Civilizational Amnesia: Why Muslims Can No Longer Recognize Their Own Institutions

Abdulaziz Abdi

Toronto, 2025

ABSTRACT

Contemporary dysfunction in the Muslim world is frequently attributed to political authoritarianism, theological rigidity, or external intervention. This paper argues that such explanations miss the deeper cause. The central problem is not the absence of moral belief, but the collapse of the institutional mechanisms that once translated morality into lived practice. Classical Islamic civilization developed a uniquely decentralized moral architecture in which legal authority, ethical formation, economic regulation, and social accountability operated largely outside centralized power. This diffusion of authority prevented the concentration of power, preserved epistemic grounding, and ensured that moral norms retained practical force.

Colonial disruption dismantled these institutions, hollowing out waqf systems, guild economies, local jurisprudence, and informal accountability structures. What followed was not merely political subjugation but a civilizational rupture in which morality survived primarily as theory, rhetoric, and identity rather than as an operative social force. The paper argues that this rupture was compounded internally by the severing of Muslims from their own institutional heritage—particularly Ottoman governance models and Sufi-based systems of moral formation—rendering contemporary Muslim societies unable to diagnose their own condition.

In contrast, modern secular liberal democracies, despite moral pluralism and ideological fragmentation, retained and refined civic institutions capable of operationalizing norms through procedure, accountability, and enforcement. These institutions are often perceived by Muslims as alien or uniquely Western, obscuring the fact that many of their functional antecedents once existed within Islamic civilization itself. This misrecognition has fostered a subconscious rejection of modern civic participation, further entrenching moral inoperability.

The paper concludes that civilizations do not decline because moral values disappear, but because the structures that make morality actionable collapse. Recovering moral vitality in Muslim societies therefore requires not increased moral exhortation, but historical honesty, institutional reconstruction, and the recovery of a civilizational memory capable of translating ethical ideals into social reality.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is not a critique of Muslim belief, sincerity, or faith. It is an attempt to explain why moral conviction, even when sincere and widespread, fails to shape social outcomes when institutional mechanisms collapse.

Moral systems do not exist primarily to express ideals. They exist to regulate behavior. This distinction is foundational, yet it is frequently overlooked in contemporary discussions of civilizational decline, particularly in the Muslim world. Morality is often treated as a matter of belief, sincerity, or identity—as something one possesses internally. In reality, morality functions socially only when it is embedded in structures that shape incentives, constrain abuse, and translate norms into predictable consequences.

No society in human history has sustained moral life through ideas alone. Ethical exhortation, theological instruction, and moral discourse have never been sufficient to regulate behavior at scale. Where moral norms have endured, they have done so because they were supported by institutions that enforced accountability, mediated disputes, rewarded virtue, and imposed costs on wrongdoing. Where such institutions eroded, moral language often persisted, but its practical force diminished rapidly.

This is the central distinction that reframes the entire discussion: moral belief is not the same as moral operation. A population may affirm justice, condemn corruption, and praise virtue while simultaneously inhabiting a social order in which injustice is rewarded, corruption is normalized, and virtue carries no protective force. In such conditions, morality survives as rhetoric rather than reality. The problem is not hypocrisy; it is structural failure.

Ethics require institutions because institutions are the mechanisms through which abstract norms encounter concrete life. Courts translate principles into judgments. Economic structures determine whether honesty or fraud is rewarded. Educational and professional bodies shape what kinds of behavior are cultivated or tolerated. Informal networks of accountability enforce standards long before formal law is invoked. Without these mediating structures, moral norms cannot exert durable influence, regardless of how sincerely they are believed.

This framing is essential because it disarms a common defensive reaction. The argument here is not that Muslims lack moral concern, nor that they are uniquely insincere or ethically deficient. On the contrary, moral language, religious commitment, and ethical aspiration remain widespread. What has collapsed is the institutional ecology that once allowed those moral commitments to shape behavior consistently and predictably. When morality is severed from its operational infrastructure, it becomes symbolic—invoked to signal identity or intention rather than to govern conduct.

Understanding this distinction shifts the question from personal virtue to civilizational design. The issue is no longer why individuals fail to live up to moral ideals, but why societies fail to make moral behavior viable, sustainable, and enforceable. Only once this shift is made does it become possible to

diagnose the deeper causes of contemporary dysfunction and to understand why moral revival, absent institutional reconstruction, repeatedly fails to produce meaningful change.

Throughout this paper, 'alignment' refers to the degree to which power remains constrained by feedback from lived social reality rather than insulated through abstraction or centralized mediation.

2. ISLAMIC CIVILIZATION AS A DECENTRALIZED MORAL ORDER (NOT AN EMPIRE STORY)

Any serious diagnosis of the contemporary Muslim condition must begin by abandoning a misleading narrative: that Islamic civilization is best understood through the rise and fall of empires. Political power mattered, but it was never the primary site where moral authority resided. Historically, Islamic civilization operated as a *decentralized moral order*—one in which ethical regulation, legal reasoning, and social accountability were structurally insulated from sovereign control, even when political authority was expansive.

At the heart of this order was the fact that law was produced outside the state. Jurisprudence did not originate as legislation issued by rulers, nor was it codified as a centralized legal code enforced uniformly from above. Legal authority emerged through interpretive communities of jurists who derived legitimacy from learning, moral credibility, and communal trust. The plurality of legal schools was not a temporary phase awaiting consolidation; it was the system. There was no final court of appeal capable of closing interpretive space, no centralized body empowered to declare definitive moral outcomes across all contexts. Disagreement was not a flaw to be eliminated, but a structural safeguard against epistemic monopoly.

This diffusion of authority extended beyond formal law. Waqf institutions functioned as parallel economic systems operating independently of rulers. Hospitals, schools, roads, water infrastructure, and charitable services were financed and governed through endowments that neither required state approval nor answered to state control. These institutions embedded moral obligations directly into economic life, ensuring that care for the vulnerable and provision of public goods did not depend on political favor or bureaucratic mediation. Power could not easily convert resources into control when those resources were legally and socially insulated from sovereign reach.

Economic and professional life was similarly regulated through guilds, futuwwa associations, and informal codes of conduct that enforced ethical norms within trades and communities. These bodies disciplined members, protected consumers, and transmitted moral expectations through apprenticeship and reputation rather than through centralized enforcement. Alongside them, Sufi networks played a critical role in moral formation, cultivating character, restraint, and accountability through embodied practice rather than abstract instruction. Importantly, these networks operated largely outside formal political hierarchies, deriving authority from moral standing rather than appointment.

Scholars and moral authorities were therefore not functionaries of power. Their legitimacy did not depend on state sanction, and their capacity to critique rulers was preserved precisely because they were not structurally subordinate to them. Even when rulers patronized scholars, the source of scholarly authority remained external to political office. Moral legitimacy flowed upward from society, not downward from the state.

Seen through the lens of alignment, this civilizational architecture achieved something rare: it kept power immersed in reality through distributed accountability. No single institution could abstract itself fully from lived conditions. Legal reasoning remained responsive to local contexts. Economic ethics were enforced by proximity rather than distant administration. Moral authority was fragmented across overlapping domains, preventing the consolidation of epistemic sovereignty. Power existed, sometimes massively so, but it was constrained by a dense ecology of institutions that continuously reintroduced feedback from social life.

This arrangement was neither accidental nor idealized. It emerged through historical pressure, adaptation, and internal critique. But its effect was clear. Islamic civilization developed mechanisms that allowed moral norms to remain operational at scale without collapsing into centralized control. In doing so, it solved a problem that many modern societies continue to struggle with: how to preserve ethical accountability under conditions of complexity and power.

The significance of this history is not that it represents a golden age to be nostalgically revived. It is that it reveals a solution whose logic has been forgotten. Islamic civilization once sustained moral life not by intensifying belief or enforcing conformity, but by designing institutions that prevented power from detaching itself from consequence. That this achievement is largely absent from contemporary Muslim self-understanding is itself part of the problem the remainder of this paper seeks to explain.

3. THE OTTOMAN CASE: CENTRALIZED POWER WITHOUT EPISTEMIC SOVEREIGNTY

Any claim that Islamic civilization historically resisted the concentration of power must confront the Ottoman Empire directly. At its height, the Ottomans governed vast territories, commanded standing armies, collected taxes at scale, and administered one of the most complex imperial systems in early modern history. If Islamic civilization were inherently decentralized only in the absence of power, the Ottoman case would decisively refute that claim. It does not. Instead, it clarifies the distinction upon which the argument of this paper rests.

The Ottomans undeniably centralized *administration* and *coercion*. Military organization, taxation, land tenure, and bureaucratic oversight were progressively systematized to sustain imperial governance. The state possessed the capacity to enforce order, suppress rebellion, and project authority across diverse regions. In this sense, the Ottoman polity was fully imperial.

What it did not do, however, was centralize *epistemic sovereignty*. Law, theology, and moral authority were never fully absorbed into the machinery of the state. Jurisprudence remained grounded in the plural

tradition of fiqh rather than reduced to codified state law. Judges operated within interpretive frameworks that predated and exceeded imperial authority, and their legitimacy derived from legal learning rather than from executive command. Theology was not canonized into a single orthodoxy enforced by state decree, nor was moral legitimacy monopolized by political office.

Crucially, moral authority remained structurally external to power. Scholars were incorporated into administrative roles, but their authority was not created by the state. Sufi orders, waqf institutions, and local moral networks continued to operate with relative autonomy, forming parallel spheres of influence that power could not fully subsume. The Ottoman state ruled, but it did not define the ultimate meaning of justice, truth, or virtue. That distinction mattered.

This separation explains a historical paradox: Islamic civilization endured long after its empires fell. Political structures dissolved, borders shifted, and dynasties collapsed, yet legal traditions, moral discourses, and communal practices persisted. The civilization survived empire precisely because it was never identical to empire. Its moral and epistemic foundations were not coterminous with sovereign power.

From the perspective of alignment, the Ottoman system represents a high-tension equilibrium. Political power scaled, but it remained partially immersed in reality through institutions that constrained abstraction and preserved feedback. Law retained interpretive openness. Moral authority retained independence. Observer plurality was not eliminated. The system approached the threshold at which power risks epistemic insulation, but it did not fully cross it.

The moment of rupture comes later, and it is instructive. Decline does not begin simply with military defeat or territorial loss. It accelerates when Ottoman reforms, particularly in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, import European-style codification, centralized bureaucracy, and mediated governance. Legal pluralism gives way to standardized codes. Waqf autonomy is curtailed. Administrative rationality begins to replace moral accountability. Power increasingly acts through abstraction rather than proximity.

These reforms were undertaken in the name of efficiency and survival, yet their unintended consequence was epistemic drift. As mediation increased, feedback weakened. As authority centralized, observer diversity narrowed. The state did not merely grow stronger; it became more insulated. This is precisely the failure mode predicted by the misalignment thesis: when power expands faster than grounding, control displaces understanding, and moral authority collapses into administration.

The Ottoman case therefore does not undermine the argument of this paper. It strengthens it. It shows that Islamic civilization could sustain imperial power without surrendering moral sovereignty, but only so long as power remained constrained by external sources of legitimacy. When those constraints eroded, decline followed—not because Islam failed, but because alignment did.

What the Ottomans demonstrate is not that decentralization is incompatible with power, but that moral civilization depends on power's refusal to become the sole mediator of reality. Once that refusal weakens, the civilization loses the very mechanisms that once allowed it to scale without collapse.

4. COLONIALISM: THE DESTRUCTION OF MORAL INFRASTRUCTURE, NOT JUST SOVEREIGNTY

Colonialism is often discussed in Muslim discourse as the loss of political independence, territorial control, or cultural confidence. While these losses were real, they do not fully explain the depth or persistence of contemporary dysfunction. The more consequential damage was structural. Colonial rule did not merely replace Muslim rulers with foreign ones; it systematically dismantled the institutional machinery through which morality had once been translated into social practice.

One of the most significant casualties was the waqf system. Colonial administrations across the Muslim world moved to regulate, nationalize, or neutralize endowments that had operated for centuries outside state control. Waqf assets were brought under bureaucratic oversight, repurposed, or dissolved entirely. In doing so, colonizers eliminated an economic foundation that had sustained education, healthcare, infrastructure, and social welfare independently of political power. What had once been a distributed moral economy became a centralized fiscal apparatus oriented toward extraction rather than care.

Guild economies and professional associations suffered a similar fate. Indigenous systems of apprenticeship, ethical enforcement, and economic regulation were either suppressed or rendered obsolete by the imposition of colonial market structures. Colonial economies privileged scale, efficiency, and external trade over local accountability. Ethical norms embedded in craft, reputation, and communal sanction could not survive the displacement of economic life into impersonal markets governed by distant authority. The collapse of guilds did not merely disrupt livelihoods; it erased a primary mechanism through which moral behavior had been enforced in everyday economic exchange. A pre-modern guild could expel a dishonest merchant, instantly destroying his livelihood and reputation. A modern sermon condemning fraud, by contrast, imposes no comparable consequence. The difference is not moral awareness, but institutional enforcement.

Local courts and customary jurisprudence were likewise subordinated or abolished. Colonial legal systems introduced standardized codes and centralized judicial hierarchies that displaced plural, context-sensitive adjudication. Judges became administrators of imperial law rather than interpreters of communal norms. Legal authority no longer flowed from moral credibility and local knowledge, but from formal appointment and procedural compliance. In this transition, law lost its proximity to lived reality. Justice became legible to the state, but increasingly illegible to the people it governed.

The cumulative effect of these changes was the disappearance of moral enforcement mechanisms. Not morality as belief, but morality as constraint. Ethical norms persisted in sermons, texts, and personal conviction, yet they were no longer embedded in institutions capable of shaping behavior. Corruption could flourish without sanction. Exploitation could proceed without communal restraint. Power could act without meaningful accountability. What remained was a moral vocabulary detached from operational force.

The most unsettling insight is that this destruction was then misinterpreted as moral failure. Colonial narratives portrayed Muslim societies as corrupt, stagnant, or ethically deficient, ignoring the fact that

the very structures that had once regulated conduct had been deliberately dismantled. The machinery that made morality actionable was removed, and its absence was cited as evidence that morality itself had never truly existed.

This diagnosis does not absolve Muslim societies of responsibility for what followed. Institutional collapse does not predetermine moral decline; it creates conditions in which decline becomes likely. Choices were made, adaptations attempted, and internal failures compounded the damage. But responsibility cannot be meaningfully assigned without acknowledging the scale of the rupture. To blame post-colonial societies for moral dysfunction without accounting for the systematic removal of their regulatory institutions is to mistake consequence for cause.

Understanding colonialism as an assault on moral infrastructure clarifies why moral revivalist movements have repeatedly failed to produce durable change. Without institutions capable of enforcing norms, exhortation substitutes for accountability, and sincerity substitutes for structure. The result is a society rich in moral language but poor in moral traction. This is not a cultural deficiency. It is the predictable outcome of a civilization stripped of the mechanisms that once allowed its values to govern reality.

5. THE MODERN PARADOX: WHY SECULAR SOCIETIES TRANSLATE MORALITY BETTER

The most unsettling comparison for many Muslims is not with openly authoritarian states, but with secular liberal democracies. These societies are often morally fragmented, ideologically divided, and openly pluralistic in their values. Yet in practice, they frequently succeed where many Muslim societies fail: translating ethical norms into consistent social behavior. Corruption is constrained, abuse of power is contestable, and wrongdoing encounters predictable consequences. This outcome appears paradoxical only if morality is misunderstood as belief rather than operation.

Liberal democracies do not rely on moral agreement. They do not presume shared metaphysical commitments, unified ethical visions, or moral consensus. Instead, they rely on civic institutions that enforce norms procedurally. Behavior is regulated not through shared virtue, but through systems that make certain actions costly, visible, and corrigible regardless of personal belief. Moral coherence is not assumed; it is engineered through structure.

Courts exemplify this logic. They do not require judges, litigants, or citizens to share values beyond minimal procedural commitments. Their function is not to perfect character but to adjudicate disputes, impose accountability, and constrain power through rule-bound processes. Regulatory bodies operate similarly, enforcing standards in finance, health, safety, and labor without appealing to moral unity. Compliance is secured through oversight and consequence, not moral exhortation.

Civil society organizations fill gaps that neither markets nor states can address alone. They monitor power, advocate for the vulnerable, and create channels for participation that do not depend on centralized authority. Professional accountability bodies regulate conduct within specialized domains,

disciplining members whose behavior undermines trust or public welfare. Local governance structures ensure that decision-making remains responsive to lived conditions, preventing abstraction from fully displacing proximity.

None of these institutions require virtue in the classical sense. They assume its absence. Their strength lies precisely in their pessimism about moral consensus. By distributing authority, embedding feedback, and enforcing norms procedurally, they prevent individual failure from cascading into systemic collapse. Morality becomes actionable not because people agree, but because systems constrain deviation.

The destabilizing insight is that these mechanisms are not uniquely Western inventions. They are functional descendants of institutions that once existed within Islamic civilization itself. Independent courts resemble earlier juridical traditions in which law operated outside sovereign command. Regulatory oversight echoes guild systems that enforced ethical standards within trades. Civil society mirrors waqf-based social provisioning and communal responsibility. Professional accountability recalls futuwwa codes and moral apprenticeship. Local governance reflects the decentralized adjudication and social mediation that characterized pre-modern Muslim societies.

What modern secular societies retained was not superior moral insight, but institutional memory. They preserved the principle that morality must be enforced through structure rather than assumed through belief. Muslim societies, by contrast, lost the very mechanisms that once performed this function, then mistook their absence for evidence that morality itself was intact as long as it was affirmed verbally.

This inversion produces a profound misrecognition. Civic institutions are perceived by many Muslims as alien, secular, or culturally intrusive, rather than as structural solutions to a problem their own civilization once understood intimately. As a result, participation is resisted, adaptation is stalled, and moral ideals remain suspended above social reality.

The paradox, then, is not that secular societies are more moral. It is that they remember something Muslim societies have forgotten: that morality survives only when it is embedded in institutions capable of enforcing it without relying on shared belief. When this insight is lost, even the most sincerely held values fail to govern behavior, and moral life retreats into theory while practice drifts unchecked.

This is not a claim that secular societies are ethically superior, but that they retained procedural mechanisms capable of enforcing norms despite moral disagreement.

6. CIVILIZATIONAL AMNESIA: WHY MUSLIMS CANNOT SEE THE PROBLEM

If the institutional collapse described thus far were widely understood, the contemporary Muslim condition would be easier to diagnose—and harder to excuse. Yet even among educated Muslims, including those living in Western societies, there is a striking inability to recognize the nature of the problem. This is not simply ignorance. It is a form of civilizational amnesia: a loss of historical self-understanding so deep that the very tools required for recovery are perceived as foreign or illegitimate.

One manifestation of this amnesia is an aversion to Ottoman history. For many Muslims, the Ottoman period is either romanticized superficially or dismissed entirely as irrelevant, corrupt, or politically compromised. Rarely is it studied as a complex civilizational experiment in balancing power with moral decentralization. As a result, Muslims lose access to the last sustained historical model in which Islamic societies managed scale without collapsing moral authority into the state. What remains is a flattened historical narrative in which empire equals failure and decentralization is never properly understood as a deliberate achievement.

Closely related is the widespread suspicion or rejection of Sufism. Over the past century, large segments of the Muslim world have come to view Sufi traditions as peripheral, irrational, or even deviant. This rejection is often framed in theological terms, but its consequences are institutional. Sufi networks historically functioned as systems of moral formation, social discipline, and ethical transmission embedded in everyday life. By severing themselves from these traditions, Muslim societies did not merely abandon a spiritual path; they dismantled one of the primary mechanisms through which character was cultivated and moral norms were enforced informally but effectively.

At the same time, Islam has increasingly been reduced to doctrine and identity. Faith is framed as correct belief, ideological alignment, or symbolic affiliation rather than as a lived system of social regulation. This reduction transforms Islam into something that can be asserted loudly while remaining socially inert. When religion is detached from institutions, it becomes a marker of belonging rather than a structure of accountability. Moral language proliferates, but moral consequences disappear.

The cumulative effect of these shifts is the loss of institutional memory. Muslims no longer recognize how their own civilization once translated ethics into practice. They inherit moral ideals without inheriting the mechanisms that once made those ideals operative. Without that memory, the present condition appears mysterious or inevitable rather than historically produced and therefore reversible.

Because of this amnesia, civic institutions are misrecognized. Courts, regulatory bodies, professional standards, local governance, and civil society organizations are perceived as Western constructs—products of secular modernity rather than as functional solutions to perennial civilizational problems. Participation in such institutions is therefore experienced as compromise rather than continuity. Governance is viewed with suspicion, institutional engagement with discomfort, and procedural accountability with theological anxiety.

This misrecognition produces paralysis. Muslims reject modern civic participation on the grounds that it is alien, while lacking access to the historical forms that once allowed them to govern morally without centralization. They stand between a past they no longer understand and a present they refuse to inhabit fully. The result is withdrawal rather than reconstruction, critique rather than participation, and moral discourse unmoored from any structure capable of enforcing it.

Civilizational amnesia thus becomes self-reinforcing. The more Muslims distance themselves from their institutional heritage, the less capable they are of recognizing its modern descendants. And the less they recognize those descendants, the more they interpret moral failure as a problem of belief rather than of design. Until this blind spot is addressed, even the most sincere calls for reform will

continue to circle the surface of the problem, never reaching the structures that determine whether morality can function at all.

7. WAHHABISM AS INSTITUTIONAL SEVERANCE (NOT JUST THEOLOGY)

Any attempt to understand the modern Muslim condition without addressing Wahhabism as one of the forces shaping contemporary religious and institutional life will remain incomplete. Yet the significance of Wahhabism is often misunderstood. It is typically framed as a set of theological positions—overly literalist, intolerant, or reductive. While these descriptions may capture elements of its doctrine, they miss its deeper civilizational effect. Wahhabism functioned not merely as a theology, but as an institution-destroying logic.

The most consequential target of this logic was Sufi moral formation. Sufi networks had historically served as systems of ethical cultivation, social discipline, and communal accountability. They trained restraint, humility, and responsibility through embodied practice rather than abstract instruction. Wahhabism systematically delegitimized these traditions, casting them as corruptions rather than as moral infrastructure. In doing so, it removed one of the primary mechanisms through which character was formed and moral norms were enforced outside the reach of state power.

This attack extended beyond spiritual practice to the broader ecosystem of informal ethics. Guilds, futuwwa associations, and communal codes that regulated economic and social behavior were either undermined or rendered suspect by a worldview that privileged doctrinal purity over lived regulation. Ethical conduct, once embedded in professional and communal life, was displaced by a narrow focus on formal compliance with prescribed rules. What could not be easily codified was dismissed as innovation or deviation.

Wahhabism also reduced Islam to rule compliance. Religion became increasingly defined by correct performance and outward conformity rather than by the cultivation of moral judgment and accountability. This shift transformed Islam from a lived moral order into an abstract system of obligations. Ethics were no longer enforced through proximity, reputation, and communal sanction, but asserted through instruction and surveillance. The result was a moral discourse heavy with prohibition yet light on responsibility. The significance of this shift lies not in theological disagreement, but in its structural effect on how morality is transmitted, enforced, and sustained.

Perhaps most critically, Wahhabism centralized religious authority under power. By rejecting the legitimacy of plural traditions and informal moral networks, it created a vacuum that was readily filled by state-aligned religious institutions. Moral authority, once distributed across scholars, communities, and ethical associations, became bureaucratized and subordinated to political structures. Religion ceased to function as a constraint on power and instead became one of its instruments.

The defining consequence of this transformation is captured in a single trade: lived morality was replaced with abstract purity. This was the worst possible exchange. Lived morality regulates behavior because it is embedded in social reality; abstract purity demands adherence without providing

mechanisms for accountability. It produces certainty without responsibility, compliance without conscience, and identity without ethical traction.

This framework explains a puzzle that otherwise appears inexplicable. Gulf societies possess immense resources, explicit Islamic identity, and formal religious institutions. Yet they struggle to produce moral civilization in the sense of accountable governance, ethical economic life, and constrained power. The problem is not a lack of belief or investment. It is the absence of institutions capable of translating moral ideals into lived consequences.

Wahhabism did not merely simplify theology; it played a significant role in severing Muslims from the institutional memory that once made their civilization morally functional. In doing so, it left behind a moral language that sounds confident but governs little. Until this severance is recognized as structural rather than doctrinal, attempts to revive Islamic ethics will continue to address symptoms while leaving the underlying damage intact.

8. THE GULF STATES: WEALTH WITHOUT MORAL GROUNDING

The Gulf states provide a particularly revealing test case for the framework developed in this paper. They possess conditions that, in theory, should favor moral civilizational success: immense financial resources, explicit Islamic identity, political stability, and the absence of overt colonial administration in their contemporary form. Yet these advantages have *not* translated into moral governance, accountable institutions, or durable ethical order. This failure is not incidental. It follows directly from the structural dynamics outlined earlier.

Wealth accelerates misalignment when it is not constrained by institutions that preserve grounding in lived reality. Abundant resources allow power to act without friction. Decisions can be insulated from consequence, errors absorbed rather than corrected, and dissent managed rather than engaged. In such conditions, feedback weakens. The system continues to function, often efficiently, but increasingly without reference to the realities it governs. This is not corruption in the moralistic sense; it is structural insulation.

Religion, under these conditions, becomes bureaucratic. Religious authority is centralized, formalized, and incorporated into administrative hierarchies. Moral discourse is standardized, disseminated, and regulated, but no longer cultivated through independent social mechanisms. Ethical guidance flows downward through official channels rather than outward through communal enforcement. The result is a religious sphere that appears highly visible yet lacks the capacity to constrain power meaningfully.

Morality, consequently, is preached rather than enforced. Ethical ideals are articulated clearly and frequently, but they do not shape incentives or impose costs on wrongdoing. There are few independent institutions capable of translating moral norms into accountability. Where enforcement exists, it is selective and administrative rather than communal and corrective. Moral language becomes symbolic, signaling legitimacy without regulating behavior.

Power, in this environment, is insulated from consequence. Decision-making is mediated through layers of abstraction that distance authority from lived conditions. Those affected by policy have limited capacity to challenge it. Observers whose experiences might disrupt official narratives are marginalized rather than incorporated. From the perspective of alignment, this is a classic failure mode: power exceeds grounding, and control displaces understanding.

The alignment framework predicts precisely this outcome. When power is not immersed in lived reality, it collapses into control. Intelligence remains active and capable, but its orientation shifts. Instead of preserving explanatory contact with the world, it optimizes for stability, predictability, and dominance. Moral systems, when subordinated to this orientation, cease to function as constraints and instead become instruments of legitimacy.

This analysis does not attribute failure to bad intentions, cultural deficiency, or lack of faith. It identifies a structural condition in which even sincere moral commitments cannot operate. The Gulf states demonstrate that resources and religious symbolism, absent decentralization and institutional feedback, do not produce moral civilization. They produce administratively coherent systems that speak the language of ethics while remaining largely untouched by it.

Seen this way, the Gulf case is not an anomaly. It is an accelerated version of a more general pattern: when wealth and power outpace moral infrastructure, alignment degrades. The lesson is not that prosperity is incompatible with morality, but that prosperity without grounding amplifies misalignment. Without institutions that force power to encounter consequence, moral discourse becomes performative, and civilization becomes administratively impressive but ethically brittle.

9. THE CORE DIAGNOSIS: THE ABSENCE OF OPERATIVE MORALITY

The argument of this paper converges on a single diagnosis: the central crisis facing contemporary Muslim societies is not a lack of morality, but the absence of operative morality. Ethical belief, moral language, and religious commitment remain widespread. What has collapsed are the pathways through which those commitments once shaped behavior, constrained power, and corrected failure.

Morality does not govern societies by declaration. It governs through enforcement. When ethical norms are not backed by mechanisms that impose consequences, behavior adapts not to ideals but to incentives. In such conditions, corruption becomes rational, abuse becomes survivable, and virtue becomes costly. Individuals may continue to affirm moral values sincerely, but social outcomes will reflect the structures that reward or punish action, not the beliefs that are professed.

Where institutions are absent, accountability disappears. Without independent courts, professional bodies, economic regulators, and communal enforcement mechanisms, moral transgressions encounter little resistance. Power operates without scrutiny, and wrongdoing becomes normalized not because people approve of it, but because no system exists to challenge it effectively. Accountability cannot be improvised through intention; it must be embedded in durable structures that outlast individual resolve.

Feedback is equally essential. Moral systems depend on the ability to register error, absorb critique, and adjust behavior. When power is insulated from feedback—through centralization, abstraction, or fear—mistakes compound rather than correct. Narratives replace evidence, legitimacy replaces responsibility, and authority becomes self-referential. In such environments, moral failure is rarely recognized as such; it is explained away, externalized, or ritualized.

The absence of enforcement, accountability, and feedback produces a distinctive pathology. Moral discourse intensifies while moral efficacy declines. Calls for reform multiply, yet behavior remains unchanged. Religious instruction proliferates, but injustice persists. This is not hypocrisy; it is the predictable outcome of a system in which morality has been severed from the mechanisms that once made it actionable.

This diagnosis reframes responsibility without evasion. Individuals remain morally accountable, but their capacity to act ethically is constrained by the environments they inhabit. Societies that fail to build institutions capable of enforcing norms will reliably produce outcomes that contradict their stated values, regardless of the sincerity of belief. Moral failure, in this sense, is systemic before it is personal.

Recognizing the absence of operative morality clarifies why revivalist movements that focus on belief, identity, or exhortation repeatedly fail to deliver transformation. Without rebuilding the institutional pathways through which ethics operate, such efforts can only circulate ideals within a vacuum. Morality cannot be restored by intensifying conviction alone. It must be re-embedded in the structures that govern social life.

10. WHY MUSLIMS SUBCONSCIOUSLY REJECT MODERNITY—AND PAY THE PRICE

The final paradox follows naturally from the analysis thus far. Many Muslims insist, often sincerely, that Islam is complete, sufficient, and morally superior. Yet this affirmation coexists with a persistent reluctance to participate fully in modern civic life, even where participation is structurally available. The result is a contradiction that appears ideological on the surface but is, at its core, historical and institutional.

Muslims often reject modern civic participation because it is perceived as *alien*. Courts, regulatory bodies, professional associations, local governance, and civil society organizations are viewed as products of Western secularism rather than as neutral mechanisms for translating norms into action. Engagement with such institutions is therefore experienced as compromise or dilution, not as *moral responsibility*. This perception persists even in Western contexts, where Muslims enjoy legal protection and institutional access yet frequently remain institutionally peripheral.

The deeper reason for this rejection is not hostility to order or accountability, but the loss of recognition. Muslims no longer see these civic structures as part of their own civilizational inheritance. Severed from their institutional history—particularly from Ottoman governance models and Sufi-

based systems of moral formation—they lack the conceptual tools to identify continuity between past and present. What appears as modernity is experienced as rupture rather than evolution.

This misrecognition has a predictable psychological consequence. Unable to operationalize morality through institutions they distrust, Muslims increasingly retreat into exclusivist moral narratives. Identity replaces structure. Assertions of "us" versus "them" substitute for functional comparison. Claims that "Islam is perfect" are repeated with growing intensity, even as the mechanisms required to demonstrate that perfection in lived reality remain absent. Moral superiority is asserted rhetorically precisely because it cannot be enacted structurally.

The result is a tragic loop. The loss of institutions produces moral failure. Moral failure deepens suspicion toward modern civic participation. Rejection of participation prevents institutional reconstruction. Dysfunction then intensifies, confirming the belief that external systems are corrupt while leaving internal deficiencies unaddressed. Each turn of the loop reinforces the next.

This dynamic is not merely political; it is *epistemic*. When communities disengage from institutions capable of providing feedback, error becomes invisible and self-correction impossible. Moral claims are no longer tested against outcomes. They circulate internally, insulated from reality, growing more rigid as their practical relevance declines. This insulation mirrors the very misalignment this paper has sought to diagnose: abstraction replacing grounding, assertion replacing accountability.

Breaking this loop requires confronting an uncomfortable truth. Affirming moral completeness without building the structures that make morality operative is not confidence; it is abdication. Participation in civic institutions is not a concession to modernity, but a prerequisite for moral credibility. Until Muslims recover the ability to recognize institutional engagement as an extension of their own civilizational logic, claims of ethical superiority will remain unproven, and the gap between belief and practice will continue to widen.

11. CONCLUSION: CIVILIZATIONS DO NOT COLLAPSE FROM IMMORALITY—THEY COLLAPSE FROM MORAL INOPERABILITY

This paper has argued that the contemporary crisis of the Muslim world is not best understood as a failure of belief, identity, or sincerity. It is a failure of operation. Civilizations do not collapse because moral values disappear; they collapse because the structures that translate those values into lived reality erode. Morality, when detached from institutions, does not vanish—it becomes inert.

Morality must be institutionalized to survive. Ethical ideals require mechanisms that enforce accountability, regulate behavior, and preserve feedback between power and consequence. Without such mechanisms, even the most compelling moral visions remain aspirational rather than effective. Islamic civilization once understood this with unusual clarity. It developed decentralized systems of law, economy, education, and moral formation that allowed ethical norms to govern behavior without collapsing authority into the state. That achievement was not theological abstraction; it was civilizational design.

The loss of this institutional ecology explains not only contemporary dysfunction, but a deeper disorientation. Modern Muslims often struggle to recognize Islam in the moral achievements of the modern world. Environmental stewardship, recycling, animal welfare, the elevation of human rights, concern for racial justice, and even aspects of feminism aimed at protecting dignity and equity are frequently perceived as foreign imports rather than as expressions of Islamic ethical imperatives. This misrecognition does not arise because these values contradict Islam, but because the institutional pathways that once made Islamic ethics visible in public life no longer exist. Deprived of those pathways, moral action is outsourced, and ethical continuity becomes difficult to perceive.

As a result, Islam is increasingly reduced to a private conviction or symbolic identity, while public moral order is attributed to external traditions. This division is historically false and civically debilitating. It obscures the fact that many modern ethical practices are not rival moral systems, but parallel responses to the same structural problem Islamic civilization once addressed: how to translate ethical commitment into collective behavior under conditions of scale and complexity.

Recovery, therefore, does not require nostalgia or romantic reconstruction of the past. It requires historical honesty. Muslims must confront not only the external forces that dismantled their institutions, but also the internal choices that severed them from their own civilizational memory. Moral revival without institutional reconstruction will continue to fail, not because Islam lacks resources, but because morality cannot operate without structure.

The task ahead is neither imitation nor withdrawal. It is recognition. Recognition that ethical life is sustained not by assertion, but by design; not by identity, but by accountability; not by purity of belief, but by proximity to consequence. Only when this recognition is recovered can morality once again move from theory into practice.

A civilization's morality is measured not by its beliefs, but by the behaviors its institutions do not allow.

12. REFERENCES

1. **Hallaq, Wael B.** *The Impossible State: Islam, Politics, and Modernity's Moral Predicament.* Columbia University Press, 2012.
2. **Hallaq, Wael B.** *Authority, Continuity, and Change in Islamic Law.* Cambridge University Press, 2001.
3. **Singer, Amy.** *Constructing Ottoman Beneficence: An Imperial Soup Kitchen in Jerusalem.* State University of New York Press, 2002.
4. **Hoexter, Miriam.** *Endowments, Rulers, and Community: Waqf al-Ḥaramayn in Ottoman Algiers.* Brill, 1998.
5. **Barkey, Karen.** *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective.* Cambridge University Press, 2008.
6. **İnalcık, Halil.** *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300–1600.* Phoenix Press, 1973.
7. **Mamdani, Mahmood.** *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism.* Princeton University Press, 1996.

8. **DeLong-Bas, Natana J.** *Wahhabi Islam: From Revival and Reform to Global Jihad.* Oxford University Press, 2004.
9. **Commins, David.** *The Wahhabi Mission and Saudi Arabia.* I.B. Tauris, 2006.
10. **North, Douglass C.** *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance.* Cambridge University Press, 1990.