eradicate their royalty forever.38 Hence, democracy in Islam is a subject of contention that can remain open for debates without a sacrosanct or a final position on its legality or illegality.

Rached Ghannouchi and Islamising Democracy in Contemporary World

Rached Ghannouchi was born on June 22, 1941, in the Province of Gabes in southeastern Tunisia. Ghannouchi’s father, Sheikh Muhammad, was a scholar, a farmer and a devout Islamic teacher. His mother was from a merchant family with influential contact outside the Province and the country. Ghannouchi was enrolled in his Province’s primary school but his educational career was interrupted when his father withdrew him from the primary school to help sustain his five brothers that were studying in Tunis. Ghannouchi faced another obstacle to his early career when his father objected vehemently to his attendance at Western schools where the language of instruction was French, the language of the colonisers that his father perceived as enemies of Islam. After the graduation of his brothers, the family resettled financially and Ghannouchi was allowed to continue with his educational career in Zaytouna, where traditional Islamic curricula are taught. Ghannouchi was not spiritual in his early career as it was observed that he often abandoned his prayers and traumatised himself by the confusion of the world he lived. After he graduated from secondary school, he studied briefly at Zaytouna University in the Faculty of Theology.39

Rached Ghannouchi (1941-Date), popularly known as a political Islamic democratic leader, a reformist and a moderate Islamic thinker who envisioned an ideal Islamic state democratically organised, Tunisian activist and a co-founder of ‘Al Nahdah’ (Renaissance), propelled an idea mostly detested by contemporary Muslim philosophers of a democratic system ideal of the Western, specifically, liberal system. Influenced by his background and experience in life, Ghannouchi could not see anything wrong with Western democracy in an Islamic world if it is channelled within Islamic practices and some of its mortal weaknesses such as inequality and materialism eschewed. Ghannouchi studied Philosophy in Damascus, Syria and later in Sorbonne in Paris before he returned to Tunisia. His entire life is always motivated by activism and political movements. A few cases are his joining of the Qur’anic Preservation Society in 1970, Islamic Tendency Movement in 1981, which later metamorphosed into Al Nahdah (Ennahda). The activism and political movement of Ghannouchi was never smooth as in the Western democracy that he envisioned. He was immediately arrested and imprisoned from 1981-1984, 1987-1989. However, Ghannouchi secured a relief when he was granted asylum in 1993 by Britain before he returned to Tunisia in 2011 after the Arab Spring where he became a leading figure in Tunisia’s politics serving as Speaker of the Assembly of the People’s Representatives till 2019.40 Ghannouchi’s obsession with democracy made him utter that: “We consider that a state is more Muslim, more Islamic, the more

it has justice in it, he says. When people asked me why I came to Britain, I explained that I was going to a country ruled by a queen where people are not oppressed and where justice prevails."\(^41\)

Ghannouchi played an instrumental role in post-revolutionary Tunisia politically. After the 2011 uprising, Ennahda was officially registered and legalised to partake in political activities in Tunisia including the contest for elective offices. The party played a pivotal role in drafting a new constitution in Tunisia and the eventual support of the secularist party Nida Tounes Party to form a unity government. Ghannouchi is highly influenced by the resurgence of liberty and democracy in Tunisia that he shifted his focus from the Islamisation of Tunisia toward democratisation in a liberal form.\(^42\)

One of the motivations of Ghannouchi towards the penchant for Western liberal democracy particularly the British parliamentary system is according to him: “The justice, freedom and liberty which exactly depict the Islamic provisions as taught by the principles of Glorious Quran and Prophetic teaching’ I saw in Western democracy the vision of Islamic justice and equality that we have been yearning to establish for many centuries.”\(^43\)

Ghannouchi displayed in his actions and words that a vibrant opposition political party is possible in the Muslim world democracy with determination and perseverance. Ennahda was instituted and sustained in opposition. The commonly anticipated notion of intolerance to opposition and criticisms in the Muslim world leaders in modern times has been overwhelmed by Ghannouchi’s movement. His responses toward why and how he succeeded in doing that are:

Adopting and consolidating of Islamic values from political Islam to Muslim democracy where Ennahda discovered its successful path between Islam and democracy through a resistance against oppression and suppression for over half a century achievable with selfless, committed and determine leadership.\(^44\)

The main principle of Al Nahdah or Ghannouchi’s democratic ideal are internal democracy which is believed to have propelled Ennahda into survival and power. This is because: “The infighting in Ennahda was contained with the charismatic selfless leadership of Ghannouchi to the extent that he declared in an interview with Al Jazeera ‘that I will respect Al Nahdah bye-laws irrespective of the provisions for the survival of our party, ideology and policies.”\(^45\)

The idea of political Islam was quickly discarded by Ghannouchi where he revealed in an interview with Middle East Eye that “there was no room for political Islam in Tunisia”\(^46\) but there is a full room for democratisation in Tunisia according to Islamic principles which sounds good for those who believed that democracy and Islam are compatible. The Ennahda was able to secure fame in Tunisia owing to its frontline manifesto of the call for a fairer distribution of economic resources, the establishment of multi-party democracy and the injection of more religious and spiritual values into the daily life all of which it claims to achieve through a non-violent but rather a democratic process with absolute legitimacy.\(^47\) What Ghannouchi presented in his philosophy of democracy and Islam is a rhetoric of political philosophy that is not easy to achieve but not impossible to practice if a critical look into the current situation is put. There is no better way of securing a responsible leadership than a Shura or people’s consent which in most cases, is lacking in the contemporary Muslim world. Moreso, there is no harm in accepting what is practised in most of the Muslim world if Al Mawardi’s avoidance of or people’s consent which in most cases, is lacking in the contemporary Muslim world. Moreso, there is no harm in accepting what is practised in most of the Muslim world if Al Mawardi’s avoidance of
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towards their personal rulership. To open up for full freedom of choice under democracy particularly, in a situation where Islamic values and orientation are injected will no doubt, offer the Muslim subjects a better governmental organisation than what is obtainable today. However, the main point of argument is whether democracy can fully and completely fit squarely into the Islamic world. To determine that, it is pertinent to observe the meeting point of the two. In doing that, this study decided to adopt Ghannouchi as a pretext for the comparison in the next section.

The Birth of Al Nahdah (Renaissance)

One of the periods that influenced the movement for the formation of Al Nahdah is Ghannouchi’s stay in Damascus when he was morally and spiritually touched to have a rethink about his Islamic perception and practice. Ghannouchi confesses that:

Eventually, my mind rested assured of the wrongfulness of the nationalist way. While my heart was perfectly reassured of Islam, I realized that what I had been following was not the right Islam but a traditional and primitive version of it. The traditional model was not ideological, nor did it represent a comprehensive system. It was a conventional religious sentiment, a set of traditions, customs, and rituals that fell short of representing a civilization or a way of life. I discovered that I was not a true Muslim and therefore I had to take a decision to re-enter Islam.48

Ghannouchi initiated the idea of forming Al Nahdah when in 1968, he went to France to obtain a Master’s Degree in Sorbonne and to have a sound mastery of French to enable him to secure a high position on returning to Tunis. He came into contact with conflicting cultures and ideologies that perplexed his perception of life and political and socioeconomic structures. He found himself struggling between preserving his faith and adapting to the challenges of building an idea of a better version of Islam and its political system. He encountered an apolitical Islamic missionary society from Pakistan known as the Tabligh. The Tabligh introduced Ghannouchi to Islamic conscience, activism and revivalism. He converted into an Imam of a small private non-Tabligh organisation mosque. He embarked on a sojourn to survey the conditions of the Northern African Muslims which he found deplorable and unsavoury in poverty and deprivation.49

Ghannouchi visited Tunisia in 1970 to meet his family and met Tunisia in resentment with collapsing socialist economy and a brutal regime. He became outrightly critical of the government which set the authorities against him thereby forcing him to cut the visit and returned to France. Ghannouchi became a teacher in Tunis. He became charismatic and influential attracting many young minds and the poor working class as well as university students. Ghannouchi joined forces with the Qur'anic Preservation Society (QPS) a non-political and cultural and social organisation that emphasised piety, morality, and faithfulness to Islam. The union was emerged and influenced by several factors. One of them is the weakness of the government of Bourguiba whose military suppression of civil societies, opposition and public critiques subsided. The second factor is the Iranian Revolution which sent signals to other Islamic leaders and activists and the increased visibility of Islam in Tunisian political and social activities. By 1979, Ghannouchi established Jammah al-Islamiyya intending to reach the poor, the working class, unprivileged and other classes to rise against Bourguiba’s one-party system and authoritarianism. In 1981, the Islamic Association was transformed into a political party, the Islamic Tendency Movement (MTI).50

In the wake of the formation of MTI, Bourguiba cracked down on members of the movement and arrested many of them including Ghannouchi himself. This development motivated Ghannouchi to become more determined to form an alternative movement contrary to the Iranian model. Ghannouchi felt that a violent revolution is not the answer but rather a peaceful democratic model. Although Ghannouchi was released from prison in 1985, he was incarcerated again in 1987 and tried before the state security court on the pretext of Islamic fundamentalism and breach of national security. He was sentenced to life imprisonment but Bourguiba was not happy with the trial and ordered a fresh trial to execute Ghannouchi. The sympathy generated by the Islamic groups and the internal schism in Tunisia
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led to the removal of Bourguiba’s Government by Zainul Abidin Bin Ali. Bin Ali quickly introduced reforms and embraced Islamic groups and values that appealed the Islamic groups and in the process, the MTI transformed into Hizb ut-Nahda (the Renaissance Party). By the end of 1988, Bin Ali gradually turned the old ways of Bourguiba and became hostile to Islamic groups. A serious crackdown compelled Ghannouchi to exit Tunisia which affected the strength of Al Nahdah. However, Ghannouchi maintained communication and activism with Al Nahdah which solidify the activities of the movement and earned it many apologies.  

Islam and Democracy: The Points of Convergence and Divergence

For democracy to be accepted fully as a structure of governance and for policymaking in the Muslim world, the supposed areas of consensus and contention must be examined and then, reconcile. Ghannouchi accepted and was convinced that Western democracy, particularly the British parliamentary is what the Muslim world is looking for, particularly, if it is built on Shari’ah principles and the Islamic state could not mince a dime in having a second thought that a critical outlook of democracy will point to its puncture holes that must be addressed before the full acceptance.

In his magnum opus, “Al Hurriyat al Ammah Fid-Daivlah al Islamiyyah” (Public freedoms in the Islamic state), Ghannouchi discussed three (3) major issues that relate democracy to Islam. The issues include the concept of the Islamic state, the status of democracy in Islam and the concept of freedom and human rights in Islam. Ghannouchi understood the concept of state in Islam from the perspective that Islam is a comprehensive religion that encompasses all aspects of religious, political, economic, cultural, moral and social. He justified the existence of a state in Islam from the consensus of the famous Islamic jurists. Ghannouchi emphasises that only some minority views from the Mutazilites and the Khawarijs opposed the formation of a state in Islam unjustifiably because, in their perception, politics is not obligatory in Islam. This erroneous and minor view cannot be taken with an iota of seriousness because politics is well-recognised and encouraged in Islam, a moral politics that promote the overall welfare of the Ummah. Ghannouchi lamented that it was the influence of Western thought and education that led to the adoption of secularism in the Muslim world where many Muslim intellectuals who studied Western education preferred to separate a state from religion, the unislamic principles that harmed the Islamic societies in contemporary times.

Furthermore, Ghannouchi believed that a state can be established in the Muslim world without necessarily following the format or style of the secular one. It was the Prophet (PBUH) that first established a state in Madina which was consolidated by his companions and expanded by his followers to the extent of becoming an empire under Al Mamun. To this end, he identified some principles of the Islamic state as follows: the Nass (text or sources of legitimacy) and the Shura (consultation committee). The first source of legitimacy or constitutional support is the Quran and Sunnah. Ghannouchi specifically mentioned in the work several Qur’anic verses where the Almighty Allah (SWT) emphasises that no law should be used other than Allah’s (SWT) laws revealed in the Glorious Quran (Q.5:44-46). No law can be supreme over the authorities of Allah and His Messenger’s (PBUH) laws. He further argues that sources of state establishment and its laws are derivable from the Quran and Sunnah. The Qur’anic text is the foundation of government in Islam. Within this context, Allah is the supreme sovereign and all authorities belong to Him alone. Leaders and government are representative of the government. The same view is shared by his contemporaries such as Qutb and Al Qaradawi who believed that democracy might not be bad for Islam but Shari’ah law is uncompromising as the source of sovereignty and governance. The only distinguishing feature is that Qutb, who is one of the founders of the Islamic Brotherhood in Egypt and Islamic revival never agrees
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that democracy is necessary like Ghannouchi\textsuperscript{61} who sees its necessity. Al Qaradawi\textsuperscript{62} takes a modest position among them.

On the concept of Shura, Ghannouchi\textsuperscript{63} stresses that it is the second principle of the Islamic system of governance. This is because the implementation of Nass (the text) rests on the Ummah and this made legitimacy rests on the Ummah too. Ghannouchi\textsuperscript{64} however, does not limit the concept of Shura just to the issue of mutual consultation. In his submission, it is more than that. In essence, Public Freedoms in the Islamic Societies gives much attention to the concept of Shura more than other principles. Shura is the obligatory work of accomplishing all tasks of the Muslim Ummah because Allah (SWT) commands the Ummah to adopt it as its system of decision-making (Q.3:159)\textsuperscript{65} and it is the symbol of the Islamic state and the Ummah. Ghannouchi\textsuperscript{66} emphasises that Shura is one of the fundamental principles of Islam because it guarantees the participation of Muslims in the executive and legislative process of Islamic governance. Four (4) critical stages of the implementation of Shura are mentioned by Ghannouchi\textsuperscript{67} which are the legislative aspects of the Shura including obeying the decision and lawmakers carried out collectively by the Ummah. He disagrees with those who believed that the Ulama can legislate on behalf of the Ummah because according to him, Shura is more than scholarly debates as it involves negotiations and interactions with unions, civil societies, associations and trade bodies. The legislative aspect of the Shura can be done by direct election or referendum such as electing leaders and representatives. Raising the sovereignty of the state over the individuals is one of the areas that Ghannouchi\textsuperscript{68} criticised the Western democracy. He believed that giving priority to state values over individual and collective interests causes wars of elites in the name of national interest and other selfish motives which are against the tenets of justice in Islam.

The second aspect of Shura identified by Ghannouchi\textsuperscript{69} is political Shura. Shura is the basis for the birth of the Islamic state. The birth can occur by coercion or contract and the Imamate should be by a contract which is the best as it will reflect the will of the Ummah. Imam can only claim legitimacy by the contract entered into in the Imamate. A sound comparison was presented by Ghannouchi\textsuperscript{70} on the process of political relationships in a stage among the theocratic/Islamic system and Western democracy. In the theocratic and Islamic systems, sovereignty originates from Allah to the government and then the society but in the Western democratic system, sovereignty is from the society to the government. In other words, the Islamic version of democracy envisaged by Ghannouchi\textsuperscript{71} is that which embraces the sovereignty and the will of Allah (SWT) as against the Western secular system. The third aspect of the Shura is the economic Shura. Shura should consist of ways of resource distribution, reducing the gap of inequality and poverty and deprivation based on the collective decision of the Ummah. The fourth aspect of Shura according to Ghannouchi\textsuperscript{72} is the educational and cultural aspect of Shura. In essence, Ghannouchi is a real democrat since he doesn’t want imposition of a decision on the Ummah as rightly observed by Wolf\textsuperscript{73} that “Ghannouchi is against imposing Islamic law on a society in which ‘many people do not understand it’. He insisted that ‘in a democratic state, the parliament has to reflect the society,’ stressing that ‘Ennahda does not want Bourguiba and Ben Ali’s top-down approach of imposing their ideology and strategy on the Tunisian people.’”

In the first instance, Shura, commonly perceived by many Islamic clerics as the oldest or the original version of democracy from the Islamic perspective is a replica of what is obtainable today in world democracies. Ghannouchi himself justified his Ennahda movement under the auspice that the Shura experience in Islam is historically related to democracy because if the rightly guided caliphs in less than 20 years of the departure of the Prophet (PBUH) will institute the Shura committee to democratically
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elect a caliph, in an era that the companions are far away from us, reflecting on that Sunnah will not harm Islamic practice. Not only Ghannouchi is perceiving this position as symbolic of Islamic governance. Al Qaradawi, Al Mawdudi and Ramadan all stressed that the democracy of today is nothing far than the Shura in the style of the committee of Umar (RTA) except that the current form is modernised to include a direct voting process which is an innovation that Islam has not frowned at since nothing is harmful in that. The current American system of the Electoral College is an exact system of Caliph Umar’s Shura Committee because it is a council of wise men formed to superintend over the majority popular decision.

Another area of convergence between Islam and democracy which motivates Ghannouchi and his sympathisers to embrace wholly democracy in the Muslim world is the desire to involve men of wisdom in decision making, consultation, accountability and transparency which the modern democracy is boasting of which has been set in practice in the Muslim world since the era of the Prophet (PBUH). Islam encourages respect for subjects’ opinions and inputs even the vulnerable and the disabled. Islam promotes accountability and transparency in governance with an eternal promise of torment for an unjust and a tyrant ruler; that which should not arrest the study here because there are numerous Quranic verses and Prophetic traditions that are too many to count or mention, democracy of today is being advanced to the extent of a forceful imposition by its apologies and global sponsors in the Western world on the cover of the best form of government that respect all diversities, accommodates varying views and foster accountability and transparency. Ghannouchi promotes Western democracy in that aspect as a plausible and purely acceptable form of rule in Islam if the principles are practicalised.

However, Ghannouchi did not completely agree with the Western democracy as compatible with the Islamic democracy and the Islamic state that he is willing to establish. He criticized the Western democracy for its inability to give enough freedom and liberty that it has been professing in the process of decision-making and governance. The economic policy or resource distribution is another area that Ghannouchi chastised the Western democracy. The deliberate gap of inequality he witnessed in France and the super-rich and the extreme poor that exist side by side in their societies can be minimised to the lowest level if the economic aspect of Shura is implemented in the Islamic state where all voices of the Ummah have a say in how the societal resources can be distributed. Another perspective of criticism of the Western democracy by Ghannouchi is the concept of secularism. However, unlike most of the universal perceptions, Ghannouchi believed that secularism is being misrepresented and misperceived across the world, especially, Western secularism and that was what affect the Islamic world in the contact with the term. For instance, Western secularism was not necessarily an effort to distance the society from religion but to avoid conflict and violence of religion in the West when the Protestant movement caused serious internal crack in Western Christianity. The Western leaders identified secularism as a tool of peacebuilding and conflict resolution otherwise their speeches, gatherings and politics remained full of religious mentioning. Unfortunately, Ghannouchi believed that the Islamic world misperceived the term as the separation of the state from religion which did more harm to Islam and Islamic democracy than the Western world itself.

However, the opposite and based on what Ghannouchi is not taken seriously among his peer Islamic philosophers of the contemporary Muslim world is the failure to take into consideration how to reconcile between sources of law and justice in democracy and Islam. Ghannouchi sees a wide vacuum between the Western democracy and the Islamic democracy when it comes to practice in the Muslim world, particularly, human rights and freedom. He suggests that what he saw in Britain is a perfect system the Imposition by its apologies and global sponsors in the Western world on the cover of the best form of government that respect all diversities, accommodates varying views and foster accountability and transparency. Ghannouchi promotes Western democracy in that aspect as a plausible and purely acceptable form of rule in Islam if the principles are practicalised.
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Ghannouchi,86 Al Ghazali87 believed that worldly knowledge can be compatible with Islamic culture and values if it will not violate the core principles of Shari’ah and faith because such ultra-motive of recognising and adopting Western or any un-Islamic philosophy into the Muslim world is leading to incoherence and delusion. Islam is unequivocally clear that no source of law is agreeable or acceptable no matter how beautiful it is except that which is provided by the Glorious Quran and Prophetic Hadith as well as the consensus of clerics. Qutb88 supported that view against his contemporary, Ghannouchi, a neighbour in Egypt, who submitted that nothing will ever make the Muslim world resuscitate and reclaim its past glory except discarding the Western ideology and adopting fully, the Islamic pure teaching. In essence, Ghannouchi made a significant effort in reconciling the East and the West using Islam and democracy as the tools of operation but what is missing is how he intended or how he is not compromising sources of law in democracy and Islam. He insists that Islamic democracy must be operated by Nass (Quran and Sunnah) instead of secular laws and the Shura system but at the same time he believed in multi-party and opposition politics.89 In a democracy, all sources of a constitution are man-made and human efforts and this will never be recognised nor accepted in Islam no matter the level of liberal mind that is at work toward that.

One vital area that Ghannouchi90 established a wide gap of applicability between the Islamic democracy he envisaged and the Western democracy is in the area of human rights and freedom. Freedom in Islam according to him is the free choice to be a Muslim first which is never by compulsion. The second aspect of individual freedom presented by Ghannouchi91 is the dignity and general wellbeing of the self. Islam prevents all means of torture, suppression, and dehumanisation of the individual. The overzealous crusades of human rights enforced by the West should have started from this perspective which has been enrooted in Islam many centuries ago according to Ghannouchi. In other words, the acclaim that Western democracy is heralded with freedom and liberty should not be the justification for adopting its system in the Muslim world because Islam in its political and socioeconomic system has its freedom of individual preserved in the Glorious Quran and the Sunnah. Besides, Ghannouchi92 criticizes the Western democracy in its perception of state and political building based on Western thought heavily influenced and manipulated by the media. Even the rights and freedoms are those packaged to the society by the manipulators as against the Islamic provisions which are eternally enveloped and beautified from Nass (the text or the Quran and Sunnah) from the divinely ordained sources that are embellished with justice, equality and the promotion of dignity and sanctity of mankind.

Additionally, other issues that Islam may not happily welcome in Ghannouchi strive to democratise Islam or Islamise democracy are some fundamental principles of democracy such as multi-party, opposition, freedom of speech and criticism, which all can be perceived from the Islamic viewpoint as disuniting the Ummah and creation of chaos or even going against the Sunnah or Islam.93 Leaders are to be prayed upon and advised but not to be criticised as assumed by the Western pattern of liberal democracy where sometimes the opposition found it eloquent to condemn their opponents in their competition for power.94

Conclusion

In the contemporary discourse for the continuous philosophical search for governance especially in the Muslim world where the monarchy, military dictatorship and a shaky democracy are in operation, a sudden surge of a philosophical view emerges from a Tunisian Rached Ghannouchi whose political ideas and movement in full support of democracy, a liberal one in the mode of the Western system, moderated by the Islamic principles of governance which are the Shari’ah and the Shura system, enriched the Tunisian politics with a movement that gave birth to a party and later a leadership which had to wait many years for the Arab Spring to strike and gave it the impetus for achieving its goals of
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Islamic democracy. Ghannouchi’s ambition was to influence the Muslims to the adoption of a full-scale multi-party democracy with internal democracy and the ideology of economic justice and fairness. The ideas of Ghannouchi are a meeting and melting point at the same time between the East and the West contemporarily. Such ideas were not new as the early classical Islamic philosophers attempted to identify when and where to situate democracy. In conclusion of this study, there is nothing harmful or wrong with this position but any effort at democratisation in the Muslim world should never forget fully the teaching of Islam in leadership, principles and operation. The Shura of the Caliph Umar (RTA) and the commandment of the chapter 3 verse 159 of the Glorious Quran are flexible and motivating for democratic rule in Islam. The provisions of the Glorious Quran on the other hand and the Prophetic teaching that there is no sovereignty except with Allah and that all sources of law are divine where failure to refer to them is referred to as a rebellion against Allah’s religion suffice to understand that any democratic attempt in Islam must consider Shari’ah as sources and means of law. If the West wants to see mass mobilisation towards democratisation in the fifth wave, it must avoid its forceful imposition of its version of democracy and allow the Islamic societies to forge their own Islamic democracy based on their culture, religious principles and political desire. This will reduce the gap of cultural clashes that Huntington and his subordinates are trying to convince the world to swallow.
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