

Bennabi considered that to resolve the problems of colonization and colonizability we must resolve the basic issues at the base of the entire crisis, starting with an integrative framework. Bennabi's civilizational paradigm would analyze human conditions and societal change within the frame of civilization as a comparative framework.

Chapter Six

The Roots of Bennabi's Approach to Civilization: The Internal-Intellectual Dimension

This study discusses the internal-intellectual factors that form the third dimension of metatheorizing in its *Mu* subtype. It relates the study of cognitive factors to the field of civilization and is internal to Bennabi's field of study to resolve the problems in the Muslim world. It identifies the major cognitive paradigms, schools of thought, paradigm changes, and general metatheoretical tools to analyze existing theories and develop new ones.

Two broad paradigms have dominated in the study of civilization: the philosophy of history and social sciences. Bennabi considered the study of civilization a unique field whose methodology and concepts derive from the social sciences. With his knowledge of the Qur'an and study of religions he could avoid materialist and secular conceptions of knowledge and historical change. Using the internal-intellectual dimension of *Mu* in this study helped to discover Bennabi's awareness of the dominant paradigms in the study of civilization.

This chapter applies content analysis to trace some ideas to original thinkers. The analysis of dominant paradigms and various schools and perspectives establishes links between Bennabi's concepts, terms, and methods and their origins in the related fields and dominant schools of thought during his lifetime and throughout the subject's history.

Within the paradigm of philosophy of history, three schools share the study of civilization with their related paradigms: the cyclical view, the progress view, and the simple side-by-side views of mankind's diverse people. The paradigms form the main views of historical change in human conditions and the main schools that approached the issue of civilization by noticing and conceptualizing patterns in historical change.

The 19th century school of historical progress, with Hegel, Comte, and Marx as its leading scholars, saw history as progressive and contributed to Bennabi's study of civilization. In Hegel's dialectical method, history is the story of the progress of civilization and human freedom. Marx, the other leading figure in the school of historical progress, was inspired by Hegel's thought. While Hegel used the dialectic of the mind, Marx used the dialectic of economic means.

Influenced by progress, Comte applied Darwin's theory of evolution and the development of physical sciences to human conditions and historical change. The school's main contribution within the scope of this research is its explanation of the historical movement, its stages and causes.

Bennabi asserted that the majority of historians tried to assemble historical events rather than develop a framework for rational interpretation of these events. He saw a link between the Hegelian notion of contradiction or dialectic and the Marxist idea that contradictory causes generating social changes are economic. Bennabi acknowledged Hegelians' ideas as catalysts for change, and praised Marxists for their dialectical analysis. Bennabi considered that Marx's theory of human needs cannot explain the dynamics of the birth of a civilization.

Bennabi criticized the school of historical progress for being more theoretical than historical and for its Eurocentric basis. The school focused on some variables of historical change and neglected the complexity of civilization as a multifaceted phenomenon. He was further influenced by the cyclical school, of which Ibn Khaldūn and Toynbee were the leading scholars. Bennabi saw himself as successor to its approach and methodology. The school distinguished patterns in historical change and conceptualized these patterns as cyclical. Scholars arrived at universal patterns of historical change after examining historians' data.

In *Muqaddimah*, Ibn Khaldūn pioneered an investigation of history to detect its laws and patterns. His study on the nature of society and social change led him to develop what he called *ʿIlm al-ʿUmrān*, the science of civilization, wherein generations and processes contribute to a civilization's direction. His concept of *ʿAṣabiyyah* is the force that motivates historical change in the rise, growth, and disintegration of dynasties and states.

Toynbee viewed world history as a sequence of civilizations and

considered civilizations the result of the dialectic challenge and response and stages of growth and decline. He emphasized the nature of civilization as the “whole” or intelligible unit of the study of historical change. Like Ibn Khaldūn, he was a determinist who conceptualized a civilizing process that must end with the breakdown and decline of civilization.

Many scholars agree that Bennabi is the second Ibn Khaldūn by his ideas, method, and concern. Both the notions of causality in history and the cycle of civilization attracted Bennabi’s attention. He believed the notion of the cyclical movement allows the discussion of the conditions of progressive development and the factors of decline. Bennabi transcended Ibn Khaldūn’s state as the intelligible unit of socio-historical study to use civilization as the unit of historical study. Toynbee’s use of civilization as the unit of historical analysis, his notion of the cycle, and his formulation of challenge and response also influenced Bennabi’s approach.

Bennabi used the methodology of the social sciences to analyze social events of his time and discuss the role of religion in the civilizing process. For Bennabi, sociology and psychology were necessary to ignite a Muslim renaissance. He saw religion as the synthesizer of social values and the catalyst for civilization to enter a dynamic interaction. Bennabi viewed man as the primary device of civilization that originates change. He was dissatisfied with the two dominant paradigms of the philosophy of history and the social sciences, the three schools, and various approaches to the study of civilization.

Chapter Seven

The Roots of Bennabi’s Approach to Civilization: The External-Intellectual Dimension

The fourth dimension of *Mu* in the metatheorizing approach includes the external-intellectual factors as an alternative to other academic disciplines for ideas, tools, concepts, and theories in the analysis of theory. The external-intellectual dimension focuses on the influence of sciences and fields of research that are traditionally considered external to civilization studies. In Bennabi’s case, this external-intellectual dimension