Abstract:

Rudolf Siebert’s *Critical Theory of Religion* provides a framework to study how a modern Islamic Social Movement has used nonviolent methods of intervention to work towards a global future with reconciled science and religion promoting peace among civilizations. Turkish Islamic Scholar Fethullah Gulen juxtaposed with Samuel Huntington and his popular theory *Clash of the Civilizations* offer two contemporary views on the nature of culture and explains why the current political context is pursuing militarization instead of reconciliation. Importantly the critical theory of religion explains why any alternative to reconciliation will result in continued conflict and power imbalance to a point of irreparable environmental and human damage. Gulen and Siebert represent spiritual thinkers from two different cultures who share a vision of a unified East and West achieved through religion, education, science, and secularism. According to both, this is only possible by restructuring the relationship between religion and science. Gulen is establishing alternative educational institutions for example that transforms the education of low income urban areas that is required to reach reconciliation and peace among cultures through science.

Varied numbers are published, but there are estimated to be over 1000 charter schools in over 100 countries across five continents. Schools are all locally initiated and target low income minority based areas. The goal is to create scientifically competitive generations for the postmodern world (Ebaugh). Schools must follow any and all educational rules and regulations of the local area where it is to be established. So schools may incorporate theological study if that is what educational institutions do culturally, but by no means disregard rules, secularism or traditions of any faith. Gulen and Siebert disagree with using religion as a method of oppression through Ninian Smart’s dimensions of religion.
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Introduction

Rudolf Siebert’s Critical Theory of Religion provides a framework to study how a modern Islamic Social Movement has used nonviolent methods of intervention to work towards a global future with reconciled science and religion promoting peace among civilizations. Turkish Islamic Scholar Fethullah Gulen juxtaposed with Samuel Huntington and his popular theory Clash of the Civilizations offer two contemporary views on the nature of culture and explains why the current political context is pursuing militarization instead of reconciliation. More importantly the critical theory of religion explains why any alternative to reconciliation will result in continued conflict and power imbalance to a point of irreparable environmental and human damage. Gulen and Siebert represent spiritual thinkers from two different cultures who share a vision of a unified East and West achieved through religion, education, science, and secularism. According to both, this is only possible by restructuring the relationship between religion and science. Gulen is establishing alternative educational institutions for example that transforms the education of low income urban areas back into the ‘right’ according to the UN Declaration of Human Rights, and into a reality that is required to reach reconciliation and peace among cultures through science.

Rudolf Siebert

Rudolf Siebert grew up in Frankfurt, Germany and as a young man objected the world wars, fascism, and genocide he lived with under Hitler’s regime (Siebert). As a boy he was a member of the Catholic Youth Movement which was against the ideology of the Nazis, so Siebert resisted when he was drafted to serve in the German Air Force. SS officers showed up on
his doorstep and persuaded him otherwise. Several years later Siebert surrendered to Gen. Patton’s army and experienced life in several POW camps before returning to Germany to continue his education (Siebert).

Siebert joined the Institute of Social Research at the Frankfurt School (Siebert). He was influenced by thinkers like Adorno & Horkheimer who were trained in the Hegelian dialectical method of thinking. This was the root of critical theory development which the institute was renowned for. It’s important to note that the critical theory was influenced and shaped by the political experience of those in the institute who had survived in Germany during the Nazi rule. They feared this type of society developing again and critical theory was their solution. Critical theory questions democracy, rationalism, enlightenment, and social gaps in society as non-concrete entities (Nye). For the thinkers of Frankfurt, this was the system that allowed WWII and the Holocaust to take place; understandably they were pessimistic about the fate of culture in modernity (Siebert).

Political thinkers at the Institute sought to transform society. This was the primary function of critical theory-the study of social process and actions (Siebert). It was understood that before the entire society could be transformed, the entire society must be critically understood. And this is what their students would be trained to do, students like Rudolf Siebert. Students of critical theory were taught to use their experience, religion, and culture to progress the theory. Siebert continued with his development of the Critical Theory of Religion (Siebert).

Similar to the definition of the original, theory of religion is a study of how religion influences social action (Siebert). Common modernist arguments blame religion as the source of conflict and power imbalance but Siebert believed this to be too simplistic. He understood
according to the critical theory that a lack of balanced action towards religion will only perpetuate power imbalance rather than offer resolution. Without religion there will be imbalance between the individual and society (Siebert). This can be explained by the three alternative civil futures (Siebert borrowed from CT) and Siebert’s own alternative futures of religion.

Let’s begin by explaining the first two alternative futures of critical theory. The first future is the totally administered society: essentially meaning ‘the end of the individual’ (Siebert). This was demonstrated in Nazi Germany. Society became an unquestionable system that gets administered to citizens and priority is promotion of a robotic society with rigid class and no social mobility. The second alternative future is the totally militarized society. This society is described as being constantly engaged in military conflict, developing weapons of mass destruction for NBC warfare, and shows little regard for effects of waste on the environment afterwards (Siebert). The possibilities of these futures created very real fears for post WWII political thinkers and authors. Literary examples of the time include *A Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley and *1984* by George Orwell. These two books reflect popular theories and fear of the administered and militarized society: contemporary comparisons to these futures come from critics of corporate governments and the long term military plans to spread democracy. It’s hard to refute the ideas of the Frankfurt School when they are currently evidenced around modern society. This is why the third alternative future is imperative.

The final alternative is the totally reconciled society. In terms of critical theory this is the key to balance between individual and society (Siebert). Siebert uses the terms “personal autonomy and universal solidarity” to describe reconciliation. This is where the critical theory of
religion enters the picture. Siebert’s goal as a student of the critical theory was to promote cultural tendencies through education that facilitate the pursuit of a reconciled future. One’s education provides enculturation and individuation, therefore it becomes a necessary component of the theory because the need is to “motivate students to modify and mitigate the trends within civil society that push toward Alternative Future I and II” (Siebert). Using the dialectical method and religions modern dichotomy, Siebert created the alternative futures of religion in attempt to find balance between spirituality and positivity, on the secular side. What Siebert meant was that students of critical theory need to assess both religious fundamentalism and total secularism in society to overcome the dialectic between enlightenment and religion. People need to reform religion and transform secularism in order to create something new that values individualism and solidarity—the reconciled society.

Allow me to explain this better through the thoughts and social actions of another thinker who also was influenced by the world wars from another part of the globe. Turkish thinker M. Fethullah Gulen and the Gulen Movement provide a contemporary example of widespread social movement rooted in religion, simultaneously and actively pursuing through nonviolent intervention the balance a reconciled global society has to offer.

M. Fethullah Gulen

M. Fethullah Gulen is a Turkish Islamic scholar and founder of the Gulen Movement. Gulen’s educational and spiritual roots developed under the influence of Said Nursi (Knauss). Nursi was a scholar of both Islam and science/mathematics. When the Ottoman fell and the caliphate officially ended in 1923, Republican president Mustapha Kemal Ataturk came into power. Ataturk has been an influential figure in Turkey ever since. While much of the former
empire was colonized by the British and French, Turkey managed to avoid this fate and it led to a history unlike their neighbors. Historically western culture is not perceived as an imposition for a majority of urbanized Turks, rather it was an acquired necessity in order to modernize and bring national prosperity. Ataturk outlawed Islam in the nation, and thinkers like Nursi were banished to the eastern rural areas of the country (Knauss).

In isolation, Nursi began combining his knowledge of science and devout nature to Islam (Knauss). He disagreed with Ataturk about the future role of religion for the country; after the final collapsing Nursi no longer argued for religion rather than modernization, rather evolved that both were potential and necessary. From Nursi’s ideas the Nurcu Movement developed and grew. A fundamental belief of the Nurcu Movement was divine creation and the compatibility of Islam and science. He wrote a 6000 page text which was later compiled into a series of books entitled The Risali-Nur (the Treatise of Light). This compilation was a set of ‘proofs’, earthly observations by Nursi that were intended to show the existence of God and intelligent design on Earth (Knauss). For example:

…the clouds suspended between the sky and the Earth, water the garden of the world In the most wise and merciful fashion, furnish the inhabitants of the Earth with the water of life, modify the natural heat of life, and hasten to bestow aid wherever it is needed. In addition to fulfilling these and other duties, the vast clouds, capable of filling the heavens sometimes hide themselves, with their parts retiring to rest so that not a trace can be seen, just like a well-disciplined army

- (Nursi ‘The Supreme Sign’)

Nursi had the ability to take the beauty of science and mathematics and incorporate this into his theories of the creator and purposeful design. The Nurcu Movement attracted Turkish youth who felt torn between their identity as a Muslim and a Turk because the two were no longer one
system the way they were during the Ottoman. One of the students was Fethullah Gulen (Knauss).

Several philosophies are useful to understand Gulen and why his efforts should be categorized accordingly as Johan Galtung’s ‘positive peace’ under Siebert’s theory. First, like Nursi, religion and science are compatible (Knauss). Second, Islam as a social system is inherently democratic (Esposito). Third, Gulen attributes peacebuilding qualities to important Islamic values including reconciliation, forgiveness, & justice. His argument suggests that the pursuit of justice for Islamic nations will leave less space for Muslims to remain complacent. This will prevent ‘marginal fanatics’ from imposing a minority interpretation on the whole. And finally Gulen does not believe that the West and Muslims are inherent enemies to each other (Esposito). Gulen believes in the potential for Islam to contribute to a universal society of peace instead of borders but this can only be successful when the real enemies of freedom are addressed. For Gulen, if the West is not the enemy, nor is globalization-then it is important to determine who or what is to understand him comparatively.

According to Gulen and members of the movement, Muslims and all people are better served by efforts to decrease and prevent ignorance, poverty, and disunity (Esposito). He criticized labeling a political conflict as ideological because this distorts the structural violence and creates a larger foundation for authoritarian regimes to rule colonized Muslim countries (Esposito). Authoritarians have a tendency to delegitimize itjihad (Quranic reinterpretation), promote proviolent interpretations of Islam, express superiority over other traditions, and place unjustified limits on Muslim women. Gulen does not agree with this interpretation of religion that serves political and nationalist interests over collective (Esposito). This is a symptom of
political tensions rather than spiritual. Gulen writings on ‘border mentality’ in comparison to Huntington’s essay offer proof for his theory.

According to Gloria Anzaldua, the borderland is a “vague and undetermined place created by the residue of an unnatural boundary. It is in a constant state of transition” occupied by the marginalized and prohibited (qtd. in Grinell pg.65) While Anzaldua was referring to the US-Mexico border in her own text, the context is applicable to almost any set of borders. Borderlands are at the front of the fight, the sense of safety that is sought after by all is deprived for these marginalized societies. Filmmaker Julie Bacha directed and edited a touching portrayal of people living in the shifting borderlands of Palestine and Israel, she filmed the people of Budrus. The film depicted the ongoing struggle that has been occurring along the border as Israel continues to build settlements & the wall on Palestinian territory. The town of Budrus organized a non-violent protest against military encroachment on their agricultural fields. “Death, stealing the land, and uprooting the trees are the same thing” said a woman from the village (qtd. in Bacha). This movie shows what most people in the West have never had to experience “the dirty work of boundary maintenance” (Crowley qtd. in Yuval-Davis).

Contrary to Huntington’s belief that ethnic and religious identities are what divide ‘us’ from ‘them’, Nira Yuval-Davis in her article “The Politics of Belonging” understands from her work that it is the modern political boundaries described by Gulen that are responsible for dividing people. And discourse is not possible without understanding on a cultural level what it means to ‘belong’. Culture has not divided the world, only political power imbalance. Bacha’s film and many others on the topic have brought the two cultures together to work towards the same goal as we saw when Israeli and other international activists joined the people of Budrus.
People just need to belong: to a home, social structure, identification, emotional attachment, shared ethics. Gulen’s use of the organizational commitment theory in his movement demonstrates his shared confidence in this idea. According to the theory, in order to have commitment to a ‘group’ then the individual must feel the group is an extension of themselves and that they are an extension of the group. There are so many examples of degraded belonging in the world, but intense divisions in this part of the world have become misplaced support and justification for Huntington’s theory.

According to a documentary filmed during American occupation of Iraq hosted by BBC journalist Sean Langan, not only did the Iraqi people want the military out of the country; but they referred to them as the Jews. And recently the UN voted on the Palestinian bid for non-member observer state status and only a handful of countries voted no to the winning bid, two of those were the United States and Israel. This conflict has lasted for literally so long that the politics have become misplaced. Western common tendency is to believe civil conflict in the Middle East is inherent and has permeated histories entirety. Easterners have come to synthesize US efforts to spread democracy (whether or not it is ethical) with Jewish imperialism. I think the whole scenario comes down to basic human nature though; the struggle for resources. This is a Catch-22 because of globalization.

International trade has become necessary to provide for all the countries in existence. But simultaneously when privatization is politically preferred to nationalization it represents the trust that is lacking in the current international relations system. Realism is based on maximizing national interest over collective so it’s not even correct to say that nationalization of resources would solve the problem. Complacency towards anarchy is accepted as long as self-interests are
not affected. To solve a problem the cause of the problem needs to be eradicated. If borders, or at least a proliferation of ‘western’ borders and inspired political systems no longer existed, if there was a universal civilization to enforce universal human rights, there would not be a need for the ‘us’, ‘them’, fear and complacency that comes with the current system.

Gulen attributes the separation between the East and West as a result of the East giving up science and the West giving up values (qtd. in Grinell). He believes the divide never should have happened but confidently theorizes that it was invented to serve a political purpose; like proving superiority of the West which is understandable based on the western role in border drawing (Grinell). Gulen seeks the cultural meeting place that is beyond East or West. As a Turk, he feels obliged to pursue this goal because of Turkey’s role as a borderland both geographically and historically. His ideas on borders form his largest criticism against Samuel Huntington’s essay *The Clash of Civilizations*. Huntington’s theory relies on the East-West border for substance, so for Gulen even if Huntington predicted peaceful co-existence among civilizations he still would have been wrong (Grinell).

Let’s take a closer look at Samuel Huntington’s theory…

**Samuel Huntington**

_The Clash of Civilizations_ was an essay from Samuel Huntington that was first featured in *Foreign Affairs* magazine in 1993. He discussed a new phase of world politics where divisions among humans will be caused by culture rather than ideology or politics (qtd. in Barash). He discusses the history of human conflict in order to clarify the shift between wars among rulers to the wars among people, “The wars of kings were over; the wars of people’s had begun” (Palmer
qtd. in Huntington qtd. in Barash). This period of conflict between nations lasted through WWII, before ideological conflicts took center stage. Ideologies like Communism versus Liberal Democracy that would continue into the early 1990s when the remains of Soviet Union collapsed.

The article was published in 1993 and the Soviet Union had only collapsed at the end of 1991. One prominent criticism of this theory contributed to this proximity was that the ‘cold warriors’ felt threatened by the ‘absence’ of an enemy just like Orwell described in 1984 (Barash). When publications like this incite public expectations based on fear of the future enemy. A self-fulfilling prophecy is created and the behavior of the perceiver will direct the prophecy to reality—both for internal and external expectations. According to Huntington, the future enemy would be the inevitable clash between western and eastern cultures: particularly western culture versus Islamic and Sino cultures (qtd. in Barash).

Huntington criticizes culture as the cause of separation and argued the “most important conflicts will occur along the cultural fault lines separating these civilizations from each other” (qtd. in Barash). His use of the phrase ‘cultural fault lines’ brings Gulen and ‘border mentality’ to mind. Both thinkers agree that in order to understand and address conflict, one must start where divisions take place. From Huntington’s perspective the cultural fault lines are literally cultural characteristics like religious and ethnic identities that lead to ‘us’ vs. ‘them’ mentalities. This allowed him to disregard heterogeneous characteristics of all cultures and create a theory based on assumption. I found this especially hypocritical coming from an American since the states have become the global representation of religious pluralism. Huntington is not applying critical theory to the fact that the Great Schism and discovery of the New World are the most
impactful moments of religious history. Our country was developed on the idea that religion no longer has to be a system of conformity. He believes the borders of the East and West are uncrossable and neo-colonialism is weakening nations and allowing religion to fill the identity gap (qtd. in Barash). Hence civilizations will become further divided based on culture and culture will become further divided from history.

Gulen argues that the fault lines are not cultural but political similar to Davis. Borders were the examples of European modernity and the Cartesian Theory demonstrating short sightedness for self-interest, failure to acknowledge long term destruction, and promotion of ‘either-or’ mindsets (Grinell). Therefore ‘borders’ created transitional areas filled by marginalized peoples, forced to live daily with the tensions of a border line that has no inherent meaning for any entity beyond the powers that drew it. Therefore reconciliation is necessary to disprove Huntington and change a self-destructive system.

Huntington’s theory was a method to legitimize the geocentric view that western culture deserves to be the center of world politics (Esposito). He does not believe in a form of universal civilization just a world of different civilizations that need to learn to co-exist (qtd. in Barash). Only he is not really discussing ‘co-existence’ as much promoting accommodation of non-western powers in order to justify a need for “the West to maintain the economic and military power necessary to protect its interests in relation to these civilizations” (Huntington qtd. in Barash).

Gulen, Siebert, and other critics of international relations would argue that this is what is wrong with our world, our complacency to just ‘co-exist’ in order to not sacrifice maximum self-interest. This has led to atrocius acts of violence, the creation of weapons that can literally
destroy our planet, and a gross inequitable rate of resource consumption. It’s becoming not so much ‘revolutionary’ that the current system needs to change. As time progresses and the gap between affluent and poor, individual and society, religion and secularism continues to grow—the survival of any form of civilization as we know it depends on a change and adoption of balance. Globalization is inevitable but not handled responsibly will prove more negative than positive.

Now that the foundation and philosophy is clarified allow me to justify according to Siebert’s theory how the Gulen Movement is effectively implementing Gene Sharp’s method of nonviolent intervention by developing alternative social institutions (Sharp). This effort, most notably evidenced through a growing number of Gulen-inspired charter schools across the world, is intended to contribute to a reconciled society over the administered or militarized. Sharp describes alternative social institutions as “a way to combat monopolistic characteristics of a particular institution…institutions controlled by the opponent…to maintain social order” (pg.138). He refers to the process as ‘parallel development’ and schools are a popular institution to pursue this with. Both Gulen and Siebert acknowledge in their work that in order to transform society, people must have the educated ability to not only remember our past but critically assess it in order to have a better future, and Huntington’s theory applied to history is proof of this.

Conclusion

Rudolf Siebert’s *Critical Theory of Religion* and the theory of alternative futures demonstrated the foreseen role of religion in the post-modern world. As a historian, philosopher, sociologist, religious scholar, professor, author, and theorist- Siebert is actively encouraging his
students to pursue a reconciled future (Siebert). Siebert was chosen to be a part of this research project because as a former student, he was integral to the perspective of this paper. Students of the academic study of religion are tasked with defining both religion, and Religion. This means that distinguishing the truth from the Ultimate Truth as key to understanding the context and purpose of religious traditions. From the functionalist perspective which influenced my past and present religious research, religion is a method of communal unification. The practice of religion brought people together based on common origins, values to guide inter/intra personal relations, and importantly removed ultimate power from man in order to justify why events (famine, death, plague, etc) in life…just happen (Knauss).

Religious scholar, Ninian Smart, is known for “Smarts 7 Dimensions of Religion” and this labeled foundational aspects of religion (Nye). For example any given religion contains: a narrative on peoples origin and place in the world, a shared system of attitudes and beliefs for membership in the institution, the laws of human behavior, and the role of material in manifesting the sacred and/or blessed (qtd. in Nye). The list simultaneously: explains why Huntington suggested when local identities are lost that religion can naturally fill in the gap, includes the dimensions of a community that need to be penetrated in order to have power over communities—therefore proving the continued necessity of religion because it’s the only causal mechanism supporting Religion in the modern and postmodern world. What I mean is, I believe Religion is the only substance that can prevent our planets idea of ‘power’ from shifting complacently into the hands of that in charge. If the possibility of religion or science disappears the backbone of a system that can at least prevent total anarchy will dissolve. Without the presence of religion mankind risks failing to question the power structures constructed by
mankind and/or the represented power structure of a supposed ‘creator’; society will irreparably progress to Future I or II.

Using my role as student I questioned Huntington and *The Clash of Civilizations*. Skepticism accompanies my research when such bold ideas like “inherent conflict” are promoted and then acted upon on macrolevels. This theory was psychologically a self-fulfilling prophecy forcing the argument that this publication may have been politically motivated in methods unknown to the general public it was addressed to. When Huntington contributed conflict to culture over politics, he revealed a weakness of the power alliance system. For example consider the former relationship between the United States and Afghanistan.

In the 1980’s, before the clash theory and before the Soviets fell, the Soviets invaded Afghanistan. Ideologically like Huntington says, this would be against our interest to have Communism penetrating strategic global locations. So we supported Afghanistan and we armed the Taliban to prevent this. In 1985 former President Ronald Reagan on camera during a meeting with the Taliban at the White House said “they are the moral equivalent of our founding fathers” (qtd. in Barash). Less than twenty years later the US would be hunting them down as terrorists.

This brought Siebert and Orwell back into my mind. When critical theory is applied, it forced me to question our current conflict with the Middle East being supported by Huntington’s idea of inherent uncross able borders. I am especially critical of these borders being politically developed sometime between the fall of the Soviet and proliferation of the clash theory which was only 1-2 years. Huntington’s essay and Reagans quote are only eight years apart. Orwell dubbed this process ‘doublethink’ ([1949] 2000). The ally becomes an enemy when interests no longer align and vice versa. Doublethink fails to recall the shift and instead as Huntington would
say “fills the gap” with supposedly conflicted cultural tendencies instead of thorough chronological political examination.

Fethullah Gulen rejects Samuel Huntington and *The Clash of Civilizations* theory (Esposito). Instead he seeks to redefine the meaning of the ‘other’. His life work has become a manifestation of his firm belief that the East and West should never have been divided. The goal of the work has been to provide mathematics and science education in the East while reviving values and metaphysics in the West (I would argue the charter schools which span the East and West are capable of reviving both categories in both cultures according to mission statements of the schools). The Gulen Movement has utilized a combination of Resource Mobilization Theory and Organizational Commitment Theory to develop a sustainable Islamic Social Movement capable of building alternative institutions across the world (Ebaugh). Charter schools, universities, publishing companies, private hospitals, relief agencies, media outlets and interest free banking institutions are some examples of what have been referred to as Gulen-inspired institutions.

Gulen-inspired charter schools are undeniably the primary sources of support and criticism of Fethullah Gulen. For example in the US, we have been documented as having lower than average math and science scores, so some of these schools do bring Turkish teachers over to work. American evaluation has proved we are not competent and need to change this, hence charter schools wholly dedicated to math and sciences will be an effective route to train new math and science teachers for US future which was recently stated by President Barack Obama to be the goal over the next decade. A US goal is being worked towards by a member of the uncross able East, and they are assisting other countries around the world as well. Gulen inspired
schools represent the efforts to work towards a collective good by trying to enhance quality of life for all in a globally competitive modern world. There just happens to be a spiritual motivator of most of those affiliated in the movement.

Varied numbers are published, but there are estimated to be over 1000 charter schools in over 100 countries across five continents. Schools are all locally initiated and target low income minority based areas. The goal is to create scientifically competitive generations for the postmodern world (Ebaugh). Schools must follow any and all educational rules and regulations of the local area where it is to be established. So schools may incorporate theological study if that is what educational institutions do culturally, but by no means do schools disregard rules, secularism or traditions of any faith. Gulen and Siebert disagree with using religion as a method of oppression through Smart’s dimensions. They believe in science, religion, and reconciliation to such an extent both have dedicated their lives to using science and religion to educate students to be critical and ethical thinkers/global citizens instead of realist robots

Works Cited


