

## TAKING THE TEXT OUT OF CONTEXT AS ONE OF THE CAUSES OF THE CRISIS IN THE CONTEMPORARY MUSLIM WORLD

Esad Duraković

Faculty of Philosophy, University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

### SUMMARY

*Our world is in a state of crisis which tends to worsen. The Muslim intellectuals today make significant efforts to detect causes of the exceptionally difficult situation the Muslim world is in today for it is engaged in several severe conflicts. In order to overcome the crisis, it is necessary to reach, subjectively conscious and efficient, the full sense of the Qur'anic explications on God's placing of Man as his emissary on the Earth. A reinterpretation of the Text in contemporariness is necessary, that is, a competent introduction of the Text in the Context, for that is the only way for it to act correctly and optimally.*

**Key words:** Muslim world – crisis - context

\* \* \* \* \*

Our world is in a state of crisis, which tends to worsen. The Muslim world is in an exceptionally difficult situation, for it is engaged in several conflicts. Contemporary wars between Muslims have led a large portion of the Muslim world to complete chaos. At the same time, that world has been engaged in conflicts of different kinds with the West, regardless of whether it is attacked by the army of a Western country, or is engaged in an ideological conflict, since Islamophobia is becoming stronger, even in the countries of the West which have not deployed their troops to Muslim countries. A special aspect of the tragic position of the contemporary Muslim world is its “conflict” with Islam itself, that is, a misinterpretation of Islam in its history and contemporariness. In such circumstances, a multitude of armies and factions have come to life in the Muslim world, all of which are engaged in ruthless wars with predominantly religious characteristics and motivations.

Although the West has significantly contributed to the crisis of the Muslim world, special attention should be given to causes of the crisis to be found in that very world.

At the very beginning of this discussion, it is necessary to present two important distinctions. First, when I here speak of the Muslim world and of Muslims, I always refer to the majority that characterises that society, or societies, meaning that I am fully aware that there exist some brilliant individuals in that world, even communities, but they are unable to change the dominant characteristics of the Muslim world. Second, I would like to draw attention to my use of the syntagm *the Muslim world*, not *Islamic*. I do this because I am convinced that that world is in a form of a “conflict”, or, at least, in a serious disagreement with Islam, even if this may sound paradoxical.

The basic premise in my considerations is that the main cause (hence, not the only one) of this extremely negative situation in the Muslim world is a crisis of the

subject in it in general, meaning that the Muslim world as a subject – from an individual to the society – has a problem of understanding its position in the world in general, with understanding its own history, and by that, with understanding the pivotal Text which determines the entire life of Muslims, both individual and social life. Due to numerous failures in understanding its history and reality, the Muslim world has been marked by a crisis of the cultural and social subject in general, and that crisis is manifested exactly in its contemporary drama.

I believe that the problem rests not in the Text (the *Qur'an*); rather, one of the main causes of the crisis is a mistaken relationship of Muslims in the modern age towards the Text. For, in the Muslim world, the *Qur'an* – as the pivotal Text of its faith, culture and history – has created and motivated the Muslim society *as a subject* through history, and when Muslims understood it, they were immensely successful. Consequently, I think it would be useful, for the purpose of understanding its contemporariness, to observe a successful past/history of the Muslim world, and to determine, in its fundamental points, the position of the Text in the Context of successful ancestors to that of today. The text contains potentials and explications that, in a correct understanding and through efficient action, can make the Muslim world a positive subject also in contemporariness. Amongst such potentials of the Text, the principle of contextualisation has a special place, for it is a principle that the *Qur'an* has elevated to the highest level and affirmed it by its own *gradual* entrance to the World, or to the Context that partially adopted, and much more upgraded and changed it. Muslims have every reason to be proud of their early and classical history, but they had determined it mainly as a sacralised history which is imposed as a *non plus ultra*, and that inevitably led to stagnation, even decadence. In other words, in the late classical period, the Text had been, through several successful centuries,

the main factor in a permanent advancement in the cultural, scientific, and social Context in general, only to be later taken out of the *entire*, complex reality as its Context, for ulema, through its inadequate understanding, imprisoned it in the past and transferred it into the sphere of religious verbalisation, enchanting eschatology, etc. By thus situating the Text in the past, outside Contemporariness as its Context, the Taliban or ISIL, or Salafi retrograde principle is established, and the Text is essentially reduced in many ways, in spite of its desire to be contextually affirmed, meaning that it essentially strives to build the Muslim world as a *subject* in full meaning of that word – that is, in every contemporariness.

Muslims today gladly speak of the exceptional success of the classical period of Oriental-Islamic culture, but in such a perception, they are seriously mistaken, for they fail to draw certain conclusions from that past. Just as people love their childhood, so cultures, that is, societies, gladly reflect upon their antiquity and classicism, but the success of the past must not be an alibi for a non-creative present, instead it needs to be, *in accordance with the principle of analogy*, the basis for an avant-garde in contemporary society.

Muslims of the late classical period were culturally curious, optimally open to the values of other cultures and sciences with which they came into contact, thus their culture constantly recreated itself, and was formed by creating a very wide cultural context, even an entire cultural universe. They considered their pivotal Text scientifically and culturally inspiring, open for constant conquest of the universal values of culture and science. That is in accordance with the Text that reads that God created Man as His emissary on the Earth (*Qur'an*: 2:30), and that is a sublime, divine mission, the essence of which is a permanent progress and development, not stagnation or decadence. A Muslim cannot agree to discussion/doubt on, for example, whether or not God is the Only One, on whether or not there is Akhirah, etc. Those are unquestionable issues of the dogma. However, the majority of other issues – those that the faith integrates into a religious cultural circle – are subject to the force of context, and that means a relative adaptability as a dynamicity that can be acceptable unless it conflicts with the dogma/dogmas. That is why Muslims of the classical period were able to magnificently communicate with the ancient Greek culture – as well as with, or perhaps especially with philosophy – while completely ignoring, without any consequences, Olympus and its deities. The principle of contextualisation is, in fact, an immeasurably important principle of dynamicity that opens a culture and saves it from decadence and collapse. In the post-classical historic period, Muslims neglected that principle, and the same applies especially today. Hence, Muslims once used to enrich that culture, they made it powerful *in time*, *in accordance with the time*, and that means primarily

that they changed it, that they made it more contemporary, even going as far as to include numerous values of ancient cultures, although they, from the point of view of Islam as a religion, were “pagan”. That did not bother them, so their culture in the Baghdad period, even their civilisation, was incomparably different from the Bedouin culture in the time of the Prophet, peace be upon him. They contextualised their own convictions and culture – a multitude of issues, all except the dogma – but they also contextualised cultures that were, in a historical sense, almost intersected. Impressively, they understood the temporality of the culture, that is, the necessity of its contextualisation as an irreplaceable means of survival or vitality. Time is not static and it is especially not retrograde, contrary to what many Muslims think today. When God makes a vow of Time (*Qur'an*, surah 103), it can mean many different things, but certainly not stagnation, or even regression.

The Muslim world today, the majority of its ulema, intellectuals, make significant efforts to detect causes of the state the Muslim world is in, and that state is not even decadence, but a cataclysm. Not much wisdom is necessary to detect the cause: observing that culture in its most dazzling moments and drawing the adequate conclusions from that is very revealing. Of course, all enormous crises are not the consequences of one but of several causes, similar in the sense that they act in the same direction.

Of course, the western corporations' excessive thirst for energy resources in the Muslim world contributed to the today's situation – the corporate deity called Profit – but important triggers leading to a wrong turn can be found in the Muslim world itself and the corporate beast skilfully makes use of that. Quite simply, the new-age (and today's) Muslims neglect the fact that Islamic culture advanced most when it was most open; it advanced forward and “around”, not backwards. In other words, Muslims need to know that the rise of classical culture of Islam is essentially based on its impressive ability to contextualise and re-contextualise its own and (occasionally) “other” values, and that at the same time means a permanent reinterpretation. A closed culture is a culture sentenced to death; it is doomed to collapse, and vice versa: the *openness* of a culture is an irreplaceable condition for its progress, which entails a number of other “cooperative” advantages, of which inherent cosmopolitanism is the primary one, or, what could be called tolerance, which has already become significantly contaminated; in general, the optimal development of universal humanistic values is precious. That is why a truly cosmopolitan – a truly *open* culture – incompatible with politics unable to understand – and, consequently, to appreciate – the necessary cosmopolitanism of a culture; rather, they use culture to pursue their particular and selfish interests, all the more since politics today is a servant of the camouflaged monster eating our world which we call corporations and their profit.

Muslims should carefully observe that “mechanism” of the classical culture of Islam, owing to which it had made progress, and should properly “reactivate” it. By such observation of the golden age of their history, they would extricate the past from the status of a limiting *past*; they would radically re-contextualise it and thus would radically change their own meagre condition. There rests a possibility for renaissance, for the renaissance comes as a fateful fermentation of one’s own cultural values and tradition, which can only be initiated by some other, “external” factors.

In order to achieve that, the contemporary Muslims, who stare at the golden age of the Islamic culture, need to overcome an important and a very difficult obstacle: that diverse, deeply rooted and powerful class of ulema. The understanding of Islam by a certain “ulema” is blindly followed by ISIL, the Taliban, different kinds of Salafis... Muslims simply need to reinterpret their Text, introducing it into the Context of contemporariness.

As far as contextualisation in Islam is concerned, I provide here but a single example about the way in which the *Qur’an* itself is contextualised, affirming that principle in the best and most obvious way. Sometimes it appears that Muslims (of course, I mean the characteristic majority) are aware of the principle of contextualisation, that they know of it, but they only verbalise it, without drawing adequate and effective lessons from it.

The *Qur’an*, as the pivotal text of Islam, but also as the pivotal text of that whole cultural universe, undoubtedly and strongly affirmed the principle of contextualisation, correctly understood and implemented by Muslims in the phase of the full rise of the culture. In the *Qur’an* as well as in the entire gigantic institution called *exegesis* of the *Qur’an*, there exists a well-known principle *the occasion for revelation* (*sabab nuzūl*). Namely, in many cases, concrete occasions in Arabic society in the time of the Prophet, peace be upon him, were an explicit, unquestionable cause for certain ayahs, decrees, rules, regulations, etc., in the *Qur’an*. Certain decrees were even gradually announced until their finality (for example, the ban on alcohol consumption). At the same time, the institution of derogation, that is, the retirement of certain regulations expressed in the *Qur’an* has also been performed.

For a believer, it is pointless and blasphemous to even think that “God did not know” what would happen, so that is not the reason why we adjust to the reality. There are other reasons for that.

Namely, gradual immersion of the Text into the World and Time optimally increases its communicability: the Text is easier to understand and adopt in a *context*. In that sense, the *Qur’an* affirms in God’s way the principle of context/contextualisation, paying full respect to the ability and need to understand such a sublime Text not in the Vertical, but in its Horizontal/Time perspective in a gradual and contextual manner, for that is the only way for a man to improve his reality

and belief to the highest level. If it were not for the God-given nature and need for contextualisation, the entire text of the *Qur’an* could have simply been delivered to the Prophet all of a sudden, in one of many ways. However, the revelation from the Vertical position (by which I mean, among other, God’s Authority) was delivered to the human Horizontal/Temporality/Context during the period of 23 years. Thus, its “way” to the finality of a text which had become unchangeable, even in a single letter, lasted almost a quarter of a century. I will emphasise one more thing: the *Qur’an* as the Revelation/*Revelation process*, as the Text, was *contextualised* during the entire mission of the Prophet, peace be upon him, which is an impressive fact in the sense that it gradually and contextually (I take the context in the widest possible sense) changed the world and constructed a truly new universe. The Prophet, peace be upon him, also needed contextualisation for several reasons, the main of which was because contextualisation and gradualness were important for the success of the mission of creating a new quality in the society of the time; the contextual process facilitated a competent interpretation of the Revelation to the Prophet, peace be upon him, as well as to the competent exegetes later on.

The flawed relationship towards the past, mainly implemented by Muslim societies, abates the sense of the notion *subject*. Consecration of the past as Muslims do it is the annulment of the ability and obligations of the subject in the present. By that, the contemporary subject is significantly limited in the creation of his own reality, that is, the subject is directed to situate the extraordinarily successful past as an alibi for his own sterility. In that way, a ferocious disturbance occurs in the historical and contemporary positioning of the subject, for the past, as the contemporaries understand it, has been brought into a dominant and a privileged position to significantly dominate the present time, instead of serving merely as a basis for the creation of contemporariness (by the subject). Thus, it is clear that the notions/phenomena marking a wrong relationship towards the past and a deviant present as a consequence of such a relationship towards the past, which we call traditionalism, retrogradation, anachronism, appear in that way.

The successful Muslim past is inextricably linked to Islam, so much so that the entire culture, with good reason, is called Oriental-Islamic, Islamic, or classical culture of Islam. That important fact should be kept in mind. That being so, it follows that today’s *Muslim* world establishes the aforementioned relationship towards its past – *as towards a consecrated Muslim* past that once was successful (and that is important to emphasise in this context). That further means that they sacralise their entire successful past in an important and limiting way, and that is only the beginning of the drama in their “endorsement” of contemporariness. By the term *sacralisation*, I here mean the *consecration of*

*the past*, that is, the demand of contemporaries to observe the past as optimised in everything, limiting, in the status of something sacred, so it is only possible to assume ready-made solutions, patterns, etc., regardless of the fact that they were efficient only in another time. That is how *the yellow book's* reign of terror begins.

By thus sacralising the past, ulema acquires a special “argument” for the defence of the authority of the past in contemporariness, for it appears that nobody should dare to question in their contemporariness that what the Sahabahs, Tabi‘uns, and perhaps some other generations immediately following them did. By that sacralisation of the past, the ulema (and in our understanding that is mainly the “theological ulema”, a religious order, although there is no priesthood in Islam, so that is one of the paradoxes of the present) acquires the most important stronghold for the preservation of its own authority as unchallenged, since the ulema is considered to be best acquainted with and the guardians of such a past as the unquestionable order of norms.

It would be risky to group this kind of ulema with an array of khawayas operating in the field, who devotedly perform their duties, frequently in the most difficult situations. The responsibility rests on the ulema of a “higher order” in hierarchy – on those who are able to educate, although there certainly are positive exceptions among them, but they do not have the strength yet to change the general currents in society.

The aforementioned relationship towards the past – as a *non plus ultra* limit and authority – is a reliable way to institutionalise the *bid‘ah*, and that is the way towards the prevention of the true *ijtihad* that should be a permanent priority of the ulema, but the ulema should also let *ijtihad* be not only their privilege, but a right of every thinking Muslim, which includes those Muslims outside theological circles.

Once such a “mechanism”, by which the sacralised past manages contemporariness, is established, then, naturally, an inertia is established as well, an inertia which is truly devastating for the “modern” or for the contemporary Muslim world. More simply, the principle or direction of movement is: *The further and deeper into the past, the better and “more secure for the faith”!* Fundamentalism is always an exceptional opportunity for retrogradation. In extreme cases, piousness has been measured by the degree of devotion to the ancestors. That inertia gave way to the terrifying results of traditionalism, sterility and retrogradation, and some of its effects, especially in certain parts of the Muslim world, I shall shortly discuss further. But before that, one should again warn of the deviant position of the subject in such inertia.

It is clear that, in such relations, the capacities of the subject are transferred from the contemporary into the past, that is, that the past administers the present. The relations should be reversed: the past should simply be desacralised, and should serve as an inspiration to the contemporaries to act as subjects in their time.

Reflecting back on the inertia of retrogradation that I mentioned earlier, and which has become a powerful force in the post-classical period of Islamic culture, as well as the contemporary, a special phenomenon should be mentioned.

Salafism is one of the dominant movements of the Muslim world, in its different variants and different parts of the world – from the Wahhabi Salafism, through the Al-Qaida Salafism and the Taliban understanding, even to the “widening of Islam” to its “promotion” and expansion in the ISIL ideological and military offensives.

Shi‘ism also has its “merits” in the anachronous quest for the bastion at the dawn of Islam and in confrontation with Sunnism, which can be a topic for separate research, but here I will reflect solely upon Salafism because in it the inertia of retrogradation is extremely emphasised; of course, Salafism is itself a topic for a separate study.

Salafism is essentially the return to beliefs and social norms, that is, practising of belief and sociability characteristic of the earliest generations of Muslims – the avant-garde Sahabahs and Tabi‘uns. That is, allegedly, the return to the very “sources” of Islam, since – as it is claimed – the later generations of Muslims brought into Islam, in its practical manifestation, something that entailed innovation in a “negative” sense, which simply corroded those sources of Islam. Hence, the following principle should be kept in mind: *To go as far towards the sources of Islam as possible!* That is the direction of complete anachronism, as well as a wrong understanding of Islam, for demanding of Muslims to live in the 21<sup>st</sup> century the way they used to live in the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> centuries is absurd. That is a severe deviation. However, since such understanding of Islam is very active, no wonder (!) that in the Taliban variant of Islam – which strives to become the dominant and the only correct variant – there is no television, music, football, while only religious/theological science is taught at schools, where the teacher sits on a sort of “receptacle” in a “class” while he “communicates” with students, all for the purpose of avoiding eye contact between men and women, etc. By those means, and for the purpose of a gradual return to the “genuine sources” of Islam, Muslims who understand and practice their faith in such a way have completely been displaced from their time; Islam is frozen in the 7<sup>th</sup> century. By inertia, we have come to the 7<sup>th</sup> century. Even the very name of such understanding of Islam etymologically indicates the ruthless conservatism and anachronism. Namely, Salafism stems from the word *‘aslāf*, which means: ancient forebears, ancestors, and that indicates a peculiar form of conservatism. In that way and at the same time, the principle of sacralisation of the past is “advanced”, for the sanctity of the past is greater the closer it is to the source, that is, to the Prophet, peace be upon him. This logic is wrong precisely because of the fact that the entire life of Muslims is encompassed by

Islam, so that is where arise the dramatic historical, cultural and social breakdowns, emanated in the most severe forms of anachronism and “desubjectivisation” of contemporary Muslims. In one of the end results, that displacement from time because of the prevailing Salafism as a kind of ideology is, in fact, seen also in that the lives of many Muslims have been reduced to the greatest and the most important extent to a kind of a “theological life”, where ibadah, dhikr, etc. have been dramatically separated from reality, and that leads to epigone, to non-creativity. Muslims and the understanding of Islam cannot be returned to the norms and achievements of the 7<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> century (knowing that Islam encompasses the entire life of Muslims) without dramatic cultural and civilisational consequences to the society and its individuals. That kind of desubjectivisation, or anachronous displacement of subjectivity can only have consequences which we see in the contemporary Muslim world. That is a historical, cultural, sociological, as well as religious *drama of the subject*. For, one should keep in mind that those people in the past, and whose authority is called upon, were not only contemporary (in their age), but they also were avant-garde in the sense that they boldly and dedicatedly changed their contemporariness because they felt great responsibility towards it, and thus created a better future. Observed in that aspect, Salafism essentially is a misunderstanding of Islam, or misunderstanding of Islam in time, since only in time can Islam be correctly perceived. In Salafism, there is a complete paradox, since it supposedly returns to the essence, and the essence is what it misapprehends.

I believe that the extent to which such an understanding of Islam is wrong, even harmful, can best be seen in a barely imaginable, but true fact. Namely, the promoters of Salafism, who have acquired also the political and financial power necessary to install it, worked dedicatedly and systematically on burning books, all but the *Qur'an* and collections of *Hadiths*, for, allegedly, the entire libraries of books were written for the purpose of tarnishing those sources of Islam. Reason ceases to function before this fact. That is truly shocking. Not only is even the successful phase of the classical culture of Islam annulled in such a way, but also the very idea of science, progress, openness of the culture and temporality of Islam is burnt as well. This is an attack against the very essence of Islam.

Muslims mainly have a strong emotional relationship towards the “homeland of Islam”, and such a relationship significantly desensitises critical observation of the phenomena that need to be observed critically. Thus, alongside the sacralisation of history, the sacralisation of a geographical region is performed, even of a *political-administrative space*, and there are no foundations for such a thing in the *Qur'an*, which gives only the sacred or exterritorial status to the Kaaba. Although a careful analysis shows that what is considered a centre, or even an epicentre of the Muslim world, has for a long time been unable to offer a suitable

“reform” in the Muslim world, unable to act as a true subject – as the bearer of awareness and progressive action. The centre has been exhausted, in a semiotic meaning of the term. The reform should be expected from other, “liminal areas” – those that are experienced as being “centres” and that have experienced other cultures, which is in accordance with my previous argument that cultures (in this case, Oriental-Islamic culture) are vital *as long as they are open*. On the contrary, the centre has for far too long focused on itself, it seeks “an exit” within itself, falling deeper and deeper towards “the sources”, all for the purpose of an alleged protection of the source as the salvation, failing to realise that by the authority of sacredness it promotes and affirms a wrong kind of fundamentalism; instead, it should do the opposite: it should open in time and towards time, affirm temporality, it should be a subject in full sense of the term *subject*, recontextualise and reinterpret itself in contemporariness, except for the issues of dogma, for the never-changing articles of faith and Islam, for example, never conflict with the idea of modernity and the need for recontextualisation. That is why I would not speak of the *reform of Islam* for the *Qur'an* as the Text cannot be reformed; rather, I would advise reinterpretation, or, even better, recontextualisation of the Text, which is what I have earlier in this discussion named *introduction of the Text into the Context/Reality*. Ulema plays a special role in that, but the problem is that ulema needs to change itself, in accordance with the ayah stating that Allah will not change the state of a people until it changes itself. One of the most efficient ways for that necessary, yet uncertain renaissance victory of the ulema would also mean its opening towards those kinds of scientists who are not a part of the “theological” ulema. For, Islam is concerned with all reality, not only “theological”, hence, ulema, in today’s meaning of the term, should break the boundary which makes it a class and open widely towards the academic ulema in general – towards intellectuals, towards values of other cultures – just as the enlightened Muslims did in their most successful period: in the classical culture of Islam.

As a summation of the discussion on the crisis of the contemporary Muslim world – which is a topic demanding more space – I would like to emphasize that it is possible to treat it in several ways, to see it from different angles, since we are talking about a very complex phenomenon. The essence rests in the crisis of the subject, of Muslims as subjects in a religious, social and cultural meaning, as well as in the domain of the Ummah that is only verbalised. That polyvalent subject has sacralised its past, embracing it as something already-realised and thus limiting, while it has also taken the Text which it claims to be its ultimate guidance and transferred it only into the sphere of verbalisation. By that, the subject has dramatically isolated the essence and sense of piousness from a productive action in reality, and a productive action is a

special “form of piousness”. Many times in the text, the term, or the category, *al-ṣāliḥāt* is mentioned, and it should be translated as *good deeds*. That category is situated in the text as a special expression of piousness, service to God, a brilliant action of believers. However, in practice, it has mainly been reduced to the notion of charity, while, in essence, it is far more than that: through the context, this term is determined as an action of believers which – just like any other kind of the highest good – leads to the overall progress and prosperity of the community. If we add to this the previously-mentioned text which reads that God placed Man as his emissary on Earth, then it is fairly easy to draw a conclusion about which categories should be good deeds of Man, and that it is fatefully wrong to reduce them to the level of charity. All in all – man has separated his universal text from his everyday context.

In order to overcome the crisis, it is necessary for us to reach, subjectively conscious and efficient, the full sense of the Qur’anic explications on God’s placing of Man as his emissary on the Earth, as well as God’s categorical warning that He will not change the state of a people until the people changes itself (*Qur’an: 13:11*). I do not know if it is possible to emphasise more expressively and explicitly the importance of the Subject in the Muslim individual and in the society from the one contained by the aforementioned ayah. His understanding is in close connection with the mission of the emissary on the Earth, an excellent Subject whom, as such, is determined and positioned by the Absolute Subject. According to the firm belief of the believers, God can do absolutely everything, but He says to Man that he is obliged, as the Subject, to do everything he can to change his possibly inadequate situation. The position of Man as the Subject – in accordance with his mission as God’s emissary, which means the highest positivity, in thus optimally emphasised, as a Divine order. That means at the same time – even though it may sound absurd and blasphemous to a believer – that the dua to God is not sufficient to change the situation. The essence and meaning of the dua is not annulled, but it is emphasised that *it must be preceded by man’s*

*action*. In this way, fatalism in Islam is prevented, although it is frequently ascribed to Islam – as a conviction that not much depends on man, even that the outcome does not depend on man at all. On the contrary, a certain inversion is necessary: one should not multiply duas, but actions. That is the essence of the Text in the Context, in Reality, that is also a clear integrity of man as a subject. And the Muslim world is going through such a crisis.

In the end, the following should be emphasised.

Countries of the west have greatly contributed to the crisis of the Muslim world, as well as the contemporary worship of the Golden Calf (the Profit), but it is wrong, unproductive, to blame the West for such a situation because – and that is the point – the West only used the situation the Muslim world is in, and which it also partly caused itself. It is necessary to seek salvation in oneself primarily, and that is in accordance with the Text which is considered to be an irreplaceable guide. Muslims should exit the lavish museum of their history and responsibly step into contemporariness – as its subject. By that I mean the academic community, intellectuals, scientists in general, but that imperative primarily concerns ulema. There are two previously mentioned reasons for such responsibility of the ulema, and I will shortly summarise them. First, ulema are the official and contemporary interpreters of Islam. Second, since Islam encompasses all aspects of spiritual and social life, it follows that this “stratum” of Muslim society, which positions itself as the most competent interpreter of Islam, takes over the greatest responsibility for the relationship between Islam and the reality of the Muslim world. In other words, a reinterpretation of the Text in contemporariness is necessary, that is, a competent introduction of the Text in the Context, for that is the only way for it to act correctly and optimally.

**Acknowledgements:** None.

**Conflict of interest:** None to declare.

*Correspondence:*

Professor Esad Duraković, PhD  
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Sarajevo  
Barica 160, 71230 Vogošća, Bosnia and Herzegovina  
E-mail: esad\_d@hotmail.com